

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

trust, all the desires of man. We can, no doubt, point to a multitude of noble examples to the contrary among the wealthy: but, if one set about it, how very much larger a multitude might be discerned, many of whom do very little, and still more do nothing appreciable, for the real good of those below them! If one could obtain an income-tax return from one of our so-called fashionable parishes either in London or elsewhere, and also a return of the full amount expended by the same taxpayers in pious and charitable works, the latter amount, taken absolutely, might seem large; but, taken relatively to the other, it will probably always be found woefully disproportionate and small. The faults are, of course, not all on one side. Those on the other must not be blinked, notably ingratitude to those rich who do try to help the poor, and a narrow-mindedness and want of foresight which often baffles the most carefully-planned schemes for their benefit. But are not even these and other faults of the poor greatly discounted by a marvellously patient endurance of lots which are often very hard, and in some cases seem to us to be almost insupportably so?

This paper may conclude in the cautious but wise words with which the Report terminates: "There is less temptation to over-haste in forcing on social experiments, inasmuch as the history of the past shows convincingly that the principles of the Gospel contain germs from which social renovation is surely, if slowly, developed by the continuous action of Christian thought and feeling upon every form of evil and suffering. If all will only labour, under the impulse of Christian love, for the highest benefit of each, we shall advance by the shortest possible path to that better and happier future for which our Master taught us to hope and pray."

W. H. DAUBNEY.



ART. III.—SOME CURIOSITIES OF PATRISTIC AND MEDIÆVAL LITERATURE.

No. I.

NOT long since the question was asked, we believe, in one of the weekly journals: "Did authors correct their printers' proofs in the sixteenth century?" We can see no reason whatever to doubt that they did. That they did so in the early part of the seventeenth century can hardly be doubted. If we had no other evidence of this, it might suffice to appeal to the prefatory matter which stands before an edition of the

works of Fulbert of Chartres which appeared in the year 1608. The editor was Charles De Villiers, a Doctor of Divinity of the University of Paris. And the evidence of his correcting the proofs of his publication stands connected with a most remarkable literary curiosity. It is one to which attention has been called anew only a few years ago. But it is one generally so little known, and one of so startling a character, that we believe the readers of the CHURCHMAN will, many of them at least, be thankful to have this extraordinary history once more simply set before them.

De Villiers in his introduction directs special attention, in rather an unusual way, to his list of *Errata* at the end. And in a very unusual way he makes an apology for these errors of the press. He pleads the difficulty of avoiding misprints, and urges, in effect, that it requires more than the eyes of an Argus to detect them.¹ This is unquestionably the defence of one who regarded himself—not the printer—as responsible for mistakes, and therefore of one who had himself corrected the press.

But the remarkable thing to be observed is this: When we turn to the page of *Errata*, in obedience to the expressive admonition “ad lectores,” we find (with one exception) nothing to be very much noted either as regards the number or the character of the misprints. They are all of a rather ordinary character, with only one very extraordinary exception. What are we to say of this one singular exception? We must say this, that it is certainly one which it did not require the eyes of an Argus to detect, and that, regarded as an *erratum* of the press, it is such an one as never was heard of before, and is never likely to be witnessed again.

We are, in fact, admonished that two words have found insertion in the text which have no place there, and are to be omitted. Strange that a printer's error should have put in thirteen letters which were not in his *copy*! Stranger still that those thirteen letters should have shaped themselves into two Latin words correctly spelt! Stranger still that those two Latin words should have fitted in, in the text, as if they were made to fit! Stranger still that the two words thus fitted should have completely changed the meaning of the author, altering quite the character of his doctrine, and, in the matter of a controversy dividing Christendom at the time of the publication, bringing him over from one side of the contest to the other. The words interpolated are “dicet hæreticus.”

¹ The words of the notice should be well marked: “Lectores admonitos velim, si forte quosdam errores invenerint, ad errata recurrant. Etiamsi Argus esses, Lector, in eo munere, tamen aliquis error semper irrepit in Tipog.”

Truly the faith of the faithful, or the credulity of the credulous was never put to a severer test than when it was taught to believe that these words had found their way into the text of Fulbert only by an *erratum* of typography.

But we are treating this matter too lightly. It is a matter which should be regarded with all sad and sober seriousness. It is, of course, obvious to all that this insertion was not made by the printer, and was the result of no accident. It is utterly incredible that De Villiers should have supposed that it could pass as a typographical error with any who really took the trouble to examine with care his table of *errata*.

But De Villiers was in a great strait. He had made the insertion. He had to make what provision he could to meet the possible detection of the error, and safeguard himself from the consequent charge of dealing fraudulently with his materials, and making his author denounce his own teaching as heresy. And it can hardly be doubted that *after the printing of the sheets* he had been made sensible of the probability of detection, and the exceeding difficulty of persuading theologians to believe that "*dicet hæreticus*" had ever been written by Fulbert.

His work was published at a time when Christendom was being shaken by the doctrines of the Reformed, doctrines which denied the "Real Presence" in the sense in which that novel term had become associated with the novel doctrine of Transubstantiation. This "Reformed" teaching was heresy in the eyes of all who upheld the mediæval system of doctrine. It maintains a figurative interpretation of the language of the institution of the Lord's Supper, as well as of the teaching of our Lord as contained in the sixth chapter of the Gospel of St. John. The publication of the works of Fulbert was confessedly intended by De Villiers (in part) to be an antidote to the prevailing "*hæresies*."¹ But then Fulbert, who had been at one time the instructor of Berengarius,² was found to have in his

¹ In his title-page De Villiers commends the writings which he edits as availing for the confutation of the heresies of his day. His words are: "Quæ tam ad refutandas hæreses hujus temporis quam ad Gallorum Hist. pertinent."

² Not very much is known of the history of Fulbert. He was a disciple of Gerbert, afterwards Pope Sylvester II. After acquiring a great reputation by his lectures at Chartres, he became Bishop of the See in 1007, and died April 10, 1028 (or 1029, according to Fleuri). See Du Pin, *Eccles. Hist.*, vol. ix., ch. i., p. 1.

It must not be inferred that Berengarius derived his doctrine from Fulbert. Adelman's letters would rather suggest the contrary. See Gieseler, *Eccles. Hist.*, vol. ii., p. 398, edit. Clark, and Hospinian, *Op.*, tom. iii., p. 287, Geneva, 1681. See also "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 294, 297. But the views of Berengarius himself were by no means what are sometimes regarded as Berengarian (see "Romish Mass and English Church," p. 12),

writings one passage, at least, which might quite fairly be claimed as giving most unequivocal support to the teaching of these very heretics themselves.¹ How should this passage be dealt with? It was easy to neutralize its effect by a little insertion; and if an insertion was to be made, why not have it made in a form which would contain a clear condemnation of the language which might be adduced in support of Protestant doctrine? Let it be made to appear to be the language of a heretic in the time of Fulbert himself, language which Fulbert himself shall denounce as heretical. Let the two words "*dicet hæreticus*" be put in as the words of Fulbert; and what could be desired more? what to show more clearly that the doctrines of the Reformed were in the time of Fulbert, and in the view of Fulbert, doctrines of corruption, doctrines of a corrupt and heretical faith, yea, rather, doctrines of sinful unbelief?²

But when De Villiers thus carried out his design of making his author denounce his own language and renounce his own doctrine, he cannot have been aware that the language and the doctrine of Fulbert here, was not only Fulbert's, that it was the language and the doctrine of the great St. Augustin, which Fulbert was making his own.

And so that little insertion had been now set up in position, as a piece of artillery pointed to fire its terrible condemnation against the force not only of English and Swiss and Swabian

just as the true and matured views of Zwingle and his followers were not altogether what are commonly denounced as Zwinglian. See Hooker, *Eccles. Pol.*, book v., ch. lxxvii., § 2; Works, vol. ii., p. 349, edit. Keble; and especially the "Consensus Tigurinus." See also "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 34, 35, 36, 742, 743.

¹ Bishop Cosin quotes largely from the epistle of Fulbert to Adeodatus as against the Corporal Presence, adding: "*Quæ omnia clarissime dicta sunt contra eos, qui Christum in hoc mysterio corporaliter in os et ventrem hominum intrare minus crasse docuerunt*" (see *Hist. Transub.*, cap. vii., § 3; Works, A.C.L., vol. iv., p. 114). The extracts will be found in De Villiers' edition of Fulbert, fol. 8 *sqq.* Cosin might have added that Fulbert says of Christ: "*Ne sublati Corporis fraudemur præsentî munimene, Corporis nihilominus et sanguinis sui pignus salutare nobis reliquit*" (fol. 8). Still there seem to be indications that he was not altogether free from the growing superstition of the age. And some of his language may be thought to point to some approximation to the view of Rupert of Deutz. See ff. 8-10, and "Eucharistic Worship," p. 294, note, and 297, note. See also Du Pin, *Eccles. Hist.*, vol. ix., p. 2, London, 1699.

² Schröckh says that De Villiers, full of wretched apprehension that the words *figura ergo est* might be damaging to the doctrine of the Church, inserted *dicat hæreticus*, and that this shameless falsification has drawn on him the lasting suspicion that he may probably have altered by his own authority other passages of his edition (*Christliche Kirchengesch.*, vol. xxiii., p. 506. See Canon Robertson, *Hist. of Ch. Ch.*, vol. iii., p. 344).

Sacramentaries of the sixteenth century, not only against the real teaching of Fulbert himself, but against that which had been the doctrine of the great Doctor of the Christian Church of old time, whom all subsequent generations of Christians had agreed to recognise as a great Catholic authority.

This was a serious matter. And there can be little doubt that this serious matter had come to the knowledge of De Villiers between the time of the printing the sheets of his text, and the time of his making out his list of *errata*. It is not to be supposed for a moment that he could have made Fulbert write that "*dicet hæreticus*" if at the time he had been aware that that *hæreticus* was the great Bishop of Hippo. And having once made Fulbert write this condemnation of the teaching of St. Augustin, he would hardly have wished to publish to the world that that "*dicet hæreticus*" had got in by printer's error—that it was not in the MS. of Petavius which he was using, and was not the writing of Fulbert, unless it had now been made known to him that the doctrine he had to make Fulbert condemn was indeed the doctrine of the great Catholic Doctor.¹

The insertion had been made. The printer's work had been done. It was too late to withdraw it. Yet he dare not let it go uncorrected. It would never do to let it be said that he was attributing heresy, the heresy of Protestant Reformers, to St. Augustin the Great.

What was to be done? The error must be corrected in the list of *errata*. And accordingly in the list of *errata*, to which he directs the reader's special attention, and for the errors of which he pleads the lack of Argus eyes, we find it stated that the words "*dicet hæreticus*" are an addition² which is not found in the MS. of Petavius.

¹ Cave, in his "Historia Literaria" (p. 418, Geneva, 1694), notes: "Hic loci misellus editor, refutandis hæresibus hujus temporis (uti in editionis fronte gloriatur) intentus, post voces istas *figura ergo est*, glossam istam, *dicet hæreticus*, inseruerat. Tandem post emissum prælo librum, integram periodum in S. Augustin Operibus legi, et exinde a Fulberto descriptam esse admonitus, binas istas voces, *dicet hæreticus*, inter errata typographica retulit, eas præter Codicis, quo usus est, MS. fidem, additas esse confessus."

But Aubertin had already denounced the falsification in his work on the Eucharist (De Eucharistia, p. 667)—the French edition of which appeared in 1633—following the lead of Ussher (then Bishop of Meath), who, in 1625, had written: "He that put in those words '*dicet hæreticus*' thought he had notably met with the heretics of this time, but was not aware that thereby he made St. Augustin a heretic for company. . . . Which some belike having put the publisher in mind of, he was glad to put this among his *Errata*, and to confess that these two words were not to be found in the manuscript copy which he had from Petavius" ("Answer to Jesuit's Challenge," Intr. Ch., Works, edit. Elrington, vol. iii., p. 22).

² The following is a *verbatim et literatim* copy of the words which appear in the *Errata* of the edition of 1608: "Fol. 168. Adverte ista

Does the reader stand amazed at reading such an admission as this? Does he say to himself, Why, what a support, then, after all, is here for the doctrine of the Reformed! What an utter defeat is here for the purpose that Fulbert had in view! Intending to curse the Sacramentaries, he has blessed them altogether! Having made Fulbert say their language was heretical, he is now constrained to confess that the language thus condemned was really the language of Fulbert himself—language, too, which was the very echo of the teaching of the greatest among the Doctors of Christian antiquity. Does the reader stand aghast?

We cannot doubt that De Villiers must have anticipated some such result, must have felt the reader would naturally judge that the words in his text—now deprived of the *dicet hæreticus* of his pious fraud—must give support to the teaching which he wished to denounce. And to deprive his adversaries of the advantage they might derive, and to deprive the words of his author of the meaning they would naturally bear, he makes this addition to his statement: “Interpretatio est mystica.”

And now, have we come to the end of this strange history? Not quite. Perhaps the strangest part yet remains to be told.

We should surely have expected that succeeding editors of the works of Fulbert would have omitted the insertion made by De Villiers, and so have avoided the necessity of inserting also his correction. But such a reasonable expectation will be found to be mistaken. It is not so. The “Sermones” of Fulbert have been reprinted (under Romish auspices) in the “Bibliotheca Magna,”¹ and again in Despont’s “Bibliotheca Maxima”² of 1677, and again in Migne’s “Patrologia,” of more recent date.

And still, in each of these editions (*mirabile dictu*) has reappeared the “*dicet hæreticus*” of De Villiers, and in each case with a note taken (not quite *verbatim*³) from his *Errata*, stating

verba figura ergo est, additum est, *dicet hæreticus*, nam non habentur hæc duo verba in Manuscript. D. Petavii, ne quis tamen fallatur cum leget ista, figura ergo est, interpretatio est mystica.”

¹ As regards the “Bibliotheca Magna,” we are relying on an old memorandum, which, however, we believe to be quite reliable. As regards the “Bibliotheca Maxima” and Migne, we have verified our assertion by recent examination.

² It is right to add that here the works of Fulbert appear as professedly a reprint of the edition of De Villiers. In other cases, however, the editor has generally (not without exception) made the corrections indicated in the *Errata*.

³ The marginal note is “Interpretatio est mystica, et nota hæc duo verba *dicet hæreticus* non haberi in MS. D. Petavii.” See “Bibliotheca Maxima,” tom. xviii., p. 47. In Migne’s edition the same words are found in a footnote (Patrol. Lat., tom. cxli., c. 334).

that these words are not found in the MS. of Petavius, and anew admonishing the reader that the interpretation is mystical.

It will hardly be expected of us that we should bring to a close a paper on this literary curiosity without desiring to point the reader's attention to the instruction it may convey to us. It is an example full of instruction.

Regarded as an example of a method of dealing with ancient records of the Christian Church, it is one which unhappily does not stand alone. To deal with other examples, however, is outside our present purpose.

But with reference to De Villiers' subsequent explanation of Fulbert's plain words as "mystical" language, it is important for us to observe that we have here an example of the way in which not only Romanists of the age of De Villiers, but modern controversialists also explain away some of the clearest and most distinct statements of the Fathers on the doctrine of the Eucharist.

As De Villiers would bring to nought, so of necessity do modern Romanist and Romanizing theologians seek to bring to nought assertions, not of St. Augustin only, but of other Patristic authorities, which, in their obvious meaning, give sure and solid support to that doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper which is maintained by the theology of the "Reformed," and supported by the consensus of all the great doctors of the English Church (High Churchmen as well as Low Churchmen) since the Reformation.

On what ground do they justify their explaining away such plain language? How can they support their strange glosses? What apology can they offer for emasculating the force of such unmistakable language as this of St. Augustin by anything like the marginal note, "Interpretatio est mystica"?

They can affirm, and do affirm—and they affirm truly—that, except as thus explained, these passages from St. Augustin and others are inconsistent with another class of passages which may easily be adduced in abundance from other Fathers, and from St. Augustin himself—passages which (unexplained) contain the affirmation of that which *these* seem to deny.

It is quite true there are two classes of quotations to be deduced from the Fathers (and from the Holy Scriptures also) which on this subject (as unexplained) are contradictory. An explanation there must be of one or other of these two classes of passages if a harmony is to be effected between them.

The only question is, which of these classes is to be interpretative of the other—which class is to submit to receive explanation from the other class?

The answer to this question is of supreme importance in the Eucharistic controversy. It demands the most careful and candid consideration of all who are really anxious to be guided into the truth of sacramental doctrine.

And for a true answer to this question we need to give due attention to these two other questions:

(1) Is there anything in the nature of the quotations themselves which makes the one class of sayings more tolerant of explanation than the other?

(2) Is there any indication in the writings of the Fathers themselves as to *which* of these classes of sayings they intended to be interpretative of the other?

I. We must touch very briefly on the first of these questions. The two classes of sayings may be described thus. One class speaks of the Eucharistic elements as *being* the Body and Blood of Christ. The other class speaks of them as figures, types, symbols of the Body and Blood of Christ, and accordingly regards the language of eating and drinking that Body and Blood as figurative language, and thus implies that the outward elements are not the Body and Blood of Christ in reality, but in figurative representation, as effectual signs or equivalent proxies for the purpose for which they were ordained.

And if this is anything like a fair statement of the case, we are certainly not making an unreasonable demand when we claim to have it allowed that the sayings of the latter class are naturally and necessarily the legitimate interpreters of the former class.

There are certain propositions in which the sense of the verbal copula is restricted by the application of common sense—so clearly restricted that no one would ever think of understanding it in its literal meaning. In such cases language may use unbridled liberty; and that without fear, from the very fact of its being so impossible for any to give the words a literal interpretation. Take as an example from the Old Testament the words of David, which he spake concerning the water from the well of Bethlehem, "Is not this the blood of the men that went in jeopardy of their lives?" Take as an example from the New Testament the word of Christ, which declares "I am the Vine, ye are the branches."

And are we to say that such an application of common sense must needs have been utterly out of place in the under-

standing of the words of Institution and of Patristic language built upon them? And must it be accounted heresy to class these words beside similar Scriptural statements which everyone acknowledges are not to be understood *ut verba sonant*? And what if such statements require limitation or explanation to bring them into harmony with the true faith of Christ's glorified Body and of His session at the right hand of God?

Assuredly the one class of sayings are perfectly tolerant of simple explanation by the teaching of the other class.

But when, on the other hand, you attempt to explain away the second class of quotations to bring them into harmony with the literal meaning of the other class, what a hopeless task is before you! You may make your marginal gloss, "*Interpretatio est mystica*," but what does it mean? Try to make clear its meaning, and see whether it is possible to make it mean anything but absolute nonsense!

II. The second question need not detain us. There are sayings of the Fathers in abundance (especially in the writings of St. Augustin) which indicate with a clearness which it is impossible to controvert, that the sayings of the first class are intended to be understood as interpreted by sayings of the second class. It is surprising to mark how these interpretative sayings of the Fathers have been ignored in much that has been written on one side of the present Eucharistic controversy.¹

¹ One such extract as the following would suffice to turn the force of any number of extracts in which the sacramental elements are called the Body and Blood of Christ, and the Eucharist is spoken of as the sacrifice of Christ: "*Die Dominico dicimus, Hodie Dominus resurrexit. . . . Cur nemo tam ineptus est, ut nos ista loquentes arguet esse mentitos, nisi quia istos dies secundum illorum, quibus hæc gesta sunt, similitudinem nuncupamus, ut dicatur ipse dies qui non est ipse, sed revolutione temporis similis ejus? . . . Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in seipso, et tamen . . . omni die populis immolatur, nec utique mentitur, qui interrogatus eum responderit immolari. Si enim sacramenta quandem similitudinem earum rerum, quarum sacramenta sunt, non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent. En hæc similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt. Sicut enim secundum quandam modum sacramentum Corporis Christi Corpus Christi est, ita et Sacramentum Fidei Fides est"* (Augustin, *Epist. ad Bonifacium*, Ep. xcviij., § 9, Op. tom. ii., c. 267, 268, Paris, 1683).

Such interpretative sayings, however, might easily be multiplied. See "*Eucharistic Worship*," pp. 253-266.

The Fathers, trusting to the common sense of Christian men not to misunderstand their sacramental language, freely gave names to the signs which they considered it impossible for sensible men to understand otherwise than as pertaining only to the things signified. Augustin says: "*Ut . . . literam sequi, et signa pro rebus quæ iis significantur accipere, servilis infirmitatis est; ita inutiliter signa interpretari, male vagantis error est*" (*De Doct. Christianâ*, lib. iii., cap. ix., Op. tom. iii., par. i.,

After anything like a fair investigation of such passages, it is strange that it should not be seen that very much of the language which has been so confidently appealed to as supporting the doctrine of the so-called Real Objective Presence is—by the teaching of the Fathers themselves, to be sacramentally understood.¹ That is to say, it is mystical or sacramental language; and sacramental language is that in which the sign bears the name of that which is signified. In this sense the gloss of De Villiers (so absurd and ridiculous as applied to the other class) might fitly be applied to this whole class of sayings, “*Interpretatio est mystica.*”²

But never let it be supposed that this mystical interpretation of Patristic and Scriptural language is intended to make “the outward sign” a less “*effectual sign*” for conveying to the faith of the faithful the full Blessed Reality which it signifies. It is not the less a real communion of the Body and Blood of Christ because the *res sacramenti* is not *in* or *under the form of* the elements. The Body and Blood of Christ are not less “*verily and indeed taken and received,*” because “*only after an heavenly and spiritual manner.*” Herein the theology of the Reformed has been grievously misrepresented. In its true teaching it leads our faith to feed indeed on the one perfect sacrifice once offered, that by the merits and death of Christ, and through faith in His Blood we may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His Passion.

Could we have a clearer, a more beautiful exposition of

c. 49). And so (with another reference) Cyril of Alexandria says: Διαγελᾶν ὅμαι πρέπει τοὺς ἀνοήτως αἰρετικούς, το ἐν τάξει σημείου τεθῆν, εἰς ἀλήθειαν πράγματος ἐκλαμβάνοντας (In Joan. I., 32, 33. Com., lib. ii., cap. i., Op. ed. Migne, tom. vi., c. 213).

¹ On this matter Canon Birch's little book may be very strongly recommended, “The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the teaching of the Primitive Church and of Anglican Divines” (Longmans).

A brief review of this book which appeared in the *Guardian* of July 29, 1891, affords a curious example of the mistakes into which so many are led by neglecting the interpretative value of sayings of the second class as applied to the language both of the Fathers and of English divines. The writer says, “That he [Canon Birch] can shelter some of his statements under great names of Anglican divines is not denied, yet ‘long catenæ’ of extracts might easily be drawn up in which *opposite views* are expressed, and sometimes by *the same writers.*” Does the reviewer really suppose that “*opposite views*” were *held* by “Anglican divines” of “great names”? If not, let him ask which of these seemingly “*opposite views*” as expressed is capable of being fairly interpreted by the language expressive of the other?

² Compare the words quoted by Gratian as from Augustin (see “Eucharistic Worship,” p. 308): “Vocatur ipsa immolatio carnis quæ sacerdotis manibus fit, Christi passio, mors, crucifixio, non rei veritate, sed significante mysterio” (Decret., Par. II., De Consecr. Dist. II., c. xlviiii.).

the Scriptural, the Patristic,¹ the Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper (as upheld by such men as Andrewes and Cosin, and Jeremy Taylor and Bull) than that to which we are led by those words of St. Augustin and that teaching of Fulbert, on which De Villiers in vain set the stigma of heresy? Let the reader be asked to mark the saying and to ponder it well: "Facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere: figura est ergo, præcipiens passioni Dominicæ communicandum, et suaviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoriâ, quod pro nobis Caro Ejus crucifixa et vulnerata est" (De Doct. Christ., iii. 16).

N. DIMOCK.

ART. IV.—BISHOP WORDSWORTH'S "ANNALS."

Annals of my Early Life, 1806-1840. By CHARLES WORDSWORTH, D.D., D.C.L., Bishop of St. Andrews, and Fellow of Winchester College. Longmans, Green and Co.

THE volume which the venerable Bishop Wordsworth has given to the public will be read with great interest. It is, indeed, a real contribution to the memoirs and autobiographies in which English literature is rich. There is a certain charm in the pleasant record of individual experiences, and the admirable English for which Bishop Wordsworth is so remarkable may claim a place for this volume near the graphic narratives of Hume, Gibbon, and the less known but most striking story of Gifford, the first editor of the *Quarterly Review*. In recent years we have had interesting volumes from Sir Henry Taylor and Sir Francis Doyle. Bishop Wordsworth's introduction, written in a vein of true piety, distinguishes it entirely from the literary reminiscences of the writers we have mentioned, and his appeal to the candour of his reader is in a high and noble strain.

Everything connected with the Wordsworth family is full of interest. Literature and theology seem to have exercised a real spell over this remarkable brotherhood and sisterhood. All students of the poet Wordsworth's life know what a debt he owed to the admirable Dorothy. A new generation has succeeded, and the present gifted Head of Lady Margaret Hall at Oxford, daughter of the late Bishop of Lincoln, and sister of the learned Bishop of Salisbury, has shown, in her recent study of the poet's life, that pure style, and true appreciation of all that is distinctive and beautiful in the world of

¹ Not that there were no approaches being made in Patristic Theology to subsequent erroneous and superstitious views—chiefly, perhaps, in the direction of the doctrine commonly associated with the name of Rupertus Tuitiensis. But of this we may have occasion to speak in a future paper of this series.