

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

FEBRUARY, 1892.

ART. I.—THE CONGRESS OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC
CLERGY AT MALINES, BELGIUM, SEPT., 1891.

ONE of the features of the age is the Periodical Congress : it has, at least, the advantage of bringing people together, and thus friendships are formed, and prejudices removed. A great deal of nonsense is spoken, for the speaker is safe from instant rebuke and correction, and a great deal of thin argument is applauded which does not bear the strain of a perusal in the printed report. On the whole, such meetings are advantageous both in things secular and things religious. I have attended congresses in all the chief capitals of Europe, on various subjects, and am familiar with their features.

Last September I was in Belgium when the Congress of the Belgian Clergy took place in the metropolitan city of Malines, under the patronage of the Cardinal Archbishop. I was present at the last meeting in the cathedral, and saw the men, secular and ecclesiastic, who took part in the debates : it lasted from Tuesday, September 8, to Saturday, September 12, was well attended, reported *in extenso* in the local journals, and was neither controlled, nor interfered with, by the Civil Government.

The first Congress took place at Malines in 1863, twenty-eight years ago, followed by two more held at Malines in 1864 and 1867 ; the object put forward then was to defend their religious liberty and public rights against the Liberal Party in Belgium, in which insignificant country, as in Switzerland, there is always a struggle going on, as the unquiet spirits, having no frontiers to defend or foreign wars to wage or prepare against, let out their unquiet feelings in intestine disturbances. The clergy and laity met on terms of

equality ; as a rule, laymen presided at the meetings. The one thing wanted, both on the first and last occasions, was a constitutional opposition. All the members sang the same song, which naturally produced a sameness in the discussions, and rendered all results of a practical kind imaginary ; for the people who have to be dealt with are the very persons who put in no appearance and were not represented. Foreign countries, including Great Britain, were represented, but by members of the Roman Catholic Church.

On Tuesday, September 8, the Congress assembled in the halls of the Seminary ; at 11 a.m. there was grand Mass in the cathedral, at which the Cardinal officiated, and all the members of the Congress were present ; at mid-day the Congress was opened. The great hall had been provided with a crucifix and a bust of the Pope. M. Victor Jacobs, a leading member of the Parliament, took the chair as President. The Cardinal Archbishop and other civil and ecclesiastical notables took their places on the dais, and, after the recitation of the *Veni Spiritus*, made the opening address. The Cardinal's name was Goosens. He expressed his joy at seeing the assembly of Catholics, and stated that the previous Congress in 1863 had resulted favourably to religion and true liberty, or, in other words, *the Church had got the upper hand*. With the usual formula, so common in English evangelical reports and proceedings, he effusively thanked God that, in the face of the evils threatened by the enemies of the Church, they could see the number, and the value, and the power of the Church's defenders. The object of the Congress was to unite all Catholics in love for their Mother Church, veneration and obedience to their Sovereign Pope, and devotion to their suffering brethren. Their desire was truth and charity. On all sides Socialism was exciting to revolt, and the overturning of the existing order of things. The Congress preached submission, and peace for the common weal. To know God was life, to serve Him was liberty, to love Him was the greatest happiness. But God does nothing in this world except by *the agency of His Church, and for His Church* ; the cause of God and of the Church is one. St. Francis of Sales had remarked that the Church and the Pope were one ; the Congress is a new proof of our devotion to the Pope. The liberty of the Pope is essential to the dignity of the Church, for it means the liberty of our soul, and the security of our belief. Society can only be saved by a recourse to Christianity in its most complete and vital form, the Church ; all our attempts are vain without God—the God of the Church. The Pope has himself declared that the only solution to the problem of the time is through the Church. It is a mistake to suppose that

we are preoccupied with things spiritual; we labour also for the temporal good, and the true welfare of society.

The Cardinal then turned to another subject, which to an outsider betrayed the *raison d'être* of the Congress after an interval of a quarter of a century; in fact, during the preceding months, a Socialist Congress had been held at Brussels, and this was the reply of the Church: it was Mrs. Partington's mop to oppose the approaching wave of the working-man's assault on Property and Capital, Civil Government and Morals. He remarked that a great transformation had taken place in the minds of men, and that the Pope, remarking it, had issued his encyclical letter *Rerum novarum*. The Church, following the example of Christ, had evidenced at all times its desire to comfort human misery, and must do so now. He then opened out the question of religion as opposed to Godless education. He then proceeded to attack the public press—at least, the non-Catholic portion. There would be ground for despair, but that his Eminence was quite sure that God was with them, and would help them. The remarks that Jesus had made to His Apostles, "O ye of little faith, why have ye doubted?" had been repeated by the august lips of the representative of the same Jesus. Seated on the throne of St. Peter, he embraced the whole human race. Leo XIII., our admirable Father, our infallible Doctor, cast on this Congress looks of most special tenderness, and covered the assembly with his protection. When the Cardinal sat down a telegram was read which had been sent to the Pope begging for his blessing, and of the reply received from Rome. The President then read the reply which was prepared to be sent to the Pope to thank him for the blessing. A telegram was also sent to the King of the Belgians, and then the President proceeded to deliver his opening address; it was excessively long, occupying five columns of the local paper, and was clearly read from MS., as the President was so weak and infirm that he had to leave Malines very soon after. It was, in fact, a pronouncement on the part of the Clerical Party in Belgium, partly in the style of a prayer, partly of a pulpit discourse, partly of a speech of a statesman. The whole world seemed to be ignored, except Belgium; the only worker of good works was the Church, the Pope being the motive power, while behind him, at a respectable distance, stood the Lord Jesus. Throughout the Congress the Holy Spirit was ignored, as well as the possibility of those who were outside the Church doing acts worthy of commendation; on the other hand, the name of the Virgin Mary, or of any of the saints, was never mentioned; St. Peter was only alluded to as the predecessor of the Pope.

A programme of the Congress had been carefully prepared, and the President drew attention to a remarkable difference between it and the programme of preceding Congresses in 1863, 1864 and 1867. All allusion was omitted to the defence of Religious Liberty, because it had been won, and a large portion of the time would be dedicated to Social questions. By Religious Liberty, a Roman Catholic always means Papal domination; according to this view there is no Religious Liberty in Great Britain. Now, in Belgium there were certain points in which there was a division of opinion amidst the Catholics, and it was thought prudent to stifle the discussion by omitting the subject, upon the principle that prudence was a cardinal virtue. On the other hand, Social questions were the questions of the hour, and the Congress of Malines was called upon to re-echo the sentiments of the Papal encyclical *Rerum novarum*. Roman Catholics always assure us that the infallibility of the Pope extends only to decisions of dogma, but the world may well be astonished that the recluse of the Vatican, an Italian Bishop, who, probably, has never visited a manufacturing district, who has never listened to the strong words uttered in the congresses of workmen, should undertake to decide the question of wages, time of labour, protection of women and children, suspension of work on certain days, and all the tangled claims of the Socialist; yet this is just what the Pope has pretended to do, and what the President of the Belgian Congress, who, being a Parliamentary statesman, ought to have known better, pressed upon this irresponsible collection of bishops, priests, professors, pious Catholics, and women occupied in their particular branch of good works. It implies a sheer oblivion of the necessities and dangers of the nineteenth century, to suppose that anything practical could be done by an exclusive Church, to which but a portion of the parties concerned belong, narrow-minded ecclesiastics, and an old man secluded from the public gaze, who could only issue mild platitudes instead of the thunders of his predecessors. Those who had to sit out the dreary recapitulation of the heads of the Pope's encyclical, as given by the poor, suffering and exhausted President, M. Jacobs, were much to be pitied. The first public assembly was then closed.

At the evening meetings of the sections a great deal of talking took place; in each section there was a reporter, who brought with him cut-and-dried resolutions on each subject noted on the programme, and laid them before the section. This system carefully closed the door against forbidden subjects, but also against lawful subjects irreverently handled. In one section it was insisted that catechetical teaching of adults was desirable and necessary, and Fénelon's advice

should be followed, and care taken to read and explain the *Gospel*. In another section the question of looking after abandoned and vagabond children was taken up. It was urged that the asylums provided by the State were not sufficiently Christian, and the more asylums which the State provided, the more vagabond children were corrupted by them, and that the Church was the only proper guardian. In another section came up the thorny question of the mode of burial of the poor, the providing of religious consolation for the parting soul, and of prayers for the repose of the departed. The decision of this section partook of the character of a pious wish rather than of practical action. In another section, to the subject of the marriage of the poor was tacked on a request to Catholic ladies to hunt up concubines and persuade them to go through the form of marriage, as was done at Antwerp. In another section it was urged that Catholics should devote more time to the serious study of the work of the great Doctors of the Church and the remarkable encyclicals of the present Pope, and that tracts should be compiled on these subjects in a popular form. It makes one shudder to think of Thomas Aquinas, and Augustine, and Liguori, and even Leo XIII. being thrust into our hands in the form of a tract. A tract of the light kind, issued in Paternoster Row, is difficult to digest; but such a tract as contemplated at Malines would absolutely choke anyone except a theological student prepared to swallow anything. In another room a scheme was discussed for forming clubs or associations in the University for the purpose of social discussions.

On Wednesday, September 9, there was a great deal done in the sections. The first subject was on catechizing by volunteers, which seems a Papist form of a Sunday-school. In one brief paragraph three subjects are noted: the worship of the Sacred Heart, the partaking of the Communion on the first Wednesday and Sunday of each month, and the *Apostolat* of prayer. The practical subject was brought forward by a layman of rest from work on the Sunday, and the cessation of all railway traffic for the purpose of pleasure excursions. A resolution was passed on this subject in great detail of a character which would gladden the heart of the Society for the Observance of the Sabbath. Private families were urged to give their servants opportunity of attending Divine service, and never to give parties on Sunday. Artisans were to be encouraged to throw up the service of masters who required them to work on Sunday. All this was decided by a little knot of enthusiasts seated in a little room in the Seminary at Malines in a country where the fourth com-

mandment is avowedly thought nothing of, and no change is manifested in the appearance of the streets, or the manner of living of the people. In another section it was proposed and resolved to constitute Catholic and anti-revolutionary leagues like those lately constituted in Germany. This was another device to meet Socialism. It appears that there exists in Belgium societies of mutual help, but upon a secular basis. This did not satisfy the extreme Papist, who cannot imagine the existence of anything good outside his Church and the control of the priest, and it was resolved to recommend the creation of rival societies with the same object, but with religion starved down to the model of the Romish Church as their base. All such schemes, being contrary to the spirit of the age, are destined to be useless. In another section a long discussion took place on the important subject of supplying decent habitations to the workman. This seemed a matter totally beyond the sphere of the Congress. Resolutions were passed of a comprehensive character. With the State alone could rest the power of carrying out such a scheme, but it was to the interest of the Church that it should be put forward and urged by priests and Catholic laity. Questions of education were discussed in other sections.

Another remarkable subject came under discussion: "Is it possible to have a Christian theatre?" The idea seemed to be that all existing theatres should be got rid of, and Christian theatres substituted. This resolution, after a faint opposition, was carried, and marks the extreme want of a practical sense in the Congress. How would they proceed to carry out their scheme? The next proposal was to exclude the study of the nude figure from the Christian art of painting. This proposal also was adopted.

The discussion then went off to the proper decoration of the interior of churches, and the symbolical orientation of the Church itself. It appears that this ancient superstition of the early centuries had in late years been lost sight of in Belgium, and it was resolved to call attention to it. The next discussion was upon the images, a subject which, according to the speaker, left much to be desired. A dead set ought to be made against a certain class of images, and none allowed to be bought or sold which had not obtained the approval of the Bishop. This also was adopted. It must be recollected that the Papist modes of worship, as exhibited in Belgian churches, is of the type of Northern Europe, and not degraded by the dolls and absurdities which meet the eye everywhere in Italy and Spain, and the reform proposed in the above resolution is clearly in the right direction. At the general meeting of this day the proceedings of sections were

formally approved, and the subject of the relation of science to the Catholic life came on for discussion—a very large one. And one of the chief speakers had recourse to the Flemish language, a dialect of Dutch, which, of course, placed the French-speaking portion of the audience out of court. The speech, as given in French, was neither to the point nor profitable. I quote the closing phrase as a specimen of Flemish oratory: “To-day the barbarians have again arrived, but Leo XIII. is at the gate of Rome, and will compel these barbarians to retire. Yes, the Pope will make them retire. May Jesus Christ give us this extreme blessing!”

Another speaker would not let himself be beaten, for, said he, “The general adhesion of Christianity to the teaching of the Pope is the certain token of victory. The Vatican had adopted the appearance of Mount Sinai, no longer in the midst of lightnings, but in the solitude of captivity. Christians not only find in Leo XIII. a wise man, a philosopher and an *economist*, but the head of Christianity. The utterance of the Pope is the watchword of God.”

The absurdity of such utterances by the little Belgian Church can scarcely be exceeded; but if the comparison of their little Church to that great indescribable collectivity called Christianity is absurd, what shall be said of the blasphemy of calling the Vatican Mount Sinai, and the utterance of the poor old man in the Vatican the watchword of God?

On Thursday, September 10, the sections were busy. In one allusion was made to St. Peter's Pence, which were sent to Rome to supply the Pope with the means of living, as he preferred to live on the bounty of the Catholics rather than on a civil list provided by the Italian Government. This brought forward conspicuously the necessity of restoring the temporal power of the Pope, and the foolish Belgians voted a resolution to this effect: Rejoicing in an independence themselves of foreign rulers by the kind protection of the Great Powers, they did not hesitate to deny to the people of Rome, and certain provinces of Italy, the same independence which they had won for themselves by their good luck. One speaker drew attention to the weakness of the Belgian missions on the Congo, remarking that the Protestants occupied thirty-one stations, and the Catholics only six. By a singular blending of subjects the same section recorded a vote in favour of free seats in the churches during Divine service—anyone who has attended Belgian churches knows how each chair has to be paid for. In another section the great and difficult subjects of provision of pensions for aged labourers, of co-operative societies, so as to give the labourer a share in the profit, of co-operative

stores and of labour strikes were touched upon in an airy and academic way, clearly indicating that no one present had approached the foundation, or even the outskirts, of these great social questions which are destined in the twentieth century to shake society to its very basis in spite of all the feeble efforts of Governments or Churches. Another section had the hardihood to express opinions with regard to the public press, which were purely academic. The proprietors of the leading journals in Belgium of all shades of opinion must have laughed at the idea of a little coterie of ecclesiastics and flaneurs attempting to control the many-headed monster.

In another section education was discussed. A resolution was passed, which sounds strange to the ears of independent nations, that "according to the desire of the Pope young men should be sent annually to Rome to form themselves under episcopal auspices for sacerdotal life in the bosom of the Church of Rome, *the mother and mistress of all Churches*, and to learn sacred science from sources opened and constructed by the Pope." It is difficult to understand by what process of reasoning the Church of Rome is *mother* of the Greek and the Asiatic Churches, or *mistress* of the British and American Churches. The old question so fully discussed in the fourth century of the Christian era was reopened in the nineteenth—whether the study of the non-Christian classics of Greece and Rome should be tolerated—and an uncertain resolution arrived at that a judicious choice should be made of authors to be studied, and whole works should be taken up rather than portions. It was then resolved to found a society for the concentration of Catholic forces on the ground of science—religious, philosophic, and historical—and to call it by the name of Leo XIII. Every Belgian conception appeared to be of the most grandiose nature. To them the world seemed only to be commencing its existence; in fact, no other nation existed except Belgium, and no idea could get beyond the encyclicals of Leo XIII. It will be interesting to inquire what kind of mouse was the outcome of the parturient mountain. Another section recommended that more attention should be paid to Christian art, as opposed to classic or pagan art.

In the general meeting of the day more serious subjects came under discussion. It was determined that the colony of the Congo should not only be opened to civilization and commerce, but to religion also, that missionaries should be sent out, and funds supplied for their expenses. All this was well, but it was well-known in Brussels and Amsterdam that the Belgian administration of the Congo Province was an entire failure, and had entailed misery upon the poor natives. It

was then proposed by an ardent priest, a survivor of the congress of 1867, to found an association of prayer for the return of Russia to Catholic unity. The Greek Church in Russia might naturally offer prayer for the return of Rome to their fold. An appeal then was made in favour of a freer use of the Flemish language, as a safeguard of faith, morality, and natural dignity. As the use of this non-literary dialect is freely permitted, it seemed scarcely necessary to use such high-flown language as is attributed to the speaker, "*that he left the subject with all confidence to the blessings of the Lord.*" No resolution was passed by the Congress: it is too well-known that the life or death of a language depends upon causes beyond the control of kings, or parliaments, or priests. An eloquent appeal was then made in the anti-slavery cause. An address to the Pope was then read to the meeting, assuring him of their obedience, and claiming the restitution of the temporal power on the grounds of natural justice.

On Friday, September 11, one section took up a subject which was clearly beyond the sphere of mere religious dilettante—of the planting of convict colonies in the Congo Province. It is characteristic that a measure utterly condemned and abandoned by Great Britain should be recommended seriously by good men in Belgium. So much time had been wasted in academic discussions that there was no time to discuss measures to arrest the abuse of alcoholic drinks: colourless resolutions were passed, which will be mere waste-paper. In another section the question of religious retreats for prayer and meditation was discussed. To a certain order of minds this kind of practice recommends itself, and being an entire cessation from the daily labour to which man was born, corresponds with fasting, which is a cessation from taking that moderate nourishment necessary to sustain the power of the body for labour. To those who take a healthy view of the duty of man to his Maker and to his fellow-creatures both practices seem open to condemnation. Another speaker urged the return to Christian usage in the family, of a place for the crucifix over the fireplace, the practice of family prayer, and the practice of parents blessing their children; neither discussion nor resolution followed this proposal. The subject of libraries for general use, of the adoption of penniless orphans, and of encouraging the study of mathematics in colleges came under discussion. Religious education and religious literature came under lengthy consideration. The subject of decorating the interiors of churches with painting in many colours was not forgotten.

In the general meeting of this day the irrepressible subject of the union, or rather the absorption, of the Greek Churches

cropped up. It was asserted that the objection of the Oriental Churches to seek absorption arose from the mistaken idea that union meant subjection to Latinism; but the Pope was not specially Latin, as he belonged to the world at large. Considering that the Pope is always an Italian bishop, and the objection of the Oriental Churches is to there being any pope at all, these remarks are beside the mark.

Father Fletcher represented the Romanists of England, and a Belgian friend tendered him the consolation that for forty years the Passionists had daily recited an "ave" for the conversion of England. Father Fletcher might indeed be thankful for small mercies, but the very existence of such expedients for the conversion of souls seems to indicate the hopelessness of the wish. Father Fletcher then begged the assistance of Belgium to convert England, and the foundation of a special Belgian society for that purpose.

The Abbé Garnier, from France, whose name deserves special mention, made some memorable remarks. He mentioned the conversions which he had made by distributing a popular edition of the Gospel. "If Christ," said he, "does not reign over the whole world it is because we too much forget the Gospel." He then uttered the following words: "The present evil social system is often charged with being the cause of the abolition of the sovereign power of the Pope, but the men who did this wrong were brought up in ecclesiastical colleges, where, unfortunately, they found in the course of instruction more Paganism than Gospel. In France an organization had been formed to distribute and encourage the study of the Gospel in all parishes. The chief impression which he wished to fix on the Congress was the necessity of re-establishing the kingdom of Christ. In the early centuries the Gospel was in every hand. Socialism is the first result of the violation of Christian duty."

These remarks were applauded, and small tracts were circulated gratis, two of which found their way into my hand. One is a list of books recommended; foremost among them are the four Gospels and the Acts in French, at the cost of less than half a franc. But more remarkable is a small leaflet called "The League of the Gospel." External ritual is denounced as an imperfect substitute for real religion: it is only a lawful accessory, not the principal object. Jesus Christ has left us the Gospel, in which none of this ritual is mentioned. Without a perfect obedience to the Gospel there can be no true Christianity. Christians ought to live according to the Gospel, and abstain from theatres and dancing, and Christian women should not wear low dresses, or read novels, as all these pleasures have a dangerous proximity to sin. The education of

children should be strictly religious, and the Gospel should be the basis. The Sunday should be strictly observed: all labour should cease, and the church should be visited. The Bible should be read in the family daily. Prayer should consist not in long readings, but in the soul having recourse to God, dwelling in thought on God, and being in union with God. After providing for the wants of their families Christians should contribute the remainder of their income to the establishment of the kingdom of Christ. All who wish to join the league should sign a token of personal adhesion.

I attended and studied the proceedings of this Congress three days after I had accomplished a pilgrimage to the Holy Coat at Treves, and gone carefully into the details of this gross imposture, and the contrast between the debased Paganism of the one and the advanced Christian life of the other was overpowering; and yet this Proteus Church of Rome tolerates and approves of both.

This being the last day, certain orators were allowed full time for their eloquence. The stamp of man is well known at English meetings, especially religious ones—"Vox et præterea nihil." In one great display about arts, sciences, and letters occurs a passage suggesting that the young men of Belgium might indeed read Comte and Schopenhauer and other wicked books on the condition that they had previously read St. Thomas Aquinas, Bossuet, and Shakespeare. I wonder whether the great English dramatist ever found himself in such a category before? The Congress ended with a telegram from the Pope, conveying his blessing to 2,500 Belgian workmen and their families.

On Saturday, September 12, there was an early meeting held. The Abbé Garnier begged that a resolution might be recorded in the sense of his speech yesterday in *favour of family prayer and daily reading of the Gospel*. He reckoned without his host; the Belgian episcopate had had time to reflect on the consequences of too great familiarity of the laity with the Gospel, and the President ruled that the subject, which seemed to be the foundation of Christian life, and to go, as it were, without saying, should be shelved till the bishops had time to reflect whether it might be brought on the agenda of the next Congress.

An Irishman, described as an examiner of natural sciences at Dublin, then put in his word that the social difficulty was also an English and Irish question. He then got on the subject of the use of the Bible. "They often talk in England of a double Bible—the revealed Word of God and the Bible of nature. The English accuse the Roman Catholics of having as little of one as of the other. As regards the Word of God, such

“an assertion is false, and as regards the Bible of nature the same defiance is offered to the men of science as has above been thrown in the face of the British Biblical societies. Science is a good thing, but a priest is a more necessary thing. While here in Belgium you have the great sun of free science, in England the spirits lie in darkness. Still, among Protestants there are hearts of gold which cannot see the truth, though they desire to do so. Your prayers are requested, as you have triumphed by your perseverance.” Here is the true ring of the Irish blarney, with the Irish bull of hearts having the power of vision.

At eleven o'clock the Cathedral of St. Rombaut was crowded. The Cardinal-Archbishop and his bishops were seated in the nave in front of the pulpit in all pomp and splendour, and a bishop delivered the closing sermon. The text was Ephesians iv. 15. I had a good seat by the courtesy of the attendants, who recognised a foreigner, and I listened with attention. There was a copious and eloquent flow of words, accompanied by a superb action, but very few ideas, either new or convincing; but this is a phenomenon with which we are familiar in England also. The Belgian preacher seemed to realize the impossibility of the existence of any good of any kind, human or Divine, outside his Church. The Christians of Belgium were invited to be the *salt of the earth* and the *light of the world*, for they had the truth, and truth commands the world. He closed in calling for the blessing of God upon all who had attended the Congress. The Cardinal-Archbishop then addressed the congregation, all standing. He was a man of noble appearance, and his words were full of dignity. He thanked all who had contributed to the success of the Congress, and called upon them to be men of action as well as words. He then gave his blessing, and the Congress dispersed. There was a banquet in the evening and toasts. One of the lay members proposed the health of the strangers, and rendered special homage to the English, *who had bit by bit conquered religious liberty*. This was a singular sentiment from the native of a province which had formed part of the kingdom of Philip II. of Spain, and had had the advantage of being governed by the Duke of Alva, one of the most bigoted and bloody of Roman Catholics. The lessons of history seem soon forgotten.

It is difficult to say whether any possible advantage can be derived from such a Congress. Many of the subjects discussed were totally beyond the sphere of action and intelligence of ecclesiastics. Narrow-mindedness, ultramontaniam, and blindness to the progress of the nineteenth century appear to be the chief features of the Belgian Church, as represented at Malines.

No ripple is heard of the wave of the assault of the higher criticism on the Scriptures; no allusion made to the spectre of downgradeism, atheism, agnosticism, and opposition to all religion, which alarm all thoughtful Christians. Those who led the Congress seem to have learnt nothing from history, and forgotten nothing of an evil past—they seem blind even just before dawn.

R. N. C.

ART. II.—THE SERVANT OF CHRIST.

NO II.—SELF-RESPECT.

AMONGST those who do not sympathize with our Christian faith, or who are hostile to it, it is a favourite device to take some very imperfect type of a merely professing adherent, and airily to assume that his unsatisfactory qualities are the necessary and natural results of a genuine love of our Lord. This would not happen if Whately's Logic were more commonly studied; his brilliant exposition of Fallacies is an indispensable part of the equipment of a modern intellect. Education is hopelessly incomplete without such a mental discipline. Never was it easier to use this illogical method of attack than now: for the world and the Church are mixed up together so inextricably. Christians are so worldly, and worldly people are so outwardly Christian; such multitudes of men and women, who have none of the essential marks of the Kingdom of Christ upon them, would be angry and mortified if they were not allowed to share in the advantages of being called by its honoured name, that it requires no great skill in controversy to take one of such persons and to hold him up as a model product of submission to the New Testament in its claim to be the revealed will of God.

It is said, for instance, in an easy, careless, indiscriminating kind of way, that the religion by which the servant of Christ humbly, and very imperfectly, tries to live, is a grovelling superstition, that it consists largely in prostrating himself abjectly and hypocritically before a wrathful deity; that he, and such as he, are, for the most part, content with the intellectual acquiescence in abstract truth without materially altering their conduct; that they are worldly and mean, selfish and grasping, that they do not care for strictness in truth and honour, that they are influenced chiefly by the idea of gaining, at the lowest price, their reward in the joys of paradise, and that they are altogether deficient in the truly noble quality of Self-respect. In other words: Christians, as a class, are said

to be satisfied with bare, mental agreement in a creed, and, as long as they pay a formal attendance at the common worship, to allow themselves to be as unsympathetic, as hard-hearted, as sordid, as ambitious, as dishonourable, as tricky, as base, as ready to grasp every possible advantage to themselves, as the ordinary, unpretending citizen of Vanity Fair.

Now, in examining this accusation, we must put aside altogether those merely nominal Christians with whose unscrupulous indifference and disloyalty it would be plainly absurd, after the smallest reflection and inquiry, except for the purposes of polemical dishonesty, even for the most indiscriminating adversary to charge our faith. For, whatever religion there might be to which large bodies of men should belong, there would always be those who would be attached to it merely from custom, convention, association or convenience, without catching anything of its real intention and spirit. We must rather inquire whether there is anything in the spiritual relation of man towards God and his fellows, as taught by our Lord and His Apostles, which, apart from the natural corrupt tendency of every man's heart (and that the very teaching itself was intended to correct, and, finally, to remove), would be likely either to destroy his Self-respect, or, at any rate, to fail in producing it in the development of his character. We not merely admit to the full that such a Self-respect as would make it repugnant to a man to do mean, base, and ungracious actions is an admirable quality, but we are at one with our critics in insisting that the production of such a disposition of mind must be a supreme object in a religion that is worth the name. It was the Christian philosopher, Francis Bacon, who said: "Self-respect is, next to religion, the chiefest bridle of all vices." It was the Christian astronomer, Herschell, who said: "Self-respect is the corner-stone of all virtues." It was a Christian theologian who wrote: "There is a moral pauperism in the man who is dependent on others for that support of moral life, Self-respect." We agree with our opponents most heartily in our value of this great criterion of morality. What we have to ask is, whether it is only the accidental defects of unworthy, inconsistent, and nominal Christians which the objection has noticed? or, if the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ is not rather, beyond all known attempts at moral progress, the one motive power in the soul able, even in the most abject and degraded, to raise the truest, noblest, and most wholesome Self-respect?

Is, then, Self-respect more likely to be found in an unbeliever, or in a sincere Christian? What our experience teaches us, is that without a Divine sanction, and the revelation of the will of God, there can be no fixed moral standard.

That we have that revelation, we believe, for reasons which have compelled the ready and grateful homage of the wisest, best, and greatest of men. For us, the model of conduct is absolutely settled in the life and teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ. We may not be able to realize it wholly in our own practice, but that is to our own loss and through our own imperfection. Many have come very near it, and they have been acknowledged, not only by Christians, but by all mankind to be the very lights of the world. Where such principles are not established, or are without the authority of the Almighty Ruler and Judge, there we see that each man must be judge for himself, and can adopt his principles to the occasion without restraint or scruple. It is just there that looseness of honour, and temporary dethronement of ideal for the sake of convenience, are most probable. However lofty a man's moral notions may be, we believe, from our common experience and observation, that in no circumstances whatsoever is he strong enough to stand alone without the grace of God. It is not amongst those who are not Christians, but amongst the best Christians themselves, those who are most like their Divine Lord, that we find the truest nobility, the nicest honour, the most absolute self-denial, the most admirable graciousness. Outside the confines of the acknowledged Kingdom of Christ there may be fine types of character: much might be gathered from Plutarch's Lives, from the Morals of Confucius, from the Dialogues of Plato, from the Ethics of Aristotle, from the Counsels of Buddha, from the Meditations of Cicero, from the writings of Seneca, Marcus Aurelius, and Mahomet. These all, as far as they have any truth to tell, we believe to be gleams of the light of God which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. But what we say is, that, whatever a man's theory may be, unless he believes in a Judge of quick and dead, before whom he will have to answer for the things done in the body, and according to whose unerring decision his future existence will be determined; what he may gather from all these sages will affect his opinions rather than his practice. We do not know enough about the distant heroes of whom Plutarch wrote, or about Socrates, or about Aristotle, or Confucius, or Buddha, to be able to say how far they were able to live up to their ideals. But of Cicero, Seneca, Marcus Aurelius, and Mahomet we know much, and, though we find many things in them to admire, we fail to discover any attractive or satisfactory model for our encouragement. Without the grace of God, in no man can the lost image of God be restored.

But more than that: one of the chief charges against us is in reality our greatest moral safeguard. It is held to be con-

trary to Self-respect to kneel down before the Almighty, and cry from the bottom of our hearts that we are miserable sinners. The truth is, that in the fallen and degraded state in which we see the world to be, without the sense of sin there can be neither perfect ideal nor genuine thirst for moral improvement. If a man merely holds that for the most part it is better and wiser to abstain from the sins of the flesh, but that there is no divine command against them, we may depend upon it that occasions will arise when passion will be so strong that the mere notion of what is better will not stand for an instant before its storm. If a man merely considers that it is, on the whole, wiser to speak the truth, but that no Divine message has ever declared that all liars shall have their portion in the banishment of the wicked from the presence of the Lord, we may depend upon it that occasions will come to him when concealment, evasion, and duplicity will be irresistibly attractive. Where is no belief in a Divine revelation, there can be no true sense of sin. It becomes a mere question of policy, prudence, and ideals chosen and adapted by the man himself. Declension from them can cause no permanent anxiety. Breaches of them will be of such slight consequence, that moral growth will be impossible. It is only when we can kneel before a Being who has revealed Himself as of purer eyes than to behold iniquity, yet who loves to pardon transgression and sin, and to heal the wounded conscience, and can say to Him with sincerity, "Father, I have sinned against heaven and before Thee; I have rebelled against Thy will, revealed in every particular for my happiness; I can do no good thing without Thee; I am not worthy to be called Thy son"; only when the heart is wrung by sincere contrition, and by the dreary contrast between what it has made itself and what has been revealed to it as its example, that the conscience is sufficiently impressed, the motive for improvement sufficiently distinct, the encouragement and hope of restoration sufficiently powerful.

The fact is, that it is only those who have not studied the truths of the Kingdom of Christ who can pretend to be ignorant that the whole object of its foundation was none other than the restoration of the lost image of God in man. God is the essence of all perfection of every conceivable kind. There is no imaginable truth or beauty which the Word of God does not prepare us to attribute to His universal Being. To reproduce the spirit of this all-wise, all-perfect, all-glorious Mind in the wayward nature of men, that was the reason why the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us. The message of Christ teaches that in all possible circumstances and rela-

tionships, external and internal, into which we can be brought, perfection is possible for us; and to seek for that perfection is our daily and hourly duty. "Be ye perfect, even as your Father in heaven is perfect." What inducement to the very highest Self-respect could be greater than this? If we believe that we have an immortal future, and are destined hereafter to an eternal weight of glory, not of mere enjoyment—for that is a sheer libel—but of perfection and enlargement in all our noblest faculties; if we believe that even here we can become partakers of the Divine nature; if we believe that we have dwelling in us, by faith and communion with the Most High, the very Spirit of God Himself, weaning us from the world, setting our affections on things above, purifying our thoughts, putting into our minds good desires, and daily bringing the same to true effect, strengthening our resolves, subduing our passions, and making us fit for the companionship of all that is best and most esteemed in humanity in the pure and tranquil radiance of the regions of light, and of the Fellowship of God Himself, the Father and the Son; then we may well ask what moral scheme or persuasive ideal could be devised by the wit of man which would go anywhere near to produce in us such reason for the truest Self-respect, which is a humble and grateful union with God Himself?

It is by having ever in our hearts and minds, by God's grace, the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ, in life and teaching, in psalm and prophet, in gospel and epistle, in private reflection, in common worship, in Divine communion, that we can grow to this freedom from all that would make us ashamed, this control over self so greatly to be desired, this daily-increasing consciousness of the presence, and blessing, and favour, and smile of God. "We all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory." If ever there was displayed on the page of history a character of consummate dignity, of absolute self-possession, of immeasurable nobility, of perfect refinement; of truth, honour, and beauty revealing themselves in the very smallest details of life; of utter majesty, both mental and moral; of a perfection from which everything short of it was so far removed that it could only be an object of pity and sympathy; if ever there was a type of fearless courage, of absolute candour, of sublime truthfulness, it was in the Person of Him who alone was able to say, "I and My Father are One."

We are not, in this respect, in a different position from St. Paul and the Apostles. Before us we have the same Divine mirror. With St. Paul it was a living Presence, combined with a living tradition. With us it is the same living

Presence, not only through the living tradition of the continuity of Christian thought and life, but through the living Word of God. For three centuries and a half it has been, thanks to His Divine favour, the peculiar honour of the Church of Christ in England to place in the hands of each of her sons, free and untrammelled, that written mirror of the glory of her Lord, that truest picture of an ideal of highest nobility and dignity for man. To one great English Churchman, more than to any other, we owe this immortal benefit of a free access to the secret of Self-respect. To Vilvoord, in the Spanish Netherlands, the place of the martyrdom of William Tyndale, every true Englishman must look with earnest and grateful homage. To his courage, to his loyalty, to his gracious and humble persistence, we owe the English version of the Word of God, which has, ever since his day, been the delight of our Church and the inspiration of our family life. Of all the succeeding versions his translation was the groundwork. It was his singular fortune that the hand of the same king, Henry VIII., who persuaded the Emperor Charles V. to imprison, strangle, and burn him, afterwards authorized the publication of that for which he was martyred; that the same Bishop of London, Tunstal, who had ordered the public destruction of his books, was in the end obliged to append his name to the title-page of the accepted edition.

“Strong in the Lord, and in His mighty power,
Gird on the Spirit's sword, the word of God.
’Tis God's own voice that bids: ‘None like to this,
Of heavenly temper, and two-edged force.’
Deep in the sheath confined, as if the sun
Were lost in midnight, still for ages lay
That sword celestial, while in ancient tongues
Blind superstition kept the Scriptures locked.
Tyndale! thy famous toil the scabbard stript:
Forth flew the imprisoned word: the darkness past,
Light shines on England: the shut Bible opes.
Thy highest meed on earth Vilvoord bestows
In rope and flame; but Heaven the crown confers.”

In the face of the picture of the perfect dignity of our Lord thus constantly and habitually before us, it is greatly to our reproach that there should be any ground at all, not in our principles but in our practice, for the charge of the incompatibility of Christianity with Self-respect. In these days of inquiry, and the scrutiny of all things human and Divine within the limited ken of man, on the servant of Christ is laid a very serious burden. More than ever he is a city set on a hill, the light of the world, the salt of the earth. In the name of Christ and of His kingdom he is charged daily to look to this, that he is in some real sense being changed from

glory to glory. What was the glory of yesterday? What is the glory of to-day? What does he hope it will be of to-morrow? Does he, indeed, find his faults falling from him, his temptations abating, his graces and gifts unconsciously lighting up his home and the circle of his friends? These are the questions that must be asked by the servant of Christ when he compares his practice with his principles, and examines his conduct in the light of his ideal. Self-satisfied he will never be; but of this he will be growingly ambitious, that from his heart may ever be more thoroughly divested every failing and inconsistency, everything selfish, mean, base, dishonourable, discreditable, everything that could make him ashamed of himself; and that on him may fall the zealous earnest prayers of St. Paul himself, when in his eager self-devotion he longed that all the servants of Christ should be more and more conformed to His image. Then, indeed, he will have cause to respect God within him, the hope of glory.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

ART. III.—THE USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN
THE NEW.

(Concluded from page 199.)

NOT more probable than the supposition that our Lord's reference to Scripture is to be interpreted as a usage merely conventional, is the supposition that we may regard His reference to it as the result of ignorance and His professed subjection to the requirements of prophecy as a case in which His knowledge as the Son of God was limited by His assumption of man's nature; but then in this case it becomes very difficult to draw the line between the instances in which we can rely upon His declarations, and those others which are open to the correction of our wider knowledge, our larger experience, the discoveries of criticism, and the like. Why are we to believe Him in His assertion about Himself—"Before Abraham was, I am" (John viii. 58, and the like)—and His professed revelations of the Kingdom of God, if we are to suppose that He did not know whether the stories of Noah, and Lot, and Abraham were or were not on a level with those of the "Arabian Nights"? Or, to put it otherwise, suppose that we have discovered that they are on a level with them, and are alike mythical; will it not follow as a matter of course that we shall think the less of His knowledge and judgment in other matters? Having found out that He knew less than we know in matters of this kind, can

we place any more reliance on His words when He tells us about a world of which He professed to know everything and we know nothing? I very much fear that if we have reason to believe that Christ was wrong on any points within our own sphere of knowledge we shall have the less reason to trust Him when He professes to go beyond it. In fact, we should only be acting, if we did so, after the analogy of His own teaching: "He that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much;"—He that is incorrect in one point may be wrong also in another. "If ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches?" If I have been indifferent to truth in My teaching here how can I expect you to believe Me elsewhere? "If I have told you earthly things and ye [have cause to] believe Me not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things?" If He has misled or deceived us in a matter of so much importance as this, how can we be expected to commit ourselves to Him and to trust Him in matters of supreme and eternal import? Would not this be to lay upon us a burden which we are not able to bear, to expose our faith to a test which it would be unreasonable to expect it to stand? For this is not a question as to whether in His man's nature we are to attribute universal knowledge to Christ, which would simply be to make Him a monstrosity, but whether we are to accept Him as an authorized and accredited teacher in such a matter as the character and function of those Scriptures upon the testimony of which, to a very large extent, He based His own mission, and His claim to have come from God. Was He warranted in appealing to the authority of Moses if it can be shown that the law to which He appealed had nothing whatever to do with Moses; that it lacked the Divine authority which it claimed to have as coming from him, and which there is no evidence of its having had if it did not so come? For it is not a matter to be questioned whether laws prescribed by the priests many centuries after the time of Moses could rightly claim to be Divine merely because they were promulgated with the conventional but wholly inaccurate and unwarrantable formula, "The Lord said unto Moses." And if not Divine He was certainly wrong, and not only wrong in fact, but wrong morally, if He attributed to compositions or to laws thus introduced, a Divine authority which it was impossible they could possess, and which, if they did not possess it, He could not bestow. For instance, when our Lord said to the leper, "Show thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded for a testimony¹ unto them," He quoted laws² which we are now told were as

¹ Matt. viii. 4.

² Lev. xiv. 3, 4, 10.

late as, if not later, than the time of Ezra. Now, if the critics are right, is it possible to think that our Lord was not seriously compromised in referring to them in this way? For according to the critics, it is certain that this was not a command given by Moses, but our Lord acknowledged it not only as coming from him, but also for his sake. He either knew or did not know that it was the commandment of Moses. If He did not *know* it was the commandment of Moses, that is, was uncertain whether it was or not, have we any reason to believe He would have spoken of it as He did? Nay, have we not every reason to believe He would not so have spoken of it? On the other hand, if He knew it was *not* the commandment of Moses, can He have had any motive for calling it his commandment? And once more, if He thought it was the commandment of Moses, and it turns out not to be, what are we to think of Him for speaking of it as He did? Is it not evident that He stands convicted of placing the law of Moses (and that, be it observed, not the moral but the ceremonial law), on an elevation to which it was not entitled? and what are we to think of Him if this was the case? What are we to think of Him when He says, "Verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise fall from the law till all be fulfilled" (Matt. v. 18). What are we to think of Him when He says, "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you" (Matt. vii. 7). What are we to think of Him when He says, "All things are delivered unto Me of My Father, and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him" (Matt. xi. 27). Lastly, what are we to think of Him when He says, "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest" (Matt. xi. 28). Have we any more reason to trust Him in these cases than in the others? and if so, on what principle is our selection to be made? I am quite aware that the dilemma is an unpopular, and, as some regard it, an unwarrantable device to resort to in argument; but there are times when we must take our choice between two alternatives, and an intermediate position is not open to us. And it seems to me that this is one of them: and then in such a case to refuse to take our choice is to remain neutral and undecided, which is at all events incompatible with action. If, on the other hand, we are to accept some of the words of Christ and to reject others, how are we to know which to accept and which to reject? and is any such course consistent with the absolute surrender which our Lord demands, and with His own testimony? "I have not spoken of Myself; but the

Father which sent Me, He gave Me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak" (John xii. 49). "The words which I speak unto you I speak not of Myself" (xiv. 10); "The word which ye hear is not Mine, but the Father's which sent Me" (xiv. 24); "I have given unto them the words which Thou gavest Me" (xvii. 8); "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My words shall not pass away" (Matt. xxiv. 35; Mark xiii. 31; Luke xxi. 23). How is this compatible with our choosing some and rejecting others? or with the possible discovery of criticism after eighteen centuries that there was a flaw in the foundation on which He built, and that He had made a radical error in ascribing to Moses what belonged to Ezra, and treated an ideal fabrication of the time of Josiah as the very words of the Most High revealed to Moses? It remains, therefore, that the only course open to us with regard to the words of Christ, and His application of Scripture, is to "trust Him not at all, or all in all."

There is something that is due to His utterances simply on the ground of their being His. As it is said of the works of Bishop Pearson that the very dust of his writings is gold, so with far more truth may we regard even the subordinate statements of Christ, who spake as never man spake, as not lightly to be set aside, but may even claim to throw their weight into the scale when we are challenged to decide on such a matter as the authority and date of the received books of Moses. For this is not merely a literary question, affording an open field for discussion; because it is undeniable that Christ has claimed an authority for the received writings of Moses which they cannot have if they are not his, and therefore the position of their authority stands or falls with the position of their date and the genuineness of their origin.

Now, we have reason to be thankful that the recent forms in which the extremest Pentateuchal and Old Testament criticism has been presented to the English public by Driver and Cheyne, as *e.g.*, in the "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament," and the Bampton Lectures for 1889, are such as cannot fail to raise the indignant protest of English common-sense. We should hardly be wrong in saying that it would be more easy to believe that the books of the Old Testament came down straight from heaven than that the condition and circumstances of their production were such as we are asked to believe they were. If adequate reasons were advanced, such as appeal to experience and to common-sense, it would be, of course, our duty to regard them; but when the reasons given are inadequate, deficient, and trivial, it is obviously no less our duty to reject them. The only verdict we can give is that of *not proven*.

It appears to be certain, therefore, that we cannot regard our Lord's use of Scripture as a mere concession to the conventional estimate of it, and certainly not, if we are to place any faith in what He tells us of Himself and His words, as though they were to be referred to His ignorance or indifference as to its true character; for we must admit that His teaching with regard to Scripture has an equal claim upon our attention with anything else that He has taught us. But if this be so, what are the reasonable inferences we may draw therefrom? First, that the Old Testament Scriptures are not to be regarded as a haphazard collection of the works of unknown and unauthorized writers who uttered accidentally certain things of real intrinsic value in themselves, as is the case with many of our own writers and with those of other nations. In this respect the Hebrew writers had no monopoly of wisdom, however high the place they hold in the republic of letters. It was manifestly for a higher reason than this that our Lord appealed to them. He regarded the Old Testament writings as in a special sense the heritage of the fathers which they had received of God. He recognised the history as authentic; He considered the Law as divinely given and authorized, both in its moral and ceremonial branches; and He regarded the Psalms and the Prophets as specially endowed with the Spirit of God—the Spirit that without measure was poured out on Him; and He regarded it as peculiarly His own mission that the prophecies, in their lofty privileges and in their solemn and tremendous responsibilities, should be fulfilled in Him.

And from this there follow two inferences. First, that the lax way of reading the Old Testament which rejects half its history and refers its highest flights of prophecy to an acute and penetrating insight into the principles, causes, and results of current events is incompatible with, and discouraged by, the example and practice of our Lord in His deference to and His application of its prophecy and history. Making all possible allowance for any modifying considerations we can discover in His use of the Old Testament, there remains clear and distinct in His use of it the recognition of a pervading and informing Spirit, which, if such recognition is trustworthy, as we have seen it must be, at once puts the Old Testament on a level above all the other literature of the world, save only that which was the direct result of His own life and teaching; and this, as I have said, not on account merely of its intrinsic excellence, but because He recognised it as the means and channel of a Divine message to man conveyed through His own nation by its prophets and seers.

But again, while we acknowledge this to the fullest extent,

we do not consider it incumbent upon us to establish every date, to vindicate every assertion, to overlook and blink every inconsistency, discrepancy, or contradiction which a keen-witted criticism can detect in the Old Testament. No one can read the Old Testament with any care without encountering obstacles and difficulties which cannot fail to baffle the utmost ingenuity and skill, just as we meet with the like difficulties in the Gospel history. The question is, are we to allow this fact to discredit the whole literature, and to outweigh our Lord's plain acknowledgment of and deference to it? or are we to set against these things the general estimate of its worth which He has taught us to form, and to admit the truth, beauty, and majesty of the Divine elements therein, while we are ready to acknowledge that the revelation, being given to man and by man, can hardly be expected to be devoid of certain human elements also? If the eternal Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, why should not the spoken Word likewise partake of that human nature which He wore, and to the conditions of which He made Himself subject? We are not called upon, even if we were able, to decide or to define the precise limits of the human and the Divine in the nature of Christ, any more than we are to distinguish and determine the principles which govern the union of the Divine and human in Scripture; it is enough for us in either case not to merge the one in the other, and not, in our eagerness to detect the human, to fail to acknowledge and to worship the Divine.

Secondly, the authority which Christ recognised in Scripture was manifestly an authority independent of man. Had Deuteronomy, for example, been written under the monarchy, it could have had only the intrinsic authority of its inherent beauty and truth derived from the anonymous writer of it. On the hypothesis there was not in it the authority of specific revelation because, as its writer was unknown, so his claim on our attention was unauthorized, as it is manifestly unauthenticated. His work was no more than any similar work of Seneca, Epictetus, or Cicero—having, indeed, certain qualities of its own of high excellence, but possessing no credentials of a heavenly character that we are bound to recognise. But Christ claimed for it the authority of the Word of God, the Scriptures of truth. "It is written;" "Moses, because of the hardness of your heart, wrote you this precept."¹ Now, the authority of Moses was a known and recognised authority. He had wrought mighty works, to which he appealed in proof of his mission. With him, as we are three times told (Exod. xxxiii. 11; Numb. xii. 8; Deut. xxxiv. 10), the Lord spake

¹ Matt. xix. 8; Mark x. 5.

face to face. He was the accredited messenger of God. Unless, therefore, his mission was a lie, that which he spoke in the name of God had a direct claim on our attention. It was the message of God and the word of God, and to it as such Christ appealed. Had anyone else personated Moses and assumed his functions, he would have had to accredit his mission as the mission of Moses was accredited; and as long as it lacked this accrediting it would have had no claim on our acceptance as the message of God, however lofty and sublime in itself. Thus the element which differentiates the Word of God, as that which differentiates the mission of Christ, is its supernatural element. Divest the Gospels and the Gospel histories of the supernatural, and you degrade them to the level of Herodotus or Livy. You have, and can have, no incarnation and no resurrection, and no mighty works revealing the character of God; you have only the monstrosity of an attractive character—whose character, however, no less than his mission, was vitiated by a falsehood; for if the foundation was false, the superstructure also was unsound.

It is the same with the Old Testament. If you do away with its supernatural credentials, and force it to rest only on its natural characteristics and excellencies, you reduce it, indeed, to the level of mundane literature, but in so doing you destroy and neutralize its claims on our special attention, and you altogether disqualify it for the purpose for which Christ appealed to it.

It is this which is the real secret of the modern theology. It professes to rest on criticism, but its criticism is uncritical and indiscriminating. It applies the microscope to minute features of the text, and exaggerates its imaginary discoveries to a portentous magnitude; but it overlooks other features which he who runs may read, and which, when read in their simplicity, are sufficient to expose the absurdity of the conjectural discoveries. It presupposes original records which must have existed and perished, and invents writers whom it knows only as P. and D. and J. and E., and conceives these literary impersonalities to have pieced together the surviving fragments of those records without regard to consistency, but nevertheless with such consummate skill that they have escaped detection as independent writers for more than two thousand years; while the last author of all, to whom we are indebted for the books as we have them, is not only unknown even to an oblivious and ungrateful fame, but has not been thought worthy of so much as a literary symbol, though it is clear that to him, as the ultimate reconciler of priest and prophet, the combiner of the work of Elohist and Jehovist, of Deuteronomist and Redactor, into an apparently harmonious or contrariant

whole, as the case may be, the world, whether Christian or non-Christian, believing or unbelieving, has been laid under obligations of ceaseless and insolvent gratitude. Verily, there are no persons so credulous as the unbelieving; there is nothing so probable and so credible as the unexpected and the impossible; there is nothing more abhorrent to nature than the supernatural. But, given these two factors, God and revelation, and it is hard to see how we can dispense with the supernatural. Certain it is that we must strike the balance between probabilities; and the question in this case is whether, if God has given an actual revelation, He is more likely to have given it through deception and fraud than by miracle and prophecy; whether, if He sent His Son, Christ, to be born of a virgin, to die the death of a malefactor, and to rise again from the dead, that Son, Christ Jesus, is more likely to have misunderstood and misapplied the Scriptures, to which He appealed as furnishing part of the credentials of His mission, than He is to have placed them on their true and legitimate basis as the Word of the Father from whom He came, and the work of the Spirit whom He promised to send; and whether, if this is really the purpose for which He claimed them, it is in any sense probable that their actual origin and growth is after the manner and with the result that has been proposed, which is inconsistent with prophecy and rejects miracle; and whether, after all, if there is any actual utterance of God to man, any voice of the Father speaking to the heart of His children, it is not more probable that He prepared them for the full-toned utterance of that voice, in sundry times and in divers manners, by marvellous history, by stupendous miracle, by dark and unintelligible prophecy, till He spake by man's voice in the substance of human flesh, not without mighty works and potent prophecies, than that He left men to discover as best they could the traces of His will through records and writings partly defective, partly distorted, and more than half untrue, and which, if they had any reference to His Son, only had it by accident, of which He falsely and ignorantly availed Himself.

STANLEY LEATHES.

ART. IV.—THE “INDEMONSTRABLE PRINCIPLE” OF
CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS.

THE contest between the philosophy of faith and that of unbelief—between those who accept a Divine revelation upon reasonable and sufficient evidence and those who reject every truth which is incapable of actual demonstration,

although lying beyond the domain of science or general experience—is a very ancient one, and one which has passed through many stages of development during the long history of our faith. By none of the great champions of Christianity in its earliest history has the defence of a revelation on sound philosophic principles been so successfully maintained as by Clement of Alexandria in his "Stromata," a title which represents our modern term "Miscellany." In the seventh and eighth books of this collection, which, as its name indicates, does not lay claim to any systematic arrangement, the writer concentrates his attention on the distinction between the true philosophy of the primitive type and the sceptical philosophy which succeeded it, and in later ages even superseded it, and lays down the necessity of admitting some first principle which is indemonstrable as the basis of a solid philosophy—a necessity which presents itself even in the exact sciences which have their only sure starting-point in definitions, postulates, or axioms. Clement begins his eighth book with pointing out this contrast between the primitive and the later philosophies.

"The most ancient philosophers," he writes, "were not driven to disputation and doubt; nor are we ourselves who embrace the really true philosophy. . . . But the more recent philosophers of the Greeks, from an empty and aimless vain-glory, through argument and contention were betrayed into a useless trifling. On the other hand, our barbarian [*i.e.*, Christian] philosophy, casting out all contention, saith, 'Seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you, ask and it shall be given you.' . . . And on those who thus make inquiry according to the Scriptures by which they walk, the gift of a Divine and comprehensive knowledge is bestowed by God by means of an enlightened search."

Clement traces here the line which divides the philosophy, which begins its investigations from fixed and definite principles, from that captious philosophy which, by failing to build on any solid foundation, ends in a chaos of universal doubt and scepticism. The most remarkable instance of this latter kind of reasoning, and one which must have been in the mind of Clement at this time, was the attack of Celsus upon Christianity, which has been the text-book of every subsequent sceptic, and which had its fullest development in the work of Strauss.

Celsus complains that some Christians, neither willing to give or receive a reason about the things they believe, "use this, 'Do not examine but believe, and thy faith will save thee.'" It is easy to trace the source of this calumny. Even the simplest Christian was able to see that he had no common ground with an adversary who absolutely rejected the principle

of faith, and regarded the miracles which formed one of the chief supports of his own faith as not only incredible but impossible. The plea in behalf of faith was misinterpreted by Celsus in order to show that reason had no part in the Christian system. But Celsus must have known that reason had already fulfilled her part and satisfied her claims by a careful examination of the evidence by which the doctrine of Christ was established.

This is well expressed in the words of Clement we have just cited, who gives the true version of the charge advanced by the contemptuous philosopher.

The learned and judicious Mr. Glas, in his "Notes on the Discourse of Celsus," observes on this passage :

We are as certain of some things known only by faith as of anything we know by reasoning and experience, and in our daily practice we proceed upon faith as confidently as upon any of the other two, and with as good success. It would, therefore, be most ridiculous to deny that faith is a way of knowing, competent to the mind of man. And it is no less absurd to demand reasoning in the place of faith than it would be to require hearing from the eye, or sight from the ear. Such is the demand of the philosopher to admit of no knowledge but what is properly called science, and his complaint of Christians as not willing to know the things of faith by reasoning, as if he had found fault with them because they would not hear with their eyes. The Christians then were perfectly in the right not to give or take a reason for the things to be known by faith ; and as to these things they said truly and most justly, "Do not examine but believe" (Works of Mr. Glas, vol. iv., p. 378).

But they had to the fullest extent admitted the claims and satisfied the demands of reason in judging and determining the evidence upon which their faith so securely rested. When they accepted the testimony of prophets and Apostles, and the record of the teaching of Christ, which their testimony has bequeathed to the Church, they entered upon the province of faith and acknowledged the Scriptures, in the words of Clement, as a first and indemonstrable principle—an *ἀναπόδεικτος ἀρχή*. The difficulties and discrepancies which might have perplexed their reason during the progress of their conversion became then the trials of their faith rather than obstacles in the way of it. Their principal object was then to clear up and reconcile all the apparent differences, the *ἀντικειμένα* of the sacred text,¹ rather than to make them the means of overthrowing their first principle and consenting to surrender to the fascination of a captious and unreasonable criticism the claims and demands of a reasoning and reasonable faith. Those who, like Clement, Tatian and others of the Alexandrian

¹ Many attempts of this kind are to be found among the early writers. Among others Julian of Toledo wrote a work bearing the title *Ἀντικειμένα* which some have erroneously attributed to Junilius Africanus.

school, had passed from the teaching of the early philosophy to the higher teaching of Christ, had already recognised the necessity of securing some first principle as the foundation of all their search after truth. They were not passing out of a chaos of vague scepticism and trackless speculation when they accepted, as a first principle, the authority of Christ as a teacher, and the Scriptures which represented His Divine teaching. The words of Clement are here very suggestive. "We have," he writes, "as a first principle (*ἀρχή*) of our teaching, the Lord, 'at sundry times and in divers manners,' leading us from the beginning to the end of our knowledge through the Prophets, through the Gospel, and through the blessed Apostles. If anyone should deem it necessary to find another first principle, it could not be truly regarded as such. In God, as inherently faithful (*ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ πιστός*) in His Scriptures and Word, we justly put faith, operating as it does for the benefit of mankind. We use this reasonably as the criterion for the discovering of other things. Now everything that is judged is not believed until it is judged, for that is not a first principle which has need of judgment. Justly, therefore, when we have embraced by faith the indemonstrable principle (*ἀναπόδεικτος ἀρχή*), and have abundantly derived our demonstrations concerning this principle from the principle itself (*ἀπόδειξεις παρ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἀρχῆς περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς λαβοντες*), by the voice of the Lord we are educated into the knowledge of the truth" (l. vii., c. 16).

This passage is a very valuable one from many points of view. For while it places the Scriptures as they were delivered to us from the first on the supreme throne of Christian teaching, they dissipate the foolish sophistries of those who, confounding their authority with their authenticity, place the Church before and above them. An earthly monarch, when his legitimacy is clearly proved, enters at once upon his supreme authority, and those who have judicially tested that authority become at once subject to it. Thus the Church, when she had established the authenticity of the Scriptures, at once submitted to their authority and accepted it as supreme. The case of the rediscovery of the former law is exactly parallel to the reception of the latter one. Its authenticity once established, both the king and the rulers, the priests and the people, gave it their entire submission and allegiance. Clement is himself as careful to prove the authenticity of the Scriptures as he is, after that proof, to assert their authority. In another very remarkable passage he charges the heretics of his day with the corruption and mutilation of the sacred text: "First, they do not receive all the Scriptures—then imperfect versions—and not as the

body and context of the prophecy require; but choosing out ambiguous passages, they draw them out to meet their own opinions, gathering from them a few scattered words, not considering their true meaning, but applying them in their literal sense."

If the words of Clement had been written in our day, they could not have better expressed the course of the advocate of the modern school of biblical criticism. For the critic of this school admits of no indemonstrable principle, no fundamental doctrine on which he can build up a superstructure of strength and symmetry. He begins, indeed, by destroying the foundations of faith, and carries on to the very last the work of disintegration. The great ideal of St. Augustine in the grandest work which the earlier centuries of our faith ever produced, his treatise "On the City of God," is reversed by the high school of modern criticism, the Kuenens, the Wellhausens, and their too-numerous disciples. The foundation-stones are violently torn out to place them on the top of their ideal building; the history of the Patriarchal Church vanishes in myths and legends; the law is detached from its ancient place to be put in a higher part of the building than that of the prophets; the historical books are post-dated in order to destroy their authority—everything is confounded and turned backwards *πάντα πάλιν στρέφεται*. Yet the wanderers in this maze of conjecture not only lose themselves, but meet only to oppose one another; while the more timid speculator hesitates to accompany his bolder companion to the end of his fruitless journey, in the hope that he may yet save a fragment of his former faith to serve for a new foundation. Professor Robertson Smith, in his preface to Wellhausen's "History of Israel," admits that the modern "historical criticism has made many false and uncertain steps." The Christian inquirer who remembers the indispensable moral qualifications which his Divine Master has laid down for the discovery of the truth, cannot but regard the pride of intellect and the almost supercilious contempt for the traditions of the most venerable and primitive antiquity which are displayed in the writings of Kuenen, Wellhausen, and more recently by their English disciple, Professor Cheyne, as presenting serious obstacles to the reception of their destructive theories.

While we readily admit the skill, the ingenuity, and the elaborate research which are exhibited by the propounders of the new theories, and which are specially exhibited in the kind of anatomical demonstration to which they have subjected the ancient Scriptures, we cannot but entertain the conviction that if the same qualities had been displayed in establishing the unity and integrity of the sacred volume, very

different results would have presented themselves. We see in all their labours the absence of the one great requisite for the study of God's Word, the honest and good heart, prepared, as St. Hilary says, to bring back more from the Word of God than it brings to it—rather anxious to discover methods of reconciling discrepancies than prove them irreconcilable. The Christian, however, when he receives the Scriptures on that kind of evidence on which the Church for eighteen centuries has received them, acknowledges them with Clement to be a *principium indemonstrabile*—a criterion by which he is to judge all else—rather than a work of human origin and doubtful authority, on which he is himself to sit in judgment. Tatian declares that the reading of the Scriptures led to his conversion to Christianity. He approached them in the spirit of a true philosophy, and was at once impressed with their moral excellence and beauty. “I was persuaded by them,” he writes, “from the modesty of their style, from the artlessness of the writers, from their natural explanation of the creation of the universe, from their prophetic foresight, from the excellency of their precepts, and from the monarchy of the world which they proclaimed.”¹ A faith thus originated places its possessor on so far higher a platform than that of the mere critic, that there is no common ground for controversy, no battle-field in which the believer and the infidel can meet on equal terms. But even to those who have not yet acquired the precious gift of faith, the arbitrary dismemberment of the body of the Scriptures, in order to assign to a number of imaginary beings, who exist only in the mind of the critic, the authorship of its various parts, must seem an act of audacity unequalled in the history even of secular and modern literature. For in this we might have some external evidence to assist us, some proof lying outside the work itself, and corroborating the testimony arising from its internal features. But in the Pentateuch, the Law and the Prophets, we have a work which can have no such outward illustration. The ancient Scriptures stand unique and alone, like the prehistoric monuments of architecture and art, and are incapable of comparison with any other work. The capricious division of them, according to some conjectural light existing only in the mind of the writer, is obviously, therefore, an act of the boldest assumption. The great diversity of opinion among those engaged in this work of disintegration, and the gradual multiplication of their conjectural authors, must make every reasonable mind hesitate ere it can entrust itself to such conflicting guides, and surrender to their plausible systems

¹ *Con. Græcos Oratio*, c. 29.

traditions which only yield in antiquity to the writings themselves, and, at all events, have the merit of clearness and consistency. No sooner was the first division of authorship—that of the Elohist and Jehovistic writer—laid down as a first principle, than a subdivision of both of them began, and we were introduced to two or three Jehovistic writers, to which are now added a priestly author of later date, and a variety of subordinate entities. We are first taught that the Elohist writer gave the text to the subsequent Jehovist, who expanded and supplemented his narrative. Now we find that the theory is reversed. The Jehovist is discovered to be the older writer. Thus Graf, in a letter to Kuenen in 1866, writes: "Vous me faites pressentir une solution de cette énigme . . . c'est que les parties élohistiques de la Genèse seraient postérieures aux parties jéhovistiques."¹

It is upon such shifting sands as these that the new theorists are walking, prophesying after their own spirit, and having no clear perception of any of the facts which they lay down with such supreme self-satisfaction. And the reason that they are only able to make guesses after truth is clearly this: that they are unable to arrive at any first principle, or to follow the wiser example of the early Christian philosopher, who, having fully investigated the claims of the ancient Scriptures and the evidence they gave to his faith, accepted them as a *principium indemonstrabile*, and made them his criterion of religious truth as well as a guide of his daily life and practice. Nor is the inquirer who proceeds upon this safe path and starts from this sure first principle daunted by the difficulties and discrepancies which present themselves in the subordinate facts and features of the sacred narrative; as these, arising naturally from the different points of view occupied by the writers, or from the obscurities of language or other causes inevitable in the case of writings transmitted to us from the remotest ages, may, by a careful and prayerful study, become capable of reconciliation, and give a stimulus to a higher curiosity. The late Cardinal Wiseman drew a beautiful picture of the difference between religious truth as seen from within and from without the sanctuary of faith, comparing the one to the stained glass of the windows of a stately cathedral as they appear externally, a chaos of fragments without light or order, while to those who are within the building the design of the artist is shown in its fullest beauty and most exquisite symmetry. As the morning or evening beam brings out its forms and colours in all their depth and richness, all that is broken and fragmentary becomes then but the contribution to the

¹ Wellhausen, p. 89, note, ed. 1885.

unity of the whole work, and falls into perfect harmony of form and colour with all that surrounds it. We cease to have any desire to spend our time and talents in criticising the features of irregularity and disunion which the exterior of the sacred books presents, and find it our chief pleasure, as well as our most urgent duty, to endeavour to reconcile their difficulties, and study the Scriptures in the light which is reflected upon them by the Spirit of God, which alone can fully clear up their meaning and exhibit their true proportions. That the Divine revelation went through a process of development from the days of Moses to that of the last of the prophets, that, during this process, it incorporated into itself many archaic and sometimes fragmentary elements which naturally and necessarily had a different form and structure to those of the later writings in which they were embodied, is sufficient to account for the differences of style and diction which it would otherwise be impossible to explain. But this process of development is rather internal than from without; it has been beautifully described by Vincent of Lerins in the well-known words:

“*Crescat igitur oportet, et multum vehementerque proficiat tam singulorum, quam omnium, tam unius hominis quam totius ecclesiæ ætatum ac sæculorum gradibus, intelligentiâ, scientiâ, sapientiâ; sed in suo dumtaxat genere, in eodem scilicet dogmate, eodem sensu, eâdemque sententiâ. . . . Fas est enim ut prisca illa cœlestis philosophiæ dogmata, processu temporis excurentur, limentur, poliantur; sed nefas est ut commutentur, nefas ut detruncentur, ut mutilentur. Accipiant licet evidentiam lucem, distinctionem, sed retineant necesse est, plenitudinem, integritatem, proprietatem.*”¹

ROBERT C. JENKINS.



ART. V.—THE TRAGEDY OF SIR THOMAS OVERBURY.

PROBABLY at no period of our history were scandals more rife than during the reign of James I. Mrs. Hutchinson calls the Court “a nursery of lust and intemperance, and every great house in the country a sty of uncleanness;” this is the view of a Puritan writer, but that there was a good deal of truth in it there are abundant facts to prove. Wilson tells us that the “streets of London swarmed day and night with bloody quarrels,” and we are not likely to forget the picture of

¹ *Common.*, l. i., c. 28, 30.

the state of society drawn with a master's hand in the "Fortunes of Nigel." But the monster scandal of all in that disgraceful period was, without doubt, the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury, which took place in the Tower in September, 1613. So many persons were implicated in this crime, and with it are connected the records of so many trials, the evidence in which is often not very clear, that it seems worth while to try to disentangle the thread of the story, and to set it down in its main details. The crime did not become known till nearly two years after its commission, when the principal actors in it had long been enjoying the highest honour and dignity, and were basking in the light of Court favour.

All readers of English history are familiar with the extraordinary rise into favour and power of the young Scotch page, Robert Carr, first brought to King James's notice by having his leg broken in a tournament, and afterwards, for no other merit than his personal beauty, loaded by the King with favours, until he reached the dignity of Viscount Rochester and the knighthood of the Garter. This youth, "drawn up by the beams of majesty to shine in the highest glory" (as the chronicler expresses it), was but poorly educated, and altogether but of mean ability; yet so great was his influence that "no suit, nor no reward but comes by him; his hand distributes, and his hand restrains." Such a man, placed in such a position, evidently needed, before all things, a clever friend who should be able to help and direct him, that he might not make too conspicuous blunders in exercising his patronage and performing the duties of the various offices which he held; and such a friend he found in Thomas Overbury. Overbury was the son of a country gentleman of Gloucestershire, and had been educated at Oxford and the Middle Temple, and had afterwards travelled in France. Determining to push his fortune at Court, he soon made the acquaintance of Carr, who, finding him clever and well informed, and perhaps not over-scrupulous, cultivated his intimacy. The two became inseparable, and their friendship, being mutually profitable, might have long continued, had it not been for the introduction of a third person who was destined to be the evil genius of poor Overbury. Bishop Goodman gives us an anecdote of the intimacy of Carr and Overbury: "His (Carr's) special friend was Sir Thomas Overbury, a very witty gentleman, but truly very insolent, and one who did much abuse the family of the Howards. He was once committed for a very short time. Upon this occasion the Queen was looking out of her window into the garden where Somerset and Overbury were walking, and when the Queen saw them, she said: 'There goes Somerset (Carr) and his

governor; and a little after Overbury did laugh. The Queen, conceiving that he had overheard her, thought that they had laughed at her; whereupon she complained, and Overbury was committed. But when it did appear to the Queen that they did not hear her, and that their laughter did proceed from a jest the King was pleased to use that day at dinner, then the Queen was well satisfied, and he was released."¹ But now for the evil genius who was to be the destroyer of the prosperous courtier. Frances Howard, daughter of the Great Chamberlain, the Earl of Suffolk, had been married at the age of thirteen to the Earl of Essex, who was only a year older. After the marriage the children were separated, and the Earl went abroad for some years. Meantime the Lady Frances grew into a most beautiful woman, and became the belle of the Court. Wilson, a writer nearly contemporary, says of her: "The Court was her nest, her father being Lord Chamberlain, and she was hatched up by her mother, whom the sour breath of that age (how justly I know not) had already tainted, from whom the young lady might take such a tincture, that ease, greatness and Court glories, would more distain and impress upon her, than any way wear out and diminish. And growing to be a beauty of the greatest magnitude in that horizon, was an object fit for admirers, and every tongue grew an orator at that shrine."² Among her admirers she is said to have had the young Prince Henry, but the most favoured was Robert Carr, now Viscount Rochester. In that corrupt Court conjugal fidelity was but little prized, and, as this young girl had scarcely seen and knew nothing of her husband, her case was specially perilous. Carr was well furnished with personal graces, but he was deficient in literary skill, and desiring to back his suit by some of the courtly epistles then in vogue, he had recourse to Overbury, who readily put his talents at his disposal. The attack succeeded, and the beautiful young Countess became the mistress of Rochester, who was passionately enamoured of her. But now a terrible impediment to their amour arose: the husband came back to claim his young bride, and, in spite of her violent opposition, carried her off to his seat at Chartley in Essex. Here they passed a miserable time, the lady doing all in her power to alienate her husband's affections from her, and even having recourse to drugs and philters, which were supplied to her by her agents, Dr. Forman and Mrs. Turner. When they returned to London, and she again met Rochester, the two agreed together that

¹ "Court of King James," i. 215.

² "History of Great Britain," p. 56.

nothing would content them but the dissolution of the union with Lord Essex, and their marriage. To this infamous scheme the King readily lent himself, and so much did that age suffer from the miserable disease of king-worship, that grave bishops were found to carry out the project of the divorce under form of law. But there was one man who resolutely opposed the scheme of divorce and the intended marriage, and this was one who had hitherto had the greatest influence with Rochester, and had aided him in his love affair by his pen. Overbury was little troubled by conscientious scruples, and was ready enough to aid his patron in an illicit amour; but when it came to a proposed legal union, by such means as were devised, he saw how utterly this would ruin his friend, and did all in his power to dissuade him. The lady was furious, and determined to have her revenge. Able now, by his infatuation for her, completely to control Rochester, she set him upon a scheme for getting Overbury out of the way. The scheme was a very ingenious one. Rochester took occasion to extol to the King Overbury's shrewdness and tact, and to mention him as one particularly well suited for diplomatic service in some foreign Court. Presently the Archbishop, by the King's command, "propounded unto him the embassy to France or of the Archduke's Court,"¹ and as he did not show any desire for these posts, the King soon after "made him a formal offer of one of them by Lord Pembroke."² Upon this, Overbury consulted his friend Rochester—as, of course, had been calculated—and was strongly advised not to accept such an offer, which, it was suggested, had been probably put upon him by some enemy to get rid of a rising courtier. Consequently, Overbury refused the offer, "and in such terms, as were by the Council interpreted pregnant of contempt, in a case where the King had opened his will."³ Upon this Rochester goes to the King and "blows the fire, incensing him with all the aggravations he could; so that the poor gentleman, for his contempt, was forthwith committed to the Tower."⁴ Here he might be thought to be tolerably safe from the wrath of the Countess, but, in fact, he was thus placed helplessly in her power. The plot proceeded with extraordinary deliberation and skill. The divorce had now taken place, and the Countess was married to Rochester—created Earl of Somerset, in order that his rank might not be inferior to hers—but in the midst of her triumph the lady never relaxed her bitter vengeance. The first thing was to provide a lieutenant at the Tower who would be ready to

¹ Others say to Russia.

³ *Ibid.*

² "Letters of Sir H. Wotton,"

⁴ Wilson.

second her designs. For this purpose Somerset, all-powerful with the King, obtained the removal of Sir William Wade and the appointment of Sir Jervis Elwes, who, as he had good reason to believe, would be ready to wink at anything that was done by the direct agents of the conspirators. Curiously enough, it was by the unguarded talk of this Sir Jervis Elwes, nearly two years after the commission of the crime, that the first revelation of it came about. This we learn from the journal of Sir Simonds D'Ewes and from the speech of Sir Francis Bacon. It seems that some information had been conveyed to Sir Ralph Winwood by the apothecary Franklin, that a crime had been committed. This appears to have been merely a vague intimation, but soon afterwards Winwood, dining with Lord Shrewsbury in company with Sir Jervis Elwes, the Lord recommended Elwes to the patronage of Winwood, who was Secretary of State. Winwood replied that he could better help him if he was sure that he was innocent as regarded Overbury's treatment in the Tower. Upon this, Elwes virtually confessed that Overbury had been done away with, but declared that he had simply acted as the agent of the Earl and Countess of Somerset. The King having been informed of this, at once ordered Chief Justice Coke to proceed to a strict investigation. It then appeared that the unfortunate Overbury had been attended during his imprisonment by a servant named Weston, who had formerly been in the employment of Dr. Turner, a famous quack, and who understood somewhat of drugs. This man was found by Mrs. Turner, the widow of the doctor, at the request of the Countess of Somerset, and was recommended by Sir T. Monson to the Lieutenant of the Tower to wait on Overbury. The fitting agent thus provided was supplied from time to time with poisons by Mrs. Turner and the Countess. Either the drugs were not very effective, or they were unskilfully administered, as the process of poisoning occupied a long time.¹ The indictment against Weston specifies that on May 9 (1613) he maliciously mingled in Overbury's broth a certain poison called rosalgar, of green and yellow colour. On July 1 he administered white arsenic; on July 19, sublimate of mercury, which was put into certain tarts and jellies, all this proving ineffectual, except to make the poor man very ill. Finally, on September 14, on pretence of bringing him medical relief, he caused an apothecary to administer an injection which killed him. The amount of

¹ It was suggested in the trials that this was done purposely to avoid suspicion.

poisons inflicted upon the sufferer was something marvellous. Franklin, the apothecary, in his confession says: "Mrs. Turner came to me from the Countess, and wished me, from her, to get the strongest poison I could for Sir T. Overbury. Accordingly I bought seven, viz., *aqua fortis*, white arsenic, mercury, powder of diamonds, *lapis costitus*, great spiders, and *cantharides*—all these were given to Sir T. Overbury at different times. Sir T. never eat white salt but there was white arsenic put into it. Once he desired pig, and Mrs. Turner put into it *lapis costitus*. At another time he had two partridges sent him from the Court, and water and onions being the sauce, Mrs. Turner put in cantharides instead of pepper, so that there was scarce anything that he did eat but there was some poison mixed."¹ The Countess occasionally sent a present of tarts and jellies of her own making. These were accompanied, to avoid suspicion, by some dainties for the Lieutenant, but it was carefully arranged that what was destined for Overbury should be marked by letters. When brought to trial Weston refused to plead, acting, as was believed, under the influence of his employers. He was told of the terrible penalties of the *peine forte et dure*, and at last he yielded. Abundance of testimony proved his work in administering the poisons, and he was condemned and hanged. The next of the conspirators brought to trial was Mrs. Anne Turner. She was a woman of infamous character, and had been concerned in aiding the illicit amours of the Countess, and in furnishing her with charms to be used against her husband. There was no doubt that she had been the plotter of the whole matter with the privity of the Countess. She had found the agent in Weston, and had furnished him with the poisons which she had procured from Franklin. The Chief Justice told her that she had all the seven deadly sins, but according to Anthony Weldon (a very bitter writer) "she died very penitently, and showed much modesty in her last act, which is to be hoped was accepted with God."² A week after Sir Jervis Elwes was brought to his trial as an accessory. It was shown that Weston had actually consulted him about the administration of a poison, though he had affected not to understand. That the Countess had written him a letter when she sent poisoned tarts to Overbury, bidding him give the tarts to Overbury which had *letters* in them, but that he or his family might safely drink the wine sent with them. The Lieutenant made the most violent protestations of innocence, but a letter of his written to the Countess having been brought forward in which he writes: "Madam, this scab is like the fox, the more he is

¹ "State Trials," ii. 941. ² "Secret History of King James," i. 416.

cursed the better he fareth," he was overwhelmed with confusion, and had no more to say. He was executed on Tower Hill, November 20, 1615. Meantime measures had been taken to bring the chief conspirators to justice. On October 17 the Earl and Countess of Somerset had been ordered to confine themselves to their apartments, and to have no communication with anyone. Somerset had doubtless felt that he might rely on the King to protect him, as he had been so high in his favour. But the King was getting weary of him, and another favourite had already appeared in the person of George Villiers, afterwards the famous Duke of Buckingham. James, however, was the prince of dissemblers. In parting from Somerset at Royston he threw his arms round his neck, kissing him and saying: "For God's sake when shall I see thee again? On my soul I shall neither eat nor sleep till you come again!" Weldon goes on: "The Earl was not in his coach when the King used these very words, in the hearing of four servants, of whom one was Somerset's great creature, who reported it instantly to the writer of this history, 'I shall never see his face more.'"¹ Somerset, repairing to London and being placed under arrest, set himself to tamper with and falsify the letters and documents which he proposed to produce on his trial, in which dishonest proceeding it is sad to think he was aided by the great antiquary, Sir Robert Cotton. The Countess was first brought to trial (May 24, 1616). Being a peeress she was tried by her peers, the judges being assistants. Sir Francis Bacon, as Attorney-General, conducted the prosecution. The convictions of those who had been tried before had made her guilt so apparent that she felt it would be in vain to plead "Not Guilty;" she pleaded "Guilty" accordingly, trusting to the clemency of the King. "Making an obeisance to the Lord High Steward, she answered 'Guilty,' with a low voice, but wonderful fearful."² Then Bacon made a speech, extolling the King, as was his wont, and holding out hopes that his mercy would be extended to the criminal. The sentence was pronounced that she should be hanged. The next day the Earl of Somerset was arraigned before his peers. There was much more difficulty in bringing the matter home to him, than there had been in the case of the Countess. Indeed, an able historian of these events is inclined to believe in his innocence.³ But it is altogether incredible that the wife could have acted in this matter without the husband's knowledge. The attempts to poison were being carried on for a long time with scarce

¹ "Secret History," p. 412.

² "State Trials," ii. 954.

³ Mr. Gardiner.

any disguise, and Somerset himself sent drugs to Overbury, which shows at any rate that he knew that he was suffering. "His suppression of the letters which had been written at the time, his authorising Cotton to misdate them so as to mislead the judges, and his attempt to procure a pardon from the King, were undoubtedly indications that Somerset had done something of which he was ashamed."¹ This *something* was more than procuring the imprisonment of Overbury; it was nothing less than a passive, if not an active, participation in his murder. Bacon sums up the case against him, showing that he it was who put Overbury in the Tower; that he it was who got Elwes made Lieutenant; that he it was who procured for Weston the place of Under-Keeper, displacing Cary, who had been in that place before, and arranging that Overbury should be entirely in the care of Weston; that by Somerset's direction Overbury was kept as a close prisoner, and no one, not even his father, allowed to see him, though he was only in prison for contempt; that a constant communication as to the state of Overbury's health was kept up between the Countess and the Earl.

During the time of the trial the King was in a state of the greatest excitement. If the story told by Weldon be true, he had the night before been awakened from his sleep at Greenwich by the new Lieutenant of the Tower, who told him that Somerset had threatened that if he were brought to trial he would reveal some terrible secret. Upon this the King had "fallen into a passion of tears. 'On my soul, Moore,' he had said to the Lieutenant, 'I know not what to do. Thou art a wise man, help me in this great strait, and thou shalt find thou dost it for a thankful master,' with other sad expressions. Sir George Moore returns to Somerset about three on the morning of that day he was come to trial, enters Somerset's chamber, tells he had been with the King, "found him a most affectionate master to him, and full of grace in his intentions towards him. 'But,' said he, 'to satisfy justice you must appear, although return instantly again, without any further proceedings; only you shall know your enemies and their malice, though they shall have no power over you.' With this trick of wit he allayed his fury, and got him quietly, about eight in the morning, to the hall; yet feared his former bold language might revert again, and being brought by this trick into the toil, might have more enraged him to fly out into some strange discovery; for prevention whereof he had two servants placed on each side of him with a cloak on their arms, giving them withal a peremptory order if that Somerset did in any

¹ Gardiner, "History of England," ii. 357.

way fly out on the King, they should instantly hoodwink him with that cloak, take him violently from the bar and carry him away, for which he would secure them from any danger, and they should not want also a bountiful reward. . . . But who had seen the King's restless motion all that day, sending to every boat he saw landing at the bridge, cursing all that came without tidings, would have easily judged all was not right, and there had been some grounds for his fears of Somerset's boldness; but at last one bringing him word he was condemned, and the passages, all was quiet."¹ Mr. Gardiner is of opinion that the secret of which the King dreaded the revelation concerned certain negotiations with Spain. Others have thought that it was something very different. The pardon of the Countess was almost immediately made out. Probably Somerset might have had his pardon at once also had he been willing to resign certain property which had been granted to him to the new favourite, Villiers. As he was unwilling to do this, he and the Countess were kept in the Tower till 1622, when they were released, and finally obtained full pardon. Thus the unfortunate agents had been made to suffer, but the principal criminals escaped with comparative impunity.

GEORGE G. PERRY.

Notes on Bible Words.

No. XVII.—“CONTENTMENT.”

WHAT Dean Burgon felt in regard to the study of Bible Words is well known. One of his characteristic letters, dealing with the word “contentment,” appears in the Biography just published, vol. ii., p. 332. The Dean wrote:

I am glad to see you notice the word *αὐτάρκεια*. It is only by cultivating this habit that you will ever *understand* languages, and be worth powder and shot as a clergyman.

I have not time for many words; but I will tell you something about *αὐτάρκεια*. It does *not* mean *contentment*. That virtue is of Christian growth, and has no word to denote it in classical antiquity. The substitute is *ἀρκείσθαι*, *ἀρκοῦμενοι*, as in Heb. xiii. 5, 1 Tim. vi. 8,—or as in v. 6, *αὐτάρκεια*.

Now this, as you see, is in strictness, “self-sufficiency” (*not* in the conventional sense of the word, but in the classical meaning of being *sufficient to oneself*—not needing external aid). The underlying notion in all these substitutes for “contentment” is always *sufficiency*, or the *sense of sufficiency*. Take the place before us, 1 Tim. vi. 6, “But godliness *is* a gainful calling, if it be combined with the sense that GOD has given us enough.”

Ponder the matter over, and you will see that *αὐτάρκεια* refers to the *outward su pply* “contentment” to the *inward feeling*.

Of *αὐτάρκεια* (Vulgate: *sufficientia*) Grimm says: A condition of life

¹ “Secret History of James I.,” i. 422-424.

in which no aid is needed. 2 Cor. ix. 8, a sufficiency of the necessities of life. Subjectively, a mind contented with its lot, *contentment*, 1 Tim. vi. 6. It is found only in these two places.

In Phil. iv. 11, *αὐτάρκεις* (Vulgate: *sufficiens*), subjectively, *contented with one's means*. Found only here.

Review.

The Holy Communion. Four Visitation Addresses A.D. 1891. By JOHN WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of Salisbury. Oxford and London. Parker and Co. 1891.

IN the Diocese of Salisbury there seems no likelihood of the Church dying of caution. We admire the outspoken boldness of the recent occupants of this see, even as we admire the courage of an ancient Bishop of the same diocese, whose learning and zeal did so much for the Reformed Church of England—"the worthiest divine" (in the estimation of the great Richard Hooker) "that Christendom hath bred for the space of some hundreds of years," the author of the "Apologia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ"—not only the Apology of a Jewel, but a very jewel of an Apology, our "Apologia vere gemmea," as Bishop Andrewes justly designated it ("Opuscula," p. 91, A.C.L.). No doubt, in these difficult days, it must be very difficult for a bishop, with a desire to be fair to all parties, and with a demand upon him to be impartial all round, to be thoroughly true to his own convictions—his most sacred convictions—on matters which concern the highest interests of his flock and the spiritual welfare of his diocese, and to use to the utmost the influence and authority of his high position for the purpose of banishing and driving away erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to the truth of God's Word.

Certainly, on one of the burning questions of our day Bishop John Wordsworth has not left his clergy in doubt as to his opinions, and on a very solemn occasion has not shrunk from throwing the weight of his utterances into the controversial scale.

And we gladly acknowledge that his utterances *are* weighty—evidently the result not only of careful inquiry and matured thought, but also of learned and laborious investigation. We trace in them, moreover, a wise and circumspect discrimination, as well as much independence of judgment. Some of his statements must, we should think, be very unsatisfactory to most of those who call themselves High Churchmen, and many must be distinctly repugnant to the feelings of the advanced party of Ritualism. There is not a little in this Charge for which the Bishop deserves the thanks of Churchmen.

Moreover, there is a tone of brotherly sympathy with his clergy running throughout his addresses which is much to be appreciated—a candour, too, in inviting criticism (p. 118) which indicates a mind still open to conviction.

In reliance on this evident readiness to give an attentive hearing to what may be said from another point of view, we shall venture briefly to touch on only one or two isolated points in the Charge, and we shall even venture to hope that further consideration may lead to the qualification of certain statements, even if not to the modification of certain doctrinal views which are here propounded.

We are glad indeed to see that the Bishop does not build an argument for the sacrificial character of the Eucharist on the sacrificial sense of *ποιεῖτε*. We wish we could think that this argument had now been withdrawn, to reappear no more in popular treatises and widely-read manuals. It is an argument which, having first (we believe) made its infant voice to be heard in the sixteenth century (though it may have had an obscure birth somewhat earlier), then having been ignored by the Tridentine Catechism (De Euch. xx., nota), then ably refuted by Picherellus (Opuscula, p. 146, *sqq.*, Lugd. Bat., 1629), then declined by Bellarmine (though rightly contending that *ποιεῖν* often does signify *sacrifice*, "De Missâ," lib. i., cap. xii., c. 991. Ingol. 1701), and rejected by Estius and other Roman Catholic theologians, ought hardly to have been revived by Bishop Hamilton, without acknowledging that the Greek Fathers and Greek Liturgies give no evidence in its favour, and that Syriac Liturgies, rendering "Do thus," are dead against it. The Bishop might have called to mind the challenge of his great predecessor: "What father or doctor ever taught that *hoc facite* was *hoc sacrificare*?" (Jewel's "Works," P.S. ii. 990). It is true that Mr. Scudamore, conceding other Fathers, claims the authority of Justin Martyr in support of this argument. And he supposes that he alone of the Fathers had the key to the true meaning of *ποιεῖτε* ("Not. Euch.," p. 625, 2nd edit.). And Bishop Wordsworth goes so far with him as to believe that in Justin's use of *ποιεῖν* it *must* have the sense of "offer." He says that in chap. xli. Justin makes it "clear that he interpreted *ποιεῖν* in the Hebrew and LXX. sense of 'offer.' . . . He further uses *ποιεῖν* twice, exactly in the same sense, both of the bread and the cup, in chap. lxx." (p. 12).

The Greek of chap. xli. is as follows: *τύπος ἦν τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας, ὃν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους . . . ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν παρέδωκε ποιεῖν*. In chap. lxx., after quoting from Isa. xxxiii., including "bread shall be given him," verse 16 (a passage with no sacrificial reference), he interprets the prophet's language: *περὶ τοῦ ἄρτου ὃν παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ ἡμέτερος Χριστὸς ποιεῖν εἰς ἀνάμνησιν κ.τ.λ.*

Here it is that we must join issue with the Bishop. No doubt such a rendering of the passages referred to will make very good sense, and a sense which we have no reason to suppose that Justin would have been anxious to repudiate. But it is a sense which we believe to be altogether a novelty. It is not that of the learned Benedictine editor (see Præf., Par. ii., c. x.). Casaubon's interpretation, "Benedictione et gratiarum actione consecrare in sacramentum Corporis Christi" (Ad B.A. xvi. 33), deserves, at least, respectful consideration. But, in truth, the wide sense of *ποιεῖν* gives scope to a variety of interpretation. Governing an accusative, it would seem almost (like the Hebrew *ásâh*) to admit the meaning of doing almost anything that has to be done or usually is done to almost anything. Thus, for example, we have *οὐδὲ ἐποίησε τὸν μύστακα* for "nor trimmed his beard" (2 Sam. xix. 24; "Intonsa barba," Vulg.). So *ποιήσει τὸν μύσχον, ὃν τρόπον ἐποίησε τὸν μύσχον τὸν τῆς ἀμαρτίας* (Lev. iv. 20) does not mean "he shall sacrifice," but "he shall do to the one as he did to the other." Compare xvi. 15: *ποιήσει τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ὃν τρόπον ἐποίησε τὸ αἷμα τοῦ μύσχου*, with the same meaning. So also *ποιεῖν τὸ χρυσίον*, to work in gold (Exod. xxxv. 30). Compare also *πεποίηκε πᾶσαν τὴν δόξαν ταύτην*. Gen. xxxi. 1, "bath gotten all this glory," A.V.; "factus est inclytus," Vulg. But it signifies also

the sacred observance, or commemoration, of an event or of a day. Not only is ποιεῖν τὸ πάσχα to keep (not to sacrifice) the passover, but ποιήσετε τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην (Exod. xii. 17) is "custodietis diem istum" (Vulg.). See the Hebrew. Compare ἡ ἡμέρα ἣν ἐποίησεν ὁ Κύριος in Ps. cxviii. 24. So we have frequently ποιεῖν τὴν ἑορτήν, to keep the feast. A cognate sense to this would not be altogether unsuitable to the language of Justin, especially as regarded in connection with the Paschal occasion, when the words would be sounding in all ears: *πᾶσα συναγωγὴ υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ποιήσει αὐτό*, Exod. xii. 47. *τότε προσελύσεται ποιῆσαι αὐτό*, verse 48. Compare Num. ix. 11, *πρὸς ἑσπέραν ποιήσουσιν αὐτό*: Verse 12, *κατὰ τὸν νόμον τοῦ πάσχα ποιήσουσιν αὐτό*: Verse 14, *κατὰ τὸν νόμον . . . ποιήσει αὐτό*. But it is also not seldom applied to the making provision for, or doing what has to be done for making ready for any "doing" or for any purpose.

Thus, e.g.: (1) *πλὴν ὅσα ποιηθήσεται πάσῃ ψυχῇ* (Exod. xii. 16) is "exceptis his quæ ad vescendum pertinent" (Vulg.). See the Hebrew.

(2) *πᾶσα θυσία ἣτις ποιηθήσεται ἐν τῷ κλιβάνῳ, καὶ πᾶσα ἣτις ποιηθήσεται ἐπ' ἐσχάρας ἢ ἐπὶ τηγάνου* (Lev. vi. 39, or vii. 9) is "Omne sacrificium similia, quod coquitur in clibano, et quidquid in craticula, vel in sartagine preparatur" (Vulg.): "Every meal-offering that is baked in the oven, and all that is dressed in the frying-pan, and on the baking-pan" (R.V.).

(3) In Ezek. xlv. and xlvi. ποιεῖν is constantly rendered both by the Revisers and by our Authorised Version "to prepare." And though this may be scarcely an adequate translation (see Bishop Wordsworth on xlv. 17) as applied to the offerings of the prince, yet, as accepted in preference of "to offer," it seems justified by the fact that there are priests (xlvi. 2) to do the strictly sacrificial offering. But we would not make too much of this. Compare, however, Ps. lxxv. (lxxvi.) verse 15, *ποιήσω σοὶ βόας*, and see Kay's note there.

(4) In Hosea ii. 8 the LXX. have *αὐτὴ γὰρ ἀργυρᾶ καὶ χρυσᾶ ἐποίησε τῇ Βαάλ*. The Authorised Version has "prepared for Baal." The Revised Version renders "used for Baal." Both have an alternative meaning in the margin. The Hebrew probably signifies "made into Baal." But (though Jerome renders "offered unto Baal") there need be no doubt that the "prepared" of the A.V. represents truly the ἐποίησε of the LXX. (see Huxtable in Speaker's Commentary).

(5) In Malachi iii. 17 we have *ἔσονται μοι εἰς ἡμέραν ἣν Ἐγὼ ποιῶ*, where the Revised Version has "in the day that I do make" with the same meaning, no doubt, as is expressed in the "Speaker's Commentary" by the translation, "in the day that I am preparing."

(6) Compare Gen. xxx. 30—*Πότε ποιήσω καγὼ ἐμαντῶ οἶκον*; "When shall I provide for mine own house also?"

(7) And in this or a similar sense it is applied to the preparatory work not only of offering sacrifice to God (see 1 Kings xviii. 23, *καὶ ἐγὼ ποιήσω τὸν βοῦν τὸν ἄλλον*, where we render "will dress;" meaning, no doubt, the cutting in pieces and laying on the wood, see verse 33), but also and equally to the work of making ready for the use and service of man; as, e.g., ποιεῖν πότον, ποιεῖν ἑορτήν, ποιεῖν δοχὴν, ποιεῖν γάμον, ποιεῖν ἐδέσματα ποιεῖν ἐπισιτισμὸν.

It seems scarcely necessary to observe how, in such a sense as this, it very naturally fits into the saying of Justin.

But we must go further, and say that we believe there is no example to be found of such an isolated expression as ποιεῖν ἄτρον, ποιεῖν ποιήριον in a sacrificial sense. Mr. Scudamore alleges Num. xv. 5, *δινον εἰς σπονδὴν . . . ποιήσετε* (where the R.V. follows the A.V. in rendering "prepare," and the words following, *ἐπι τῆς ὀλοκαυτώσεως*, sufficiently indicate the sort of doing) and 1 Kings viii. 64, *ἐποίησε . . . τὰ στέγατα*. And this last is probably the nearest approach to the language of the Martyr. But it must

be observed that here τὰ στέατα does not stand alone, like the ἄρτον and ποτήριον of Justin, but follows close on two other words, which naturally require the sense of *offer*. Surely this fact tends to vitiate the force of the comparison.

This will be obvious, we think, to all who look at the sentence as a whole : ἐποίησεν ἐκεῖ τὴν ὀλοκαύτωσιν καὶ τὰς θυσίας καὶ τὰ στέατα τῶν εἰρηνηκῶν.

The direction concerning the wave-loaves is προσοίσετε ἄρτους (Lev. xxiii. 17). So for the thank-offering προσοίσει . . . ἄρτους (Lev. vii. 2 or 12). The command concerning the loaves of the shew-bread is ἐπιθήσετε αὐτούς . . . ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν (Lev. xxiv. 6). We submit that it is a fact of very high and important significance, if (as we believe) it can be established, that whereas the Old Testament had what may be called its sacrificial ἄρτοι, the LXX. never in respect of these uses the word ποιεῖν to express the sense of *offering*, or of any *sacrificial doing*.

On the other hand, there are unquestionable examples of the use not only of similar language, but of the very words ἄρτον ποιεῖν or ἄρτους ποιεῖν, in which a sacrificial signification is altogether out of the question. See Ezek. iv. 9, ποιήσεις αὐτὰ σεαυτῷ εἰς ἄρτους, and verse 15, ποιήσεις τοὺς ἄρτους σου ἐπ' αὐτῶν; but especially Gen. xxvii. 17, ἔδωκε τὰ ἐδέσματα καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους οὓς ἐποίησε; and Eccles. x. 19, εἰς γέλωτα ποιοῦσαν ἄρτον, καὶ οἶνον καὶ ἔλαιον τοῦ εὐφρανθῆναι ζῶντας. See also Lev. xxiv. 5, Καὶ λήψεθε σμιθάλω καὶ ποιήσατε αὐτὴν δώδεκα ἄρτους; and compare 1 Kings xvii. 12, 13, ποιήσω αὐτὸ ἐμαυτῇ καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις μου . . . ποιήσόν μοι ἐκεῖθεν ἐγκρυσίαν . . . αὐτῇ δὲ καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις σοῦ ποιήσεις ἐπ' ἰσχάτι.

We need not, indeed, question the fact that Justin does in one place speak (like Irenæus) of the bread and the cup as a sacrifice. And he regards the Jewish minchah of flour, offered by the cleansed leper, as a type of the eucharistic bread ("Dial. Try.," chap. xli.). In this Justin appears to be forgetful of the fact that no part of the *minchah* was given as food for the offerer, and that the sacrifice which we do feed upon in the Eucharist is certainly not a *minchah*, but a sacrifice of propitiation—of blood shed for the remission of sins. But this language should be read beside another passage, in which he speaks of the sacrifice prescribed by Christ, and everywhere offered by Christians as being (not the bread and cup, but) in the Eucharist of the bread and cup (ἐπὶ τῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου, chap. cxvii.). And he goes on to teach expressly that prayers and thanksgivings are the *only* perfect and acceptable sacrifices, and the *only* sacrifices which Christians have learnt to offer ("Try.," c. cxvii.). And it is material to observe that this is said with distinct reference to the Eucharistic Liturgy. He adds, in view of the prophecy of Malachi, that there is no race of men with whom prayers and thanksgivings are not offered through the name of the crucified Jesus.

It would seem, perhaps, as if, in Justin's idea the eucharistic elements¹ were regarded as, in some sense, the centre (shall we say, like the coal in the flame?) of the prayers and praises which constituted the pure offering of the Gentiles, being sometimes looked upon, in connection with these,

¹ *I.e.*, viewed, no doubt, as tokens of homage, and incentives to thanksgiving and praise. Justin's inconsistency can hardly, we think, be held to justify those divines who refuse to see that Justin does, in some sense, include in the sacrifice the material elements of the Eucharist. Such inconsistency is not peculiar to Justin.

The offerings were originally made by the people for the purposes of the sacred rite, a custom which is said to have its survival now only in the Church of Milan. See Neale's "Essays on Liturgiology," pp. 148, 193.

Bellarmino regards the unconsecrated elements when offered as *sacrifices*, "quia sunt materia sacrificii, et jam dedicata, et parata, ut ex iis fiat sacrificium" ("De Missâ," lib. i., cap. xxi., c. 1128. Ingolst. 1701).

as a subsidiary part of the offering, and sometimes being altogether out of view.¹

So Irenæus also, referring to the same prophecy of Malachi, speaks of it as God's will that we should offer a gift at the altar, frequently and without intermission. And then he adds: "The altar is in heaven, for towards that place our prayers and oblations are directed" ("Adv. Hær.," L. iv., c. xviii., § 6).

And so Tertullian, in view of the same prophecy, says: "Gloriæ scilicet relatio et benedictio, et laus, et hymni" ("Adv. Judæos," § 5), apparently (as Bishop Wordsworth justly observes, p. 12) "thinking rather of the eucharistic praises than of the oblation of bread and wine."

We submit that not only is there a lack of evidence to substantiate the opinion that Justin's *ποιεῖν* must needs mean *offer*, but that it would be nearer the truth to say that it hardly can in fairness be made to bear such a sense.

We must turn for a moment to another point. It has too often been alleged that, in using the word *ἀνάμνησις*, our Lord was using the technical language to express the sacrificial memorial of the Levitical service—whereas the truth is that for this signification the word *μνημόσυνον* is used in the Old Testament (not including the Apocrypha) nine times, that is *always*—the word *ἀνάμνησις* never. Moreover, no part of the sacrificial *μνημόσυνον* was ever given to be food for man. Avoiding this mistake, but desiring, apparently, to lead up to the same result, Bishop Hamilton had asserted that *ἀνάμνησις* "signifies the offering of a *μνημόσυνον*" (Charge, p. 52). It is an assertion which, we think, never ought to have been made. Is it too much to say that it is quite unwarranted? We are sure the Bishop did not wish to mislead, but he must, we think, have been strangely misled. Bishop Wordsworth, of course, knows better than to follow such a mistaken leading; yet we observe with regret that he seems to aim at guiding his clergy in somewhat the same direction by apparently attaching to *ἀνάμνησις* the sense of a memorial *before God*. We refer to his language in p. 135, where he reads into an answer of the Catechism a meaning which, we are persuaded, no one would naturally read out of it, and says that it "leads us to think of the memorial of Christ made before God, and especially to think of it as a thank-offering, a 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.'" Far preferable, we think, is the interpretation of Bishop Sanderson: "This Sacrament was ordained by our Saviour Jesus Christ Himself for this end especially, that the remembrance of His death, wherein He offered up Himself a sacrifice for our sins (and the innumerable benefits that we receive thereby), might be better remembered in the Christian Church to all succeeding generations" (Jacobson's "Fragmentary Illustrations," pp. 23, 24. Comp. Nowel's Catechism, pp. 90, 92, 93, P.S.).

Bishop Wordsworth, indeed, is not the first who has thus understood the language of our Lord in the words of institution. And none will deny that *ἀνάμνησις* can very well be used with such an application, and, in an interpreting connexion, is sometimes so used by some of the Fathers. Yet we must venture to express quite a decided opinion that any argument, based on the assumption that the word here *must* have such a force is nothing less than a great mistake. It is true indeed that on both occasions where (besides the titles of two Psalms) the word is used in the Septuagint it has a Godward reference. This is made unmistakably clear by the

¹ On the language of Justin Martyr see Canon Heurtley's "Sermons on Recent Controversy," pp. 50, 51. The whole sermon may be strongly recommended as most valuable. It has, to our knowledge, been of great service to some (and, we doubt not, to many others) whose minds have been exercised and their thoughts perplexed on the subject of "The Eucharistic Sacrifice."

addition of the words following *ἐναντι τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν* in Num. x. 10, and *ἐναντι Κυρίου* in Lev. xxiv. 7, 8 (where it represents the Hebrew *azkarah*). But the fact of its receiving this addition to give it this application tends rather to lead to the inference that without such an addition the word does not avail to convey such a meaning of itself. Wherever the word *μνημόσυνον*, the technical term for the Sacrificial memorial, is used of *that memorial*, it never, we believe, has any such addition. Wherever the word *μνημόσυνον* has such an addition, as in Eccles. i. 19; Exod. xxviii. 23, xxx. 16, it is used in another sense, in which another application would be admissible. The word *ἀνάμνησις* is used by Symmachus for "this is My memorial" in Exod. iii. 15, and for the "no remembrance of Thee" in Ps. vi. 5, where the LXX. render *ὁ μνημονέων σου*.

Mr. Scudamore, indeed, in favour of a Sacrificial sense of *ἀνάμνησις*, says "The Lexicons tell us that *azkarah* is a 'sacrificial term'" ("Not. Euch.," p. 626, 2nd edit.). But in the LXX., *μνημόσυνον*, and not *ἀνάμνησις*, is used to represent the Hebrew *azkarah*. The single exception, we believe, is Lev. xxiv. 7, where it is applied to the frankincense put on the shew-bread (see "Speaker's Com.," *in loc.*), not to the sacrificial memorial laid on the altar, and where the addition of the words *προκείμενα τῷ Κυρίῳ*, and in v. 8, *ἐναντι Κυρίου*, sufficiently indicate, as already stated, the Godward relation. The texts which Mr. Scudamore refers to—Exod. xii. 14, xiii. 9, xvii. 14; Num. v. 15 (compared with Num. x. 10)—do not show at all "how completely equivalent *ἀνάμνησις* is" to *μνημόσυνον*. They only show what none can doubt, that *μνημόσυνον* admits also a wider sense than its technical signification.

It cannot be shown that *ἀνάμνησις* is ever used in the New Testament with a distinctly Godward reference. And we question whether of itself, and apart from any verb of offering, or interpreting context, it ever conveys such a meaning. Moreover, it does not appear to have been so understood by the ancients. Philo, we are assured, "finds no 'memorial' in *ἀνάμνησις*" (Malan, "Two Holy Sacraments," p. 173).

The Liturgies express the obedience to our Lord's word by *μνημημένοι*, and the Coptic Liturgy of St. Basil has the words "Quotiescumque manducabitis . . . *meique memores* eritis donec veniam" (Renaudot, tom. i., p. 15). So in the Syriac Liturgy of St. James, as in many others, the "Memoriam agimus" has relation not only to Christ's sacrifice, but to His ascension and second advent, which admit no Godward sacrificial memorial (see Hammond, p. 70). So the Ambrosian Liturgy has "In mem commorationem facietes," etc. (Hammond, p. 334), followed (as in the case of several other Liturgies) by the "Unde et memores."

Chrysostom compares this *ἀνάμνησις* of Christ with the keeping a commemoration of a deceased relative (Op., tom. x., p. 246, edit. Montfaucon), and regards it as parallel with the command concerning the Passover, that "this day" should be "for a memorial." In each case he says, *τῆς ἐνεργείας ἐγκατέθεσε τὸ μνημόσυνον τῷ μυστηρίῳ* (*Ibid.*, tom. vii., pp. 782, 783). Theodoret clearly understands our Lord's words as pointing to a memorial whose aim and purpose it is that *we* may be reminded, and *our* minds affected by the contemplation of the sufferings thus represented ("In Ep. Heb.," cap. viii., Op. tom. iii., pp. 594, 595. Edit. Schulze).

So the author of the treatise "De Baptismo," which has been attributed to St. Basil the Great, thus regards the object of the institution: *ἵνα . . . αἰὲ μνημονεύωμεν τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανόντος*, adding, *ὁ γὰρ ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, δηλονότι εἰς ἀνεξάλειπτον μνήμην τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀποθανόντος* (Lib. i., cap. iii. § 2, Op., edit. Garnier, tom. ii., Append., pp. 650, 651).

So Sedulius Scotus compares *this* memorial to the *pignus*, left by a parting friend, "ut quotiescunque illud viderit, possit ejus beneficia et amicitias recordari" (In 1 Cor. xi. ; in Bibl. Max., tom. vi., p. 545).

And another commentary, sometimes attributed to Remigius of Auxerre, compares our Blessed Lord's words to those of a dying man, who commits some *munus pretiosum* to a friend, saying, "Accipite hoc munus . . . et tene illud . . . in memoriam mei, ut quotiescunque illud videris, recorderis Mei" (*Ibid.*, tom. viii., p. 971).

In like manner Christian Druthmar likens our Lord's dealing with us to that of one who, going on a journey, leaves to those who loved him a *vinculum dilectionis*, and says of the consecrated symbols, "ut per hæc duo memoremus quæ fecit pro nobis de corpore et sanguine suo, et non simus ingrati tam amatissimæ charitati" ("In Mat. Evang.," fol. lxxxiv., edit. 1514).

So also Nicholas, of Methone, says: 'Αιτία δὲ τῆς παραδοσῆς ἢ τῆς μεγάλης ταύτης εὐεργετίας ἀνάμνησις ("De Corpore et Sanguine Dom.") In Migne's "Patrol. Græc.," tom. cxxxv., c. 512), where none will maintain that ἀνάμνησις means anything else than *our* remembering.¹

We must, therefore, respectfully decline to accept the teaching that in the words of Institution there is any idea of sacrificial offering or presentation to God of a sacrificial memorial conveyed in the use of the term ἀνάμνησις. We must even urge that, on the contrary, if our blessed Lord had intended to convey this idea, we should almost certainly have had His meaning conveyed to us by the Greek word *μνημόσυνον*. And yet, as connected with the command "Eat this," "Drink this," this word would have involved a strange—may we not say, to Jewish minds, an impossible?—combination of ideas, seeing that the sacrificial *μνημόσυνον* was never to be eaten, neither by the offerer nor by the priest (see Waterland, vol. v., p. 144).

It may be permitted to add the statement of a historical fact which ought to carry some weight with ministers of the Church of England.

The first Prayer-Book of Edward VI. spoke of "making here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make." Why were these words omitted from the second book? They implied no belief in transubstantiation. They conveyed no doctrine of the Mass. All that could be said to belong to the Romish and Mediæval Mass doctrine had already been carefully eliminated from the first book. And it has recently been maintained by a very able writer, whose Protestantism is above suspicion, that

¹ So also the commentary—perhaps the work of Pelagius—among the works of Jerome (tom. xi., par. 3, c. 259, 260. Edit. Vallarsius). "Quemadmodum si quis peregre proficiscens aliquod pignus, ei, quem diligit, derelinquat. . . . Ideo hoc Salvator tradidit Sacramentum, ut per hoc semper commemoremus, quia pro nobis est mortuus . . . ut beneficiis Ejus non existamus ingrati."

So also Florus Magister: "Hoc Sacramentum ultimum discipulis tradidit, ut memorium tantæ charitatis, per quam solam salvamur, arctius eorum mentibus infingeret" ("De Exp. Missæ," § 63, Op., Edit. Migne, c. 55).

And the same words are found also in Hincmar (Op., tom. ii., p. 92. Paris, 1645).

So also Primasius: "Salvator Deus exemplum dedit ut quotiescunque hoc facimus, in mente habeamus, quod Christus pro nobis omnibus mortuus est . . . quemadmodum si quis moriens relinquat ei quem diligit aliquod pignus" (In I Cor. xi. In "Bibl. Max.," tom. x., p. 189).

It is scarcely necessary to add that many other testimonies might be added to the same effect—all witnessing to this: that (though doubtless, in some sense, the "memory" was said to be offered to God in token that in our approach to the throne of grace we had no sacrifice to offer but the remembrance of that which had been once offered for our remission, in which alone—i.e., in the Blood of Christ—we had boldness to enter into the holiest) the primary purpose of the command, the object of the ἀνάμνησις was that *we* might have a continual remembrance, whereby *our own* hearts might be continually reminded of Him who loved us and gave Himself for us.

the omission of these words made no doctrinal change. There was a memorial while they were retained, and there remained a memorial when they were omitted. This is doubtless quite true. But there is a difference between memorial and memorial. And it is inconceivable that such an omission could have been made carelessly without a purpose, wantonly without a design. What, then, can have been its design and purpose? We cannot doubt that this change—like other changes of the same date—indicates the wise (even if sometimes perhaps excessive) caution of our Reformers—not only to lop off branches on which had grown the blasphemous fables of the Mass, but also to pull up the dangerous roots out of which might grow less noxious, but still dangerous errors. They saw the distinction between the memorial of the *μνημόσυνον*—the sacrificial memorial—and the unsacrificial memorial of *ἀνάμνησις*. They would leave, indeed, the memorial—the sacred and blessed remembrance for the ransomed of the Lord—their remembrance of the precious death of Him who loved them and gave Himself for them—their *ἀνάμνησις* (as the Fathers understood it), to remind *them* of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which they receive thereby.

But they would carefully avoid the use of language which might, even by mistake, seem to imply the making of a *μνημόσυνον*—by some acting or making of the priest upon an altar—that is, of a sacrificial memorial to be offered to God, to be accepted on our behalf.¹

And because we admire the wisdom of our Reformers, and are satisfied that the circumstances of our times are vindicating their caution, we must be allowed, with all due respect, to dissent from the desire of the Bishop that the words "and this" might be substituted for "or this" in the rubric between the two Post-Communion Collects. It may seem a very small matter, but there is a witness in that little "or" which we should be sorry to lose. We can have no possible objection to the use of both prayers, but we do feel a decided objection to any loss or impairing of this witness. If our Church had intended in the words "this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" to signify a sacerdotal offering of a sacrifice on the altar, it is impossible that she could have left the use of this prayer to the option of the minister. That "or," therefore, testifies that our eucharistic sacrifice is the sacrifice of praise, not (if we may so express it) of the Eucharist, but *for* the Eucharist. And we submit that in these days this distinction is one which we are called upon faithfully to uphold. We must, therefore, regret what the Bishop has said in p. 142 about the Prayer of Oblation as recognising the Sacrament as a "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving." It seems to us to be suggestive of that of which our Liturgy has no suggestion, and which derives no support, we believe, from the words of Bishop Ridley referred to ("Works," *p.s.*, pp. 211, 216, 217). See his "Works," pp. 208, 209, 322, 323.

It will little avail, in our judgment, to plead as against this that at the date of the last review a reactionary current had set in, and made its influence felt in the revision. The doctrinal views of the reaction have been, we believe, much misunderstood, notwithstanding the eccentric opinions of one or two individuals, and its influence, we are sure, has been greatly exaggerated. In the matter of the eucharistic sacrifice, Laudian divines (departing, as they did, from the language of Hooker) were as far from the doctrines of the Mass as Cranmer and Ridley and Jewel.

¹ We are not, of course, questioning that the ancients offered (or pleaded) to Godward the commemoration which they made of the Sacrifice of Christ. Chrysostom expresses the truth—*προσφέρομεν μὲν, ἀλλ' ἀνάμνησιν ποιούμενοι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ* ("Ep. Heb.," c. x., Hom. xvii.).

The teaching of Laud himself was no more sacrificial than that of Beza, the Calvinist, abroad, and of Perkins, the Puritan, at home. His followers were perhaps over-anxious to make the language and practice of the Reformed Church conform to that of the third and fourth and fifth centuries of our era. But they knew well that that language meant nothing like the corrupt doctrines which, as parasites, had grown upon it in after ages of darkness and superstition.

As a matter of fact, however, it should be noted that the efforts of the reactionary party were (as a whole) defeated all along the line. The revision was governed, indeed, by a decided—perhaps we ought to add by an intemperate and unconciliatory—anti-Puritan bias, which doubtless was willing to make concessions to the reactionary party in matters of indifference or of little apparent moment; but not the less did it give clear evidence of an animus which looked suspiciously on Laudian innovations, and would have nothing of that which might seem to shake the doctrinal settlement of the Reformation.

Thus, for example, wisely and well, instead of putting “into the poor man’s box,” the churchwardens are now directed reverently to bring the basin with the alms and devotions of the people “to the priest, who shall humbly present and place it upon the holy table” (though there seems to be no evidence of *money* alms being so placed in early times; see what the Bishop says, pp. 84, 85); and then the priest is directed to “place upon the table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient.”

This direction concerning the bread and wine was, in fact, only carrying out the suggestion contained in Baxter’s Prayer-Book. The suggestion, however, came from another quarter, that the rubric should run thus, “the priest shall then *offer up* and place upon the table,” etc., and the words “offer up” (possibly from an excess of caution) were struck out.

So also as regards the whole body of change which distinguished the second book of Edward VI. from the first—the Revision did not interfere with it as a whole. It is needless to say that it included many particulars evincing an unmistakable design to suffer nothing to remain in our formularies which even by ambiguity could seem to shelter the doctrine of the real corporal presence or countenance the idea of an offering for sin of any sort in the Eucharist.

Not only were the words which spoke of making a memorial with the holy gifts before the Divine Majesty not restored, but Wren’s proposal (if pressed) was rejected, to alter the words of institution with the view of making them receptive or suggestive of this memorial sense (see Jacobson’s “Fragmentary Illustrations,” p. 81), and the witness of all the other most significant changes remains unimpaired.

Mr. Maskell regards three rites as *essential*. “These three rites are: the recital of the words of Institution, the oblation of the elements afterwards, and a prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit, to make them in effect the body and blood of Christ” (“Ancient Lit.,” Pref., p. xlix.). Certainly, as regards the two last, this could not have been the view of our Reformers in 1552 nor of our Revisers in 1662.

The reactionary party, indeed, would fain, as we know, have done away with what is now sometimes spoken of as the mutilation and dislocation of our Communion Service. And but for the value and importance of the testimony to the reformed character of our Liturgy, there might have been something considerable to be said in favour of the change. But the knowledge which we have of the efforts made in this direction is now valuable evidence of the checkmate of the Laudian influence in the Revision. We have the note in Sancroft’s handwriting: “My Lords the Bishops at Ely House ordered all in the old method.”

Possibly the innovators themselves became sensible of their error. At all events, we know—and it is all we want to know—that wiser counsels

prevailed. The Bishop says (p. 134): "We must remember that our Prayer-Book was modified not a little after Hooker's time." But the particular modifications which he mentions (pp. 134, 135), and of which he makes much, when weighed against the changes of 1552, which gave to our Liturgy its distinctly Reformed character, and which still remain unchanged, will be found to be very light indeed. Moreover, they all (including the addition to the Catechism) came of following out Puritan suggestions.

But while we thus speak thankfully of the check which was given to the reactionary tendencies of the Restoration, we must not be supposed to be accusing any of an attempt to bring back Romanizing doctrines, nor to be condemning as unfaithful to the English Reformation those divines who maintained a commemorative sacrifice (*i.e.*, the commemoration of a sacrifice—see Waterland, vol. v., pp. 292, *sqq.*) in the service of the Eucharist. We can see no possible objection to the offering of God's earthly gifts—the unconsecrated elements—for the service of the Sacrament, for the sacred purposes of the Eucharist. We do not even condemn the word "offer" as applied to the sacrifice commemorated in the sense of simply "offer symbolically to view." It is, doubtless, very commonly so used by the ancients. See Waterland, vol. v., pp. 129, 269, 275, 286, 294. Only we think it a misfortune that this word—so innocent as explained in this sense—should have even the semblance of contravening the inspired Word—"no more offering for sin." We should be more careful not to seem to contradict the Word of God than not to seem to differ from the language of old Catholic doctors, whose words (however soundly meant) have given occasion to misunderstanding. It was truly said by Bishop Bilson: "This hath been not the least of Satan's sleights in conveying your [*i.e.*, the Romish] religion from step to step, and from point to point, to keep the speech and change the sense of the learned and ancient Fathers" ("True Diff.," p. 688; edit. 1585).

Between "offering" in the sense of the Fathers and real sacrificial offering there is the same sort of difference as there is between paying a debt and showing the receipt. We shrink, indeed, from using such a comparison between things sacred and profane. And we are conscious that the analogy is very imperfect. But it may help to mark clearly a distinction which is too important to be overlooked—a distinction between things which need to be very clearly distinguished. What we have to do with in this service, regarded in its Godward relation, is a pleading the merits of the sacrifice once offered on the cross (and we fully acknowledge that such a pleading is inseparable from a worthy receiving of the Eucharist); it is (if we may so speak) the sacrifice of nothing but a remembrance—the *μνημὴν ἀπὸ θυσίας* of Eusebius ("Dem. Ev.," i., c. 10)—and not the sacerdotal doing of anything or the sacrificial offering of anything as a real sacrificial memorial before God. This truth is involved, as we think, in the saying of Cyprian: "Passio Christi est sacrificium quod offerimus" (Ep. lxiii.). See Waterland, vol. v., p. 269.

If we speak of the sacrifice of Christ in the Eucharist we must (with the Roman Catholics Ferus and Barnes) take *sacrificium* "passive pro *sacrificato*." *Actively* considered, it was (as Waterland says) "one transient act." In the Holy Communion "Christ's sacrifice is our sacrifice, but in the *passive* sense—for us to partake of, not to give to God" ("Works," vol. v., p. 235).

Every feast upon a sacrifice postulates the idea of the sacrifice itself as a thing of the past—a thing already finished. And the date of the finished sacrifice which we feast upon ought not to be doubtful. Herein the object of our faith is not any memorializing act of a priest, but the commemorated sacrifice of the cross. And the purpose of the institution

is not that we may have a memorial to offer on an altar, but that we may have a continual thankful remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, when He was once for all offered to bear the sins of many. This distinction is not too fine to be apprehended by the simple. And it needs in our days to be clearly stated and strongly insisted on. Let faith be taught to rest on a sacerdotal act—the offering of a *μνημόσυνον* as a sacrifice—and this act will naturally assume in faith's view a prominence which will naturally attract to itself superstitious ideas—ideas which again will naturally develop into much more than superstition. (We may refer here to what the Bishop says, pp. 87, 143.) Has it not been so in the past? And with the history of the growth of the Mass-sacrifice before us, can we be too cautious as to the restoration of that which at the Reformation we cast away? That which may have had its first beginnings in piety, it may be impious now to bring back. What was once a "holy excess of language" has become a fruitful parent of erroneous doctrines and dangerous deceptions.

The idea of a sacrificial offering of a victim now going on in heaven, and needing a continuous counterpart by the hands of sacrificing priests on the altars of our churches on earth (see Bishop Hamilton's "Charge," p. 51) is one which is condemned alike (as we are persuaded) by the doctrine of Scripture and the teaching of the Fathers. The inspired Word—*οὐκ ἐστὶ προσφορά περὶ ἁμαρτίας* (Heb. x. 18)—lays the axe to the root of all such conceptions. And the language of Chrysostom—*ἄραξ ἱεράσαστο, καὶ λοιπὸν ἰκάθεισεν* ("Ep. Heb.," c. vii., Hom. xiii.)—which could never have lived in such surroundings, is good witness against these views having ever been incorporated into the faith of the early Church. It is not merely sacrifice, but all sacrificial offering of sacrifice which is thus excluded. On this matter we must venture to think that Bishop Wordsworth (pp. 138, 139) might have expressed himself more clearly or more cautiously.

And indeed, concerning the Charge as a whole—considering that it obviously aims at bringing into greater prominence the sacrificial character of the Eucharist—we think it right to say that it might well have been, in our judgment, much more distinct in pointing out the lamentable errors which our Reformers so diligently laboured to banish from the Church of England. We could certainly wish that the Bishop had been more careful to warn his hearers against the revival of those blasphemous doctrines, for the denial of which our Reformers were willing to lay down their lives.

Is there not a cause?

The impetus given of late to the study of the ancient Liturgies may doubtless account, in some measure, for the general spread of a desire to make our own Communion Service more like them in form and in sound. But we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that this desire has been too commonly associated with a diseased hankering after the restoration of doctrines which belong not to the English Church, nor to the Fathers, but to the dark ages. And surely this craving calls loudly for a word of solemn warning from our rulers—an echo of the word of warning in our Homilies, "lest of the memory it be made a sacrifice."

Still, we do not doubt that the Bishop would join with us in deprecating the extremes to which some have allowed themselves to be carried. There are some passages in his book which need, we think, to be read with caution, and some suggestions which we cannot but think very questionable. But we can heartily thank him for many of his statements, which ought to carry much weight, and which, if allowed to have their full force, ought to do much in the way of restraining the hasty, and correcting their errors.

We may take, for example, his mention of "Gregory the Great's

strongly-expressed assertion" that the Apostles by the Lord's prayer alone "were accustomed to consecrate the oblation"—which, though stumbled at by Bona ("Rev. I.it," lib. ii, cxv., § 1), and doubted by Muratori, and denied by the Jesuit Zaccaria (who considers that the words unexplained would argue the Pope to have been in heresy, "Bib. Rit." tom. i., Diss. i., p. xvi.), and cruelly racked by other Romish divines, and questioned by Maskell (who seems inclined to follow the lead of those who consider the passage to be corrupt, "Anc. Lit. of Ch. of E.," Pref., p. xxii.), had been repeated by Durandus ("Rat.," iv., c. 1), and accepted by Cassander (Op., p. 37), and not rejected by Bellarmine (the "verba consecrationis" apparently being presupposed, "De Missa," i., c. xxvii., c. 1036, 1038). It is a tradition which comes from an authority which is not easily to be set aside. Pope Gregory, as the Bishop says, p. 105, "was a student of liturgies, and had personal acquaintance with the Greek Church, and had access to materials no longer in our possession." And it is one which, whether true or false, and however explained, could hardly have had its birth in the atmosphere of mediæval or modern Romish doctrine concerning the Sacrament.

Bishop Wordsworth supposes that it is the Lord's prayer which is probably meant by Justin Martyr when he speaks of the "word of prayer which is from Him, by which our ordinary food becomes eucharist" (pp. 107, 108). And he considers the position of the "institution," sometimes before and sometimes after the invocation, to be, "in all probability, an evidence that it was of more recent introduction" (pp. 104, 105); and he alleges other evidence (p. 104) to the same effect.

We are thankful also to read such words as these: "By blessing they [early writers] clearly mean not so much an act of consecration as blessing God for His gift of this spiritual food" (p. 96). Cardinal Cajetan had taught the same, alleging "that Jesus's blessing of the bread was a blessing of praise, and not a blessing of consecration" (see Canon Jenkins, "Pretridentine Doctrine," p. 40). And this sense may be found in the writings of some of our Reformers (see Ridley, "Works," p.s., pp. 16, 26; Calhill, p.s., p. 231; Becon, Prayers, etc., p.s., vol. iii., p. 269). Gasquet observes that in the Prayer-Book of 1552 the words "Blessed and" are left out, and have not since been restored (Edw. VI., p. 207).

The Bishop adds: "The words 'sanctification' or 'consecration' are, I think, hardly found in the first two centuries as descriptive of the eucharistic action. I do not in the least mean to imply that there was not a thought of this consecration or that there was not a prayer for it in the Liturgy, but I feel sure that it was not the prominent thought in that age. The main thought was the thanksgiving for what God had done for us in Christ, and the bringing it home to the receivers by a solemn distribution of the elements, over which thanks had been given. The words *εὐχαριστηθεῖσα τροφή, εὐχαριστηθεῖς ἄρτος*, etc. . . . are of themselves enough to prove this" (pp. 96, 97).

He says also (p. 76): "The *ὅσα θέλουσιν* [of the "teaching"] is like Justin's *ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ* of the president's prayers, chap. lxvii., and implies the absence of a fixed form of consecration on the part of the minister." He considers the "Recital of the Institution" to have been introduced early, but not universally (p. 103), and thinks that the evidence shows "that it was considered at first as descriptive rather than effective" (p. 103; see also p. 105).

In like manner Bishop Wordsworth separates himself clearly from the teaching of Bishop Hamilton (Charge, pp. 49, 51) when he writes: "By a kind of prophetic instinct of reserve and caution, she [the Church] made no attempt to treasure up our Lord's own words of blessing or invocation, and, for several centuries at least, had no doctrine as to a necessary

'form' of consecration. . . . When the consecrated bread and cup is delivered to the communicants, the Body and Blood of the Lord is proclaimed aloud to the faithful. But the actual moment of the mysterious union of Christ with the elements is not known to man. To seek to fix it is to be wise above the teaching and example of Christ—wise above the doctrine of the Apostles, wise above the early Liturgies. It leads to a dangerous and curious materialism and carnality, from which I trust you will all keep yourselves, and the flocks committed to you, free" (p. 110).

The Bishop might very suitably have added here that the real presence in the Eucharist is not simply the presence of the Saviour's humanity, but the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ as in the condition of death. "The Eucharist," to quote the words of Archbishop Laud ("Conf. with F.," Oxford, pp. 255, 256), "is a sacrament *sanguinis effusi* (of blood shed and poured out); and blood poured out, and so severed from the body, goes not along with the body *per concomitantiam*." It is needless to quote the well-known words of Bishop Andrewes, and of other English Divines, to the same effect. If this truth were more commonly insisted upon, it would tend effectually to exclude the materialistic notions which Bishop Wordsworth is condemning by making it evident that the presence can only be spiritual—that is, not the presence of a body, after the manner of a Spirit, which Cosin pronounces impossible (Works, vol. iv., p. 169. A.C.L.), but presence "to our spirits only," as Bishop Jeremy Taylor so well expresses it ("Real Presence," sec. i., § 8).

In conclusion, we should like to be allowed to supplement this Charge of the present Bishop of Salisbury with the weighty words of the late Archbishop Longley, who, in his posthumous charge, wrote: "The Romish doctrine of a true, real, and substantial sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, as it is called in the Council of Trent, entailed the use of the word altar. But this term appears nowhere in the Book of Common Prayer, and was, no doubt, omitted lest any countenance should be given to the sacrificial view. The notion, therefore, of making in the material elements a perpetual offering of the Body and Blood of Christ is as foreign to the spirit and the letter of our service, as I hold it to be to the doctrine of the Early Fathers, as well as of the leading Divines of our Church" (p. 26).¹

And we will be bold to add further the following from the conclusion of the great sermon preached at St. Paul's Cross by Bishop Wordsworth's great predecessor in the year 1560: "If there be any here that have had or yet have any good opinion of the Mass, I beseech you for God's sake, even as ye tender your own salvation, suffer not yourselves wilfully to be led away, run not blindly to your own confusion. Think with yourselves, it was not for nought that so many of your brethren rather suffered themselves to die, and to abide all manner extremity and cruelty than they would be partakers of that thing that you reckon to be so holy. Let their death, let their ashes, let their blood, that was so abundantly shed before your eyes, somewhat prevail with you and move you. . . . Ye have a good zeal and mind towards God—have it according to the knowledge of God. The Jews had a zeal of God, and yet they crucified the Son of God. . . . If ever it happen you to be present again at the Mass, think but thus with yourselves: What make I here? . . . Christ bade me take: I take nothing; Christ bade me eat: I eat nothing; Christ bade me drink: I drink nothing. Is this the insti-

tution of Christ? Is this the Lord's Supper? Is this the right use of the holy mysteries? Is this it that Paul delivered unto me? Is this it that Paul received of the Lord? Let us say but thus unto ourselves, and no doubt God of His mercy will open our hearts. We shall see our errors, and content ourselves to be ordered by the wisdom of God—to do that God would have us do, to believe that God will have us to believe, to worship that God will have us worship. So shall we have great comfort of the holy mysteries; so shall we receive the fruits of Christ's death; so shall we be partakers of Christ's body and blood; so shall Christ truly dwell in us, and we in Him; so shall all error be taken from us; so shall we join all together in God's truth; so shall we be able with one heart and one spirit, to know and to glorify the only, the true, the living God, and His only-begotten Son Jesus Christ; to whom, both with the Holy Ghost, be all honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen."

AN ENGLISH PRESBYTER.

The *Quarterly Review* contains articles on Oxford before the Reformation, Horace and Hafiz, the History of Bookselling in England, and a Teaching University for London. There are two ably-written reviews of Memoirs, viz., Baron de Marbot, and Duke of Livia, son of the Duke of Berwick. From the *Quarterly* article on the Election, forcible and suggestive, we take the following, specially interesting to the rural clergy:

"The chief hopes of the Gladstonians are centred in the agricultural labourers. There does not appear to be much chance of capturing many of the boroughs now in the hands of Conservatives, although we should not advise over-confidence even in that direction. Where a change of candidate is impending, it is highly desirable to find the strongest man to lead the fight without regard to 'prior claims.' A very mischievous candidate having once been sent to a certain constituency, the persons who sent him were asked why in the world their choice had fallen upon him. The reply was, 'He has spent a good deal of money in contesting other seats, and we thought he ought to be recompensed.' That system will never win elections in these days. We look upon most of the Conservative boroughs as fairly secure, unless where the sitting member has fallen out of favour or is weak. There, of course, anything may happen. The rural counties are likely to be more easily moved against the Conservative party. The Radicals are issuing promises to pay with the utmost profusion under the guidance of Mr. Gladstone himself. There is nothing which the agricultural labourer may not hope to get if he will help to put Mr. Gladstone into office. All the resources of the party are to be brought to bear upon this section of the community. The 'Conference' which was so skillfully got up in December last is but an indication of what is going on. Everywhere the labourers are being taught that their worst enemies are the 'parson and the squire,' and their best friends the Radical agitators."

THE MONTH.

THE death of the Duke of Clarence and Avondale, which occurred at Sandringham on the 14th inst., has evoked expressions of deep regret and tender sympathy on every side. The influenza chill, of which his Royal Highness complained a few days before, developed into pneumonia, and the end was sudden.¹

The *Record* well says :

A great grief has fallen upon the Empire in the almost sudden death of the Duke of Clarence. The sympathy of all the Queen's subjects and of millions who are not so will be offered to the Sovereign herself, whose life—chequered by many sad bereavements—now receives a fresh scar ; to the Royal parents who lose so unexpectedly an eldest son ; and, perhaps, most of all to the lady who was so soon to have become the bride of the heir to the throne of England.

We have to record the death of the late Bishop of Winchester (Harold Browne) and the late Bishop of Worcester (Philpott) ; of the Bishop of Down (Dr. Reeves) ; of the Duke of Devonshire ; of the Earl of Lichfield ; of Sir Thomas Chambers, Recorder ; of Bishop Crowther ; of Canon Dixon, and of Canon Purton.

Cardinal Manning died on the 14th inst., in the eighty-fourth year of his age.

The epidemic of Influenza has this year—the third year—been very general and very severe. The majority attacked by it, says a weekly journal, still escape death,

but a minority, apparently including all who have any liability to lung-disease or any inherent weakness of constitution, are killed by it as rapidly and certainly as by the great malaria fevers of which the world entertains such fear. They die, like the Duke of Clarence, within a week of seizure, no possession of means, no medical skill, and no perfection of nursing, appearing to afford them the least protection. The victims are not, as we thought last year, picked from among the officers of the social army, for the general death-rate rises sharply ; but the disease betrays a distinct malignity towards the old, who, in the modern system of society, are those who are the most important, and, therefore, the most missed. Men over sixty, if fairly seized by the pest, in a day or two develop pneumonia—that is, acute inflammation of the lungs and delirium—and then, unless they are exceptionally strong, they die within a week.

¹ The country has been saddened this week, says the *Spectator* of the 16th, by the death of the Duke of Clarence and Avondale, the ultimate heir to the throne, whose betrothal to the Princess Mary of Teck has brought his name into all men's mouths. The Duke, it is believed, caught cold at the funeral of Prince Victor of Hohenlohe-Langenberg, and on Friday week was compelled to take to his bed with influenza, complicated, the doctors perceived, by congestion of one lung. The fever was severe, the temperature rising to 107 ; but no serious result was expected until Monday, when it was seen that both lungs had become affected. By Tuesday evening delirium had set in, and the doctors, in their next day bulletins, warned the public that the gravest danger was apprehended. On Wednesday night there was for a time a slight improvement, but the Prince's vitality was never strong, and at 9.15 a.m. on Thursday he died. The grief of the Princess of Wales, a most affectionate mother, is overwhelming ; but the country thinks first of the Princess May, the expectant bride whose hopes have been so cruelly blasted. The mourning is universal, for though the Prince was little known, the circumstances have touched all hearts, and any grave misfortune to the Royal house calls out the sleeping loyalty of the people.