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:

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

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

MARCH, 1888.

ART. I.—THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

The Pulpit Commentary, Hebrews: Exposition, by Rev. J. BARMBY, B.D., Vicar of Pittington. Kegan Paul, Trench and Co., London. 1886.
Apologia ad Hebræos, The Epistle (and Gospel) to the Hebrews. By ZENAS. T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh. 1887.
Wolverhampton Church Congress: Papers by Canon WESTCOTT, Prebendary GIBSON, Canon PAGET, Canon HOARE, Rev. F. J. CHAVASSE. *Guardian*, Oct. 19, 1887; *Record*, Oct. 14, 1887.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

ART. II.—THE CHURCH IN WALES.

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

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

history and condition, and comparatively indifferent to our hereditary and distinctive possessions. The astounding assertion on their part that our Church is "an alien" can be attributed, without any great breach of charity, to pure ignorance, or a callousness of feeling which would immolate the past, with all its rich stores of historical associations, on the altar of expediency and party politics. But by the very confident air, not to say the strange effrontery, with which it is made—and made, too, at a time when the old landmarks of sentiment and principle are violently and suddenly changed, as in one night, and a spirit of opposition to existing institutions is abroad—it is well calculated to make an impression on the popular mind, and to produce a considerable amount of mischief.

Undoubtedly a strenuous effort is being made at present to spread the erroneous notion in question among the masses; and the effort must necessarily be indeed both strenuous and persevering before a lodgment for such a notion can be effected among the honest and intelligent part of our people. For not only must the whole current of history be ignored or contravened, but the Welshman's ingrained habitudes of thought and feeling must be changed as well. For the Welshman in his genuine state, and when undepraved by ideas and influences that come to him from external and alien sources, loves to dwell on the past and identify himself and his concerns with a long line of ancestral descent. This is evinced, as we need not add, by what has been considered by many as his inordinate love of family lineage, by his old-world ways and customs, and by his long and steady attachment to the old British tongue when, at the same time, he cannot but feel it an incumbrance on his commerce with the rest of the kingdom, and an impediment on his children's intellectual and social advancement. And this feeling he carries with him in reference to the Church. Whatever faults might have been alleged against its administration, all sections of our people have always, until recently, concurred in the common belief of its great antiquity, and of its identity, in most essential points, with the Church of their forefathers.

The agitators for disestablishment fasten on the designation by which the Church is popularly known. They direct attention to the fact that she is not called "The Church of Wales," but the "Church of England in Wales," as if that alone proved the validity of the accusation. They thrust this into the forefront, and infer from it a train of invidious and humiliating recollections and incidents. But what it does prove to every candid mind is their own eager desire to avoid a deliberate discussion of the matter on its merits, and their wholesome dread of touching on the heart and centre of the whole con-

troversy. It shows to what shifts the adversary is driven when he summons to his aid the discordant and discredited voice of passion and provincial prejudice. It is, indeed, an additional illustration of the proverbial abuse of the aggrieved party when no other resource is available to his opponent. But in connection with this particular ground of contention we would beg leave to state for ourselves in Wales, that not a Churchman among us would be inclined, on account of such a reproach, to disregard, or for an instant to forego, the honoured designation of our Church, which it has now borne for centuries, as the Church of England in the Principality. We claim—and we are ready to vindicate the claim—that we are a part, and an integral part, of the great and glorious English Church, and it is our fervent prayer that we may always remain in that happy condition, united in fortune as in faith, in common work and inalienable affection, and that no convulsion, social, political, or religious, may ever occur to sever the sacred bond.

Instead of this unity which at present subsists, and has subsisted for so many generations between the Welsh and English dioceses, forming a ground of complaint, least of all matter for an incriminating charge, it should be a cause of joy and of the deepest gratitude, and every effort should be made to keep it whole and inviolate. By weakening the bond for any purpose whatever, and loosening one single tie, even the secular, which may serve at present to hold us together, we should not only be unfaithful to fraternal obligations and the true welfare of our common country, but also running counter to the best hopes and aspirations of Christendom. Even Mr. Spurgeon, the renowned Baptist pastor, who in his younger days was looked upon as an exponent of the dissidence of Dissent, has lately expressed himself, in pathetic language, as utterly weary of religious divisions, and as yearning for the time when "all Christians may blend in manifest unity."

It has sometimes been stated that the union of the four Welsh dioceses with the Southern Province of England dates only from the reign of Edward I., and is a badge of conquest. What really occurred then was not the ecclesiastical, but the political, union between the two countries, which had been going on in a fragmentary way and with intermittent steps for a long time before. It was, we repeat, the successful completion of many previous efforts at effecting a political union that was the work of that reign. Wales was repeatedly brought under tribute to the earlier English kings. Its richest and most populous districts were occupied and subdued by the Normans in the reign of William the Conqueror, and were held by the Norman Marchers in tenure to him and his successors. The

political union became complete and irreversible when the whole country was annexed to the Crown of England, and for several competing chieftains (who used to disturb and harry the country with their endless feuds) was substituted one sovereign lord common to England and Wales; and this took place, as everybody knows, in Edward I.'s reign. But the ecclesiastical incorporation—which, like the political, was a gradual process, and had been prepared and matured by a long series of close and intimate relations—had taken place before. It took place at least as early as the year 1112 A.D., when all the Welsh Bishops submitted to the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury. The legalized recognition by the State of England was the only change that affected the Church by the annexation of the country in the time of Edward I.

But should we admit the full force of the argument in favour of the later date (King Edward's reign), we should still be in a position to show the groundlessness of the charge in its legal and constitutional, as well as religious, aspect. For the admission would involve the conclusion that the present Church in Wales has occupied the same political and religious status for six hundred years, and occupied it without a break in the descending line, and (with the exception of one brief interval, when she was the victim of ruthless violence) without any default in her representative character as the national Church. Such a long period—longer, as the reader knows, than the period of the full and final establishment of the Jewish Church, when all the tribes were placed under one divinely ordained monarchy, and remained so till the Babylonish captivity—assuredly offers a sufficient guarantee that she cannot with any propriety be called an alien. At any tribunal where truth could be heard the claims of all other rivals would be barred out; but in the Principality we know of no rival or claimant who could show the least colourable competency in opposition. To the Patristic and Mediæval Church, as well as to the Church of the Reformation, she can be the only residuary legatee.

Some persons, no doubt, would here point to the Roman Catholics. But, not to mention the process of development, or rather the process of endless change and miserable deterioration, which has been recklessly set in action in their Communion, culminating, as it did at last, in the famous Council of A.D. 1870, when the Immaculate Conception and the personal Infallibility of the Pope were voted as necessary and incontrovertible dogmas of the faith, and thus confirming by one irrevocable act the common opinion that the Church of Rome is other than she was, we can answer that practically that Church has no adherents among us. So far as the natives are

concerned—and it is they who should primarily be considered in this view—the Church of Rome has long disappeared from among us. Such adherents as it reckons in Wales are found in large seaports, such as Cardiff, or on the hills where iron and mining works are carried on, such as Dowlais; and they are almost wholly composed of Irish immigrants.

Other persons would probably point to Welsh Nonconformity, which, it must be confessed, is always in presence, and has latterly assumed, but with a considerable deduction, an attitude of extreme hostility. It would be a waste of time to prove, what we presume is well known, that this is a product which is indeed alien, and not native to the soil. In its origin it was unquestionably an importation. It is also comparatively of recent growth. It found here an uncongenial clime, and only made its home among us when forced by the factitious influences of political and social agitation and strife. And even then it could never have flourished, we believe, to anything like the extent that we at present see it, were it not for the almost insurmountable difficulties with which the Church had to contend in the discharge of her functions. Among these difficulties were her abject poverty, especially in South Wales; the immense size and scattered population of many of her most important parochial cures; the fact of having to minister in two languages; and, we must add, of having to deal with the unreasonable prejudices that existed between what has been euphoniously called the "masses and the classes." It was from beyond Offa's Dyke that Welsh Nonconformity sprung. Our earliest Nonconformists were Puritanical clergymen, such as William Wroth, Vicar of Llanvaches, Monmouthshire, and William Erbury, Vicar of St. Mary, Cardiff. Our first Dissenting congregations were formed by them when they seceded or were ejected from the ministry in the Church. We do not believe that a dozen such congregations could be found in the whole of Wales in the last years of King Charles I.'s reign.[1] It was under the Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell, when extraordinary efforts were made by him and his confederates to exterminate the Church in the Principality, that these congregations multiplied (all the offices of the Church at the time, it should be remembered, being suppressed, and the clergy cruelly persecuted), and Dissent may be said to have taken root in the country. It separated into three leading sects—the Presbyterian, Independent, and Baptist. The Presbyterians soon adopted, like their English brethren, what they

[1] The late eminent patriot and philanthropist, Sir Thomas Phillips, was inclined to believe that there were only three Dissenting congregations in Wales at the beginning of the Civil War. See his "Work on Wales," page 109.

were pleased to call free and rational views of religion, and gradually lapsed into stark Socinianism. The other two—the Baptist and Independent sects—still survive, and, judging from their own published accounts, are in a fairly prosperous state, but are considerably dependent for their supply of intellectual fare, and even of their religious tenets, on their English allies. And the same external support is as much needed in the shape of monetary aid, and is freely and generously rendered by the same faithful allies, and is duly appreciated by the recipients. But into whatever form Welsh Dissent had cast itself, it is noteworthy that it had lost its hold on our countrymen until it was revived by the advent of Methodism.

Now the Methodists, as our readers are doubtless aware, were long reluctant to separate from the Church. They considered themselves for years in no other light than the skirmishing wing of the main army of the Church, who volunteered for the special service of awakening and reforming the ignorant and supine masses. A thousand pities that they were not officered and trained and put in the field under proper episcopal sanction, and with the hearty goodwill of the whole Church! But separation was finally decided on, and the Calvinistic Methodists (who now, we believe, outnumber any other single Dissenting denomination) appeared as a distinct sect in A.D. 1810, under the guidance of the Rev. Thos. Charles, of Bala, one of the founders of the British and Foreign Bible Society, whose real convictions, we are told, were overpowered by the pressure of the lay leaders. The older members of the Methodist body still largely share in the feelings of affectionate attachment professed towards the Church by Mr. Charles and his immediate followers; but the younger members, who seem to mix more and more in the political movements of the day and to cara less for the unobtrusive but deep and unimpeached piety of their fathers, do not.[1]

In whatever category they may place themselves as fellow-helpers to the truth, and fellow-labourers in the kingdom that is not of this world, and however highly they may be rated when their worth will be fairly and finally assigned (and no one can deny that their services have been great and substantial), none of these various sects can seriously be put forward in competition with the Church in point of age, visible continuity, national *prestige*, wide acceptance with the rich as well as the poor, and amount of important and permanent benefits conferred on the country. We may affirm, at all hazards, that it is not she that is "an alien" here.

[1] Articles on this subject appeared in THE CHURCHMAN some four or five years ago, written by my late friend, Canon Powell Jones.

In the face of these plain facts, and especially of the incorporation of the ecclesiastical parts, Welsh and English, and of the final union of the two countries six hundred years ago, the position of the Church in Wales, in regard to the charge of being an alien, cannot be disconnected from the position of the Church in England. What can be alleged against one can be alleged against the other. What is true and apposite of one is true and apposite of both. We are the same Church, such as both English and Welsh may equally claim as the ancient Church of the land; inseparably the same as our forefathers, finding the several ecclesiastical portions apart, whilst there was an identity of doctrine and discipline, and irresistibly impelled by Christian duty to join the severed portions together, formed into the one organic Church which has come down to us all through the centuries with common historical events and associations, and, we may add, with common hereditary possessions. The Church in Wales is no more "an alien" than the Church in England.

But, as Churchmen in "gallant little Wales," we profess to enjoy a slightly better position still in point of antiquity. We derive the descent of our branch of the Church from a time higher than its acceptance of the primacy and jurisdiction of the See of Canterbury, and even anterior to the origin of the English Church under Augustine, when he received his mandate from Pope Gregory. The British Church existed before Norman, Dane, or Saxon crossed the Northern Seas and settled in any considerable numbers on the eastern shores of England, and even before the final departure of the imperial legions from the country for the purpose of defending Rome against the Goths in A.D. 411. Long before the appearance of Augustine in Kent she had built churches and established colleges and religious houses, and had already produced a martyr in St. Alban, a world-famous heresiarch in Morgan ("Pelagius"), able and famous defenders of the faith once delivered unto the saints, a patron saint in Archbishop David, missionaries to the Picts and the Irish, and representatives at the Council of Arles (A.D. 314), and at the first General Council of Nicæa (A.D. 325). We must admit that conjecture and probability cannot be absent from the grounds of our judgment on the earliest introduction of the Christian Church among our Celtic ancestors. Scholars and antiquarians have always differed on the subject, and, in the absence of authoritative records, must always necessarily differ. It may be impossible to satisfy Cardinal Newman's analytical requirements, and definitely state "the how, the where, by whom, or the when," as applied to its beginning; but the fact of its primitive origin, as early as the first centuries of the Christian era, rests, as it seems to

us, on irrefragable evidence. If the testimony of contemporaneous and subsequent history, separate in its sources, but single in its attestation—diverging, it may be, in the accessories, but consentient on the main point, and fluctuating, perhaps, in its drift, but running at last in the same channel, as the unbroken traditions of a jealous and insulated people, the inhabitants of the country—can corroborate any event which has occurred in the past, and which has not occurred under our own immediate observation, then it is absolutely certain that Christianity reached our shores, and the Church was founded in Britain, at a very early period. And of this, the earliest branch of the Church Universal in the British Isles, the existing Church of England in Wales is the lineal descendant and the legitimate inheritrix. And yet, forsooth, she is termed "an *alien*"! As well might they say that the Christian religion itself is alien to our race and country.

We wish we could adduce here, in support of our allegation, other evidences, such as may be found in literary and structural remains. These we could offer as indefeasible muniments and incontrovertible proofs in favour of the National Church's rightful claim to her title and position. But we are restrained and embarrassed, not by the scantiness of the supply, but by its very profusion. The native literature, it is true, does not, so far as we know, ascend very high in date; but it covers a thousand years, and all the records we possess—the Laws of Howel Dda, the miscellaneous works of Giraldus Cambrensis, Liber Landaviensis, the Annals of Caradoc of Lancarvan, and others which we need not enumerate—present us with the essential features by which to recognise the old Church in the modern, and some of the necessary links to connect the past with the present. Other evidences of a more substantial kind, and more obvious to the public eye, such as ancient edifices and glebes, are found in every part of the Principality; and they testify to the Church's continuity as a living body, and to its long-settled occupation of the country. They are especially present in the Vale of Glamorgan, where this article is written. We say "the Vale of Glamorgan" *pace* Mr. Carlyle, who tells us, in his "Life of John Sterling," that it is "not properly a vale, there being only one range of mountains to it, even if one; but on the south no mountains at all, not even land, only the Bristol Channel." In this district, whether properly called a "vale" or a "pleasant plain"—and the old British name of *Bro* certainly denotes the latter as well as its situation, lying as the district does on the sunny seaboard of the county of Glamorgan—the ecclesiastical remains are abundant, as they are, indeed, in the whole of this diocese. We might refer to Llandaff, to Lantwit Major, and Lancarvan.

These were celebrated sacred structures of the Welsh Church of the fifth and sixth centuries. She has never been dispossessed of them (except for one brief interval), and they are still in actual use and possession by the same National Church as existed then. At these and many other such hallowed spots in our midst, where the service of prayer and praise, the preaching of the Gospel, and the administration of the Holy Sacraments have never been discontinued any more than the life of the imperishable Church ceased, if the reproach was raised of her being "an alien," we might truly affirm that "the stone would cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber should answer it. The vision is written, and made plain upon tables, and he may run that readeth it."

We should like, moveover, to dwell on the historical traditions that throng around the Church in Wales, and go to prove that instead of being an alien in her old mountain retirement, and among the children of the household which she reared and founded when she rescued our remote ancestors from the cruel and degrading dominion of Druidical superstition, her presence has been felt at every stage and turn of our national existence. Leaving her out of our calculation in the review of our history would be the same as taking away the vital principle which guides, controls, and sweetens the corporeal frame and preserves it from decay and dissolution. This is equally true of us, as a people, in social as in religious matters. But, interesting as the subject might be, we can now only refer to two or three circumstances which bear on the religious aspect. We refer to them inasmuch as they have placed us under obligations that should never be forgotten, and form the ground and source of most of the real piety that is in the country. The Church gave us an open Bible, translated by her faithful Bishops and divines. This is the only version used by Welsh-speaking Nonconformists and Churchmen, and is justly regarded as an inestimable boon by both.[1] She supplied us, by a succession of able ministers, with the characteristic mode—the unique model of popular preaching. It is well known that Daniel Rowlands of Llangeitho was a disciple of Griffith Jones of Llanddowror, and Griffith Jones the follower of Vicar Pritchard of Llandovery. These were all celebrated preachers, and their example and methods were followed by all who wished to succeed in the public ministration of the Word. But they themselves only carried on and

[1] This year of grace 1888 is the tercentenary of the first translation of the whole Bible into Welsh by Bishop William Morgan. Both the Very Rev. the Dean of St. Asaph and Canon Howell, of Wrexham, have made a public appeal towards commemorating the event in some worthy and substantial manner.

transmitted to their successors the older traditions of the Church. And this strain of sacred oratory is still prevailing; and whether animated or pathetic, goes straight to the Welshman's heart now as it did of old, when St. David and his companions, by their pulpit eloquence, extirpated Pelagianism and vindicated the orthodox creed. She set the example of collecting the young together and teaching them on the Lord's day. This was begun, long before the venture of Mr. Raikes of Gloucester in the same direction, by Mr. Griffith Jones and his associates in South Wales; and their efforts led eventually to the Sunday-school system, which is at present almost universal among us.

But we fear that we have already trespassed too much on the reader's patience, and we feel besides that any further treatment of the question would be superfluous. We venture to state conclusively that the parties who assert that the Church of England in Wales is "an alien" are certainly breaking the ninth Commandment. We do not profess to judge of their motives or objects. But we cannot forget that the ninth Commandment is closely related to the tenth. This is taught us from its position in the Decalogue, as well as from many a lesson in history. We have a significant warning in the case of Naboth the Jezreelite, whose vineyard, "the inheritance of his fathers," was seized and appropriated on a false accusation, and the accusation was invented for the express purpose of the robbery. The vineyard of the Lord of hosts, which His right hand has planted, and which heretofore has borne fruit of "the choicest vine," is ours, and ours also by right of inheritance, and is in the keeping of England no less than of Wales. May its hedges not be broken down—may its sacred inclosures be not again wasted by the spoiler, as was the case once before in our history, and when the result to our beloved country was nothing but anarchy, irreligion, and incalculable misery.

JOHN MORGAN.

LLANILID, GLAMORGAN.

ART III.—UP THE MISSISSIPPI.

OF all the features of our globe, there are none that surpass in interest its Rivers. We cannot name the Euphrates, the Tiber, the Thames, the Nile, without a host of deeply interesting associations rushing in upon our memories. Without the Euphrates, the Garden of Eden would have wanted one of its noblest features; without the yellow Tiber, Rome would not have sat on her seven hills, the centre and mistress of the world; how should London have become the greatest city of ancient or modern days, the undisputed ruler of the financial

world, without the Thames bringing the commerce of all nations to her markets? or how could Egypt have been the granary of the ancient world and the birth-place of science, if the Nile had not fertilized its soil, and by the resultant wealth afforded learned leisure for the pursuit of knowledge?

These rivers all run their course through continents or kingdoms; but we have now learned to think and speak familiarly of rivers in the great seas. I know no more picturesque or suggestive description of a natural object in any writer than Maury's remarkable piece of word-painting: "There is a river in the ocean; in the severest droughts it never fails, and in the mightiest floods it never overflows; its banks and its bottom are of cold water, while its current is of warm; it takes its rise in the Gulf of Mexico, and empties into Arctic seas; this mighty river is the Gulf Stream. There is in the world no other such majestic flow of waters. Its current is more rapid than the Mississippi or the Amazon, and its volume more than a thousand times greater."

We attribute to this great stream many important results affecting our daily life; it ameliorates the climate of the British Islands; it is the prolific source of many storms and atmospheric disturbances; and so it enters into our daily thoughts and conversation. Now the Mississippi does not run by any means so long a course, nor exercise an influence over so wide an area, as the Gulf Stream, yet it is a wonderful river both in its volume and its influences. The region which it drains, known as the Mississippi Valley, occupies fully half the area of the United States; it greatly exceeds in area the Nile Valley, which is in comparison but a narrow strip of alluvial soil; it is the most important region on the North American continent; its resources are as boundless as its climate, which varies from the almost tropical heat of New Orleans to the low temperature of St. Paul, where the thermometer frequently falls far below zero in the winter. A naturalist who should embark at New Orleans and ascend to the Falls of St. Anthony would note with interest the gradual marks of transition as he passed from the confines of a tropical fauna and flora to the southern limits of Arctic forms, both in the animal and vegetable kingdoms—from the habitat of alligators and humming birds in Louisiana to the home of the buffalo and prairie hen in Minnesota—from the sugar-canes and cotton of the south to the wheat and barley of the 45th parallel of latitude.

The contrast of the people, their life and habits, is almost as marked as in the animal and vegetable worlds. New Orleans is inhabited by a race of men utterly dissimilar to those who have built up St. Paul. French tastes, French

amusements, French morals, reign in New Orleans; the French die has been sharply stamped on its society, and has left its indelible impress. No commercial distress, nor even an epidemic, can restrain the light-hearted *abandon* of the people. During the Reign of Terror in Paris in the last century we read that the theatres never ceased to be filled with crowds. An epidemic of yellow fever periodically causes a reign of terror in New Orleans, but it fails to curb the irrepressible levity of the citizens.

At the other end of the journey we find a community differing from this in every particular. The indomitable energy and moral force of the old Puritan stock of New England have built up within an incredibly short time a populous and wealthy city, while the distinctive features of New England life and habits strongly mark the community.

To those distinctive features of character the American people owe more than the founding even of great cities, like St. Paul. From New England a far-reaching and powerful influence has gone out to the utmost limits of the continent; the leaven of the Pilgrim Fathers has leavened the whole lump; the sons of men who in bygone days had forsaken all that men count dear for civil and religious liberty could not brook the tyranny and cruelties of slave-owners in the South; abolition doctrines had their origin in Massachusetts, and to the ultimate prevalence of those doctrines the three millions of slaves in the Southern States owe their freedom, purchased for them at the cost of one of the most bitterly contested and bloody wars on record. The black chattel, whose only travels in the past were to the markets, where he would bring the highest price to his owner, may now go unhindered from New Orleans to St. Paul, and view with a freeman's eyes the glories of the great river and the cities which adorn its banks.

The vast region comprehended under the name of the Mississippi Valley is rapidly becoming the wealthiest portion of the continent; the nation that controls that valley, and the great river flowing through it, must be carried by the irresistible force of natural causes to power and wealth. "We are not here selling a number of vats and boilers," said Dr. Johnson at the sale of Mr. Thrale's brewery, "but the potentiality of growing rich beyond the dreams of avarice." The people that command the great Mississippi and its valley do not merely bear sway over so many acres of soil and a great natural highway, but possess the potentiality of growing rich and powerful beyond the dreams of the most ambitious of the Pharaohs that ever sat enthroned on the banks of the Nile.

The Church of Rome, ever on the watch for any opening to promote her interests, has not failed to appreciate the import-

ance of ascendency in this region. To be in the ascendant there means to be in the possession of the high-road to the ultimate control of the American Continent; and long ago Rome planted her foot there, and has never relaxed in her efforts to attain the coveted supremacy. The number of priests that one sees everywhere is very striking; the present number of adherents of that Church is by no means sufficient to require the ministrations of such an army of ecclesiastics as the traveller meets—it is evidently the future that is in view; and unless the Protestant Episcopal Church and other Protestant denominations awake to the supreme importance of the stake at issue, and put forth efforts commensurate to the occasion, they will at no distant period wake up to the appalling fact that the day is lost and their opportunity gone for ever.

When the American revolution had been accomplished and the revolted Colonies were recognised as an independent nation, the State of Louisiana was a French domain; but through it the Mississippi flowed, and its mouths opened into the Gulf of Mexico near its chief city, New Orleans.

The absolute control of the mouth of a river differs little from the control of its whole course; if the nation owning the mouth is sufficiently powerful to maintain its claim, it holds the key to the whole position. This was precisely the position of France in relation to the Mississippi. Louisiana was French, and France was a powerful nation, but fortunately for the young American Republic, was friendly. America was under a deep debt of gratitude to France and Lafayette for assistance in their struggle for independence; there can be no doubt, however, that if the French Government had not consented to the sale of Louisiana to the United States, war would inevitably have broken out sooner or later. The importance of controlling the outlet as well as the course of the great river would have obliterated all sentiments of gratitude in the mind of Americans for past favours, and they would have endeavoured to wrest the coveted control from France even at the cost of a war. In fact their permanent existence as a nation would have been seriously imperilled if deprived of it; it was an absolute necessity to the stability of the Union.

The transfer of Louisiana to the United States was the last step in the retirement of France from her long-cherished dream of founding a great empire in the West. That dream embraced the whole continent; from Cape Breton, where Louis XIV. constructed at an enormous cost the vast fortress of Louisburg, on to the historic citadel of Quebec, and so down to the city of New Orleans on the Gulf of Mexico, France had not only set her heart on establishing a great

French dependency, but she had gone a long way towards the fulfilment of her gorgeous dream. The thought will arise unbidden to us all, What if her dream had been accomplished? Had it been realised the history of the world would have been changed. The United States, as we now know them, would not occupy their present position among the nations of the earth; in short, without giving the reins to our imagination, we can readily see that the whole course of history would have been greatly modified. It is doubtless well, then, not only for the people of the United States, but for the peace of the human family, that France, in transferring Louisiana to the American Government, should have bid adieu for ever to the Western continent.

What conflicting claims grow out of divided ownership of territories through which a great river runs its course, the statesmen of Europe know well. The international commission which, after protracted negotiations and amid much jealousy and heartburnings, is now engaged in the task of dredging the mouths of the Danube, is simply the outcome of divided riparian sovereignty. A similar condition would inevitably have been the result in America if France had retained the control of the mouths of the Mississippi. From all this, however, the Government of the United States is free. It is the only Government of any civilized country that practically has no debt; in fact, the Treasury at Washington is suffering from the burden of an immense surplus, for the appropriation of which rival schemes are already contending; one of these schemes is for the dredging and improving of the navigation of the Mississippi. A gigantic undertaking! But it is one which a great nation, possessing undisputed sovereignty of the river from its source to its outlet, and having also unlimited financial resources at its command, is well able to carry into execution.

It is somewhat difficult to know why the river bears the name of Mississippi. The Missouri, which flows into it at St. Louis, far exceeds it in length, having a course of nearly three thousand miles before it falls into it, from which point the character of the joint stream is essentially that of the Missouri until it empties itself in the Gulf of Mexico. The Missouri is a very turbid stream, while the waters of the Mississippi above the junction are clear; after the confluence, however, the river never recovers its clearness, the vast deltas deposited at its mouth affording indisputable evidence of the fact. By right of origin, therefore, the Missouri would appear to be the proper designation of the united rivers; but, like many other usurpers, the Mississippi has by some means obtained an advantage over its rival, and maintains its ascendency to the end.

From any point above the confluence the voyage up the Mississippi is delightful: the scenery is in many portions very fine, the "bluffs" rising in great grandeur. No traveller on the Upper Mississippi can have failed to notice the terraces on either side of the river, which so exactly correspond to each other and which have all the appearance of being the result of successive subsidences of a mighty stream in ages long past. The Falls of St. Anthony are twelve hundred miles from the mouth of the river at New Orleans, and the great city of St. Paul has sprung up at this head of the navigable waters. The cataract is a magnificent sight, the whole of the great river pouring over a cliff sixty feet in height in an unbroken line. If it were not for the superior attractions of Niagara, the Falls of St. Anthony would draw thousands of visitors to gaze upon them every year.

The romantic Minnehaha, the Laughing Waters of Longfellow's poem, are easily reached in a morning's drive from St. Paul, and no tourist should fail to see them; they are, or were at the time of my visit, very picturesque, and were still in all their natural beauty; this was some years ago, and whether they still retain their original charms, I know not. The patent medicine vendor and his tribe have managed to disfigure and debase nearly every scene of natural beauty on the American Continent; probably this lovely spot has fallen into their remorseless hands, and the Laughing Waters are now chiefly devoted to the announcement of the virtues of some all-healing pills or matchless soap.

Some years since, when the Mississippi formed nearly the most western boundary of the advancing line of civilization, it possessed an unenviable notoriety for the reckless racing of steamboats and the frequent resultant explosions, and for the wild character of those who chiefly travelled on its waters. They were a peculiar class of men, springing out of the abnormal and transitional state of the region; they were seen on every steamboat. They usually had a greasy pack of cards in one pocket and a bowie-knife in the other, and were adepts in the use of either. The Hoosiers, as they were termed, were a terror to all peaceably disposed people. They were distinguished by their appearance; one distinctive feature of their dress was a slouched hat, very like that now affected by the clergy in this country.

In whatever aspect we look at this great river we shall find much to interest us; it is to a large extent an untrodden field, if I may be allowed to use so mixed a metaphor; it has little in common with the well-known and beaten tracks of European or African rivers; as the traveller ascends it, not only the transition from climate to climate, but from one type

of men to another, from tropical to semi-arctic forms of life, presents attractive features peculiar to the "Father of waters."

The wonderful progress of civilization, the contest between man and nature which may be witnessed in all its stages, the magnificent scenery of the Upper River before its confluence with the mud-stained Missouri, all combine to render a voyage up the Mississippi one of the most interesting and instructive now accessible to travellers.

P. CARTERET HILL.

ART. IV.—THE WELSH CHURCH QUESTION FROM AN ENGLISH STANDPOINT.

THERE may be those who think an Englishman guilty of something like audacity who ventures to write on the Church in Wales. In the face of such a possibility among readers of the CHURCHMAN, I fortify myself by three considerations. In the first place, I met with the other day a charge brought against English Churchmen, as a body, that they had just discovered the Church in Wales, and that, recognising in the organized attack upon her a danger to themselves, they had determined to defend her. To that charge I do not plead guilty. The Church in Wales is no new interest to me. Her story, her difficulties, and her gallant struggle to overcome them have long had a peculiar fascination for me; and if any words of mine can increase the sympathy which ought to exist between the Church in England and the Church in the Principality, I shall indeed feel grateful to the Editor of this Magazine for permitting me to set them down. In the second place, I am encouraged by the language of Lord Selborne, when speaking at Lampeter, last October, before a Welsh audience and in the presence of the four Welsh Bishops. "I do not," he said, "plead guilty to the charge of being an outsider. I hold that there is what the French would call a complete solidarity between the Churches of England and Wales, and no English Churchman, in or out of Wales, can, I believe, feel indifferent to the efficiency, to the fortunes, to the position or prospects of the Church in Wales." And lastly, I have before me a letter from one of the most eminent dignitaries of the Church in Wales, in which he expresses his opinion that the defence of the Church is more properly to be undertaken by those who are not actively engaged in its work.

My interest, I would submit, is no new thing. I am not an outsider because an English Churchman; and yet I am not an active worker in that part of the Church which is attacked. On such grounds I excuse my seeming audacity.

The common places of the attack may be summarized thus: (1) The Church in Wales is alien; (2) Wales is essentially nonconformist; (3) Churchmen constitute a very small minority of the population; (4) The endowments of the Church could be better employed.

With regard to (1), this is no new charge. It was formulated by the late Mr. Watkin Williams, in 1870, when he moved in the House of Commons, "That in the opinion of this House it is right that the Establishment of the Church and its union with the State should cease to exist in the Dominion and Principality of Wales," and was dealt with very effectively by Mr. Gladstone: It has again and again been urged by Mr. Henry Richard, and temperately but with convincing power replied to by Canon Bevan, yet, so recently as the 30th of January last, it reappeared in the columns of the *Daily News*. By no kind of reasoning which will commend itself to logical minds can the Church in Wales be demonstrated "alien." While the story of the British Church has been obscured and overlaid with legend, its existence and continued life is as much a fact of history as the mission of Augustine or the primacy of Theodore. Mr. Henry Richard, in the letter quoted above, calls Canon Pryce to his aid to knock down a man of straw of his own erection, to demolish a theory "that the British Church never succumbed to the authority of Papal Rome, but had not only a separate origin but a distinct succession which never fell into the turbid and impure Popish stream through which the Church of England derived its ecclesiastical life." This kind of reasoning is utterly beside the mark. The "turbid and impure Popish stream"—which flowed, we presume, from Augustine—is a piece of rhetoric meant to strike the imagination of readers whose thoughts as they read it will fly to Alexander VI. or the dogma of Papal Infallibility; but Mr. Richard must be perfectly well aware that no educated person has even questioned the fusion of the English Church as founded by Augustine with the British Church which had taken refuge in Wales. No one claims a distinct succession for the British Church, and there would be no object in doing so; but we do distinctly claim, even in the face of a phrase from such an authority as Mr. Freeman, a very distinct share in the common succession for the British Church, and we confidently challenge any proof of the proposition that the British Church was overpowered and rooted out from the Principality of Wales.[1]

[1] On other occasions Mr. Richard and his friends have found the Evidence of Conquest in the imposition of Norman Bishops on the

2. It is commonly asserted that Wales is essentially Nonconformist. I am disposed to apologize for touching on this point at all, but it will be understood that I am not writing for Welshmen, but for English readers. This is a historical question, and the answer of history to it is that Wales is *not* Nonconformist. The Nonconformity of Wales, however brought about, is a comparatively new thing. Mr. Gladstone, in his speech of 1870, ascribed it to the efforts of William III. in the interests of his newly-founded throne, to anglicize the country and Church in Wales, but it has been clearly shown that William III. was by no means the first offender in this respect. Long before his day the practice of sending English Bishops to Wales had prevailed, and yet the Church flourished and was strong.

Canon Bevan, than whom Wales has no more loyal and able champion, ascribes the growth of Nonconformity to two causes: (1) the inadequacy, at all times and in all parts, of the Church's equipment, and (2) the linguistic condition of Wales. The Church in Wales has ever been poor, and in common with the Church at large, she has been slow to adapt her machinery to changing conditions and sudden accessions of population. She has also suffered from the bilingual difficulty in a way which Nonconformity has not. Nonconformity, speaking broadly, has ministered to the Welsh-speaking population—it has been said that less than 40,000 Nonconformists in Wales worship in the English language—the Church has endeavoured to minister to both English and Welsh. The Church has therefore been in a position of disadvantage; the same man has endeavoured to serve both the educated and the illiterate, both the English and Welsh-speaking people. Let it be candidly acknowledged also that inadequate or negligent supervision has in past times suffered the services of a large number of unworthy Ministers.

Still in spite of these things, Welsh Nonconformity, as a great force, has a history of little more than 100 years, and looking at the undoubted strength of the Church in certain districts at this moment, and its progress throughout the Principality generally, there appears to be no sufficient ground for assuming that Wales is essentially Nonconformist, or that the descendants of the men who were such staunch Churchmen in the seventeenth century are permanently alienated from the faith of their fathers.

The third charge is that Churchmen constitute a very small

Church in Wales in the days of Edward I., forgetful that this had been a grievance at least a hundred years before, and that it was, moreover, a grievance common to English Churchmen, and therefore no proof whatever of the alien character of the Church in Wales.

minority of the population. Supposing this were true, it might be a powerful argument (not that it would weigh with me) for Disestablishment, but not for Disendowment. But is it true? We have had various estimates of the proportions of Churchmen to Nonconformists at various times, and some sanguine Liberationists have put down our share of the population at one-ninth, others at one-seventh, and so on. The real question to answer is, What is a Churchman? and the next, Are all who do not come regularly to church to be counted as supporters of Disestablishment? It would not seem so. Either, in fact, Churchmen form a much larger proportion than is commonly allowed, or a vast number of Nonconformists are opposed to Disestablishment. Let the returns for the election of 1885 bear witness. In that election the question of Disestablishment was prominently before the constituencies; it was publicly announced that every Liberal candidate was a Liberationist, and that no other would have a chance of being returned. Yet the Church candidates polled 67,593 votes as against 98,593 for the Liberationists. No words can be more eloquent than these figures. As a complement to them it may be observed that the preference shown by the people of Wales to funerals with the rites of the Established Church has long been a subject of complaint among Nonconformist ministers, and that statistics taken in 272 parishes of the Dioceses of Bangor and St. Asaph show, for five years, 20,598 Church funerals against 1,441 under the Burials Act. It would seem then that when advocates for Welsh Disestablishment contend that Churchmen are but 1 to 9, or perhaps 1 to 7 of the whole population, the retort may fairly be made that, at any rate, the voters for the maintenance of an Established Church are as 7 to 10, while those who seek the rites of the Church in burial are 20 to 1.

The last allegation I propose to consider is that the endowments of the Church might be better employed than at present. These endowments are said to be in round numbers, £242,000 per annum. It is not an overwhelming amount, especially when it is remembered that it has to maintain 1,434 educated gentlemen. There is more than one individual Englishman who has a larger income for his sole personal use. Inefficient and unworthy men there are, of course, in holy orders as there are in every profession; but on the testimony of her adversaries the clergy, as an order, are an industrious, painstaking and thoroughly useful body of men, and we venture to say that it would be hard to point to any other income of a quarter of a million which was made to go further or do more good.

The following passage from the *Cambrian News* of January

20th, illustrates my defence of the Welsh Clergy so aptly that I cannot refrain from quoting it:

The advent and growth of the Salvation Army on the one hand, and the extraordinary activity of the Church of England on the other, tell a story of apathy, or want of adaptability, or loss of spiritual power, or increase of pride amongst Nonconformist bodies, that cannot be ignored. The rank and file of Nonconformist denominations are beginning to inquire amongst themselves how it comes to pass that the clergy of the Church of England, and the officers of the Salvation Army, can be seen hard at work every day of the week in all sorts of places, while Nonconformist ministers seem to have very little to do except on Sundays. Nonconformity has done a great work, and is to-day by far the most powerful influence for good in the Principality. The question whether this is, in the main, a finished work and a waning influence, must be asked in the face of existing conditions . . . Do new needs demand other means? Religion always remains the same living principle, but machinery alters with the times. It was not a new religion that was preached by the Church of England clergymen, who at last were severed from the Establishment in the early part of this century. It is the old religion that the Salvation Army and the Church of England are preaching with so much energy from widely different standpoints. . . . If Nonconformity in Wales becomes formal and professional and crystallized we have no fear that religion will suffer, whatever may become of Nonconformity as it now exists.

Side by side with this should be read some words of Lord Aberdare, an old Liberal, spoken at Aberdare on February 1st, at the opening of a Liberal club:

I read with some astonishment the statement recently made by Mr. Labouchere at Swansea that the Church in Wales had not made a single convert. The slightest acquaintance with the actual state of things would have shown him that almost everywhere in Wales the Church was making healthy progress, and certainly nowhere more than in this county of Glamorgan—perhaps I might say in the borough of Merthyr Tydfil and Aberdare. I can remember the time when the only clerical representative of the Church for Merthyr and Dowlais, with their population even then of some 30,000 people, was the curate, whose rector for thirty years lived at Swansea, receiving the tithes of the most considerable living in the diocese, and doing nothing for his Church but pay the stipend of that one curate. What Merthyr became in the days of Mr. Campbell, how many churches were built, how many districts were cut out of that vast parish, how many active and zealous clergymen ministered to a constantly increasing flock, I need not tell you. For many years of my youth and early manhood there was but one clergyman of the Church of England ministering for the even then populous parish of Aberdare. There was but one church, and that a very small one, in the whole of the valley from Hirwain to what is now the Aberdare Junction. Now there are eleven churches, besides three missionary places of worship, and several of these are already too small for the congregations belonging to them. They are ministered to by sixteen clergymen, of whom I will only say that they seem to me to perform their duties with earnestness and zeal, and in a spirit very different to that which prevailed during the years of which I am speaking. Nor are these great effects due simply to the wiser application of Church endowments. These additional churches were built and the greater part of these sixteen clergymen are maintained by voluntary offerings of Churchmen. For instance, at Mountain Ash we have

one clergyman supported out of the property of the Church. The other four are maintained by the voluntary offerings of Churchmen in one form or other. I might easily accumulate similar examples in other parts of this diocese, and, indeed, throughout Wales. And there can be no question that the Church, in its renewed spirit of life and energy, is conciliating the respect and attracting the interest of large numbers of educated Nonconformists. You would, I am sure, be greatly surprised if I were to give you the numbers of Nonconformist ministers who apply every year to the four bishops of Wales for admission into the Church and into Holy Orders. I might, with pardonable pride, further pursue this subject, and give overwhelming proof of the healthy vitality of the Church at this moment.

A quarter of a million per annum for such a body of men as this—for men on whom, be it remembered, every individual in the community has a claim, which at any time he may choose to exercise! We spend, and few grudge it, £30,000,000 a year on our army and navy; the mere duty on beer and spirits is £25,000,000 per annum, and, in face of this, it is sought to deprive the cause of religion of this comparative trifle of £250,000. It is hardly credible that such a proposal should seriously be made. Again, people talk cheerily about the appropriation of the tithe to education. Do they realize that in case of Disestablishment three-eighths of the elementary schools which are now kept off the rates by the exertions of Church-people would then necessarily be placed upon them? Has any individual tithe-payer calculated, I wonder, what his own share of remitted taxation would be in case he ceased to pay tithe to the clergyman, and paid it to some public office instead? Is he sure that in his lifetime there would be any remission at all?

Of course, if this quarter of a million were doing harm instead of good, one could understand the bitterness with which it is assailed; but that is not pretended. The good it is doing is universally acknowledged. While to the nation it is a very small sum, to the Church it is a large one; a great work would be crippled by its withdrawal; a very doubtful advantage would accrue to the general public.

On the whole, then, except in the interest of that intangible consideration, religious equality, it is hard to see what case there is against the Church in Wales, or why reflecting Englishmen and Welshmen should suffer her to be despoiled. I have read Sir George Trevelyan's speeches through from end to end, but have found no shadow of a reason for the policy he advocates; and when at Swansea he expressed a wish that other politicians would visit Wales, as he had done, and judge for themselves, I could not help echoing the wish, with the added hope that they would not merely see what they were taken to see, and wished to see, but what was really being done both by Churchmen and Dissenters. Englishmen, clergy and

laity, should go to Wales and judge of facts for themselves. We no longer want men to go down and make speeches as soon as they arrive, on one side or the other, but men who will take the advice which the Dean of Llandaff offered to his old pupil, Sir George Trevelyan—advice which, unfortunately, was not followed, first to "inquire, and then reflect."

The matter is one of vast and abiding interest, not only to Wales but to England, and is not to be decided on *ex parte* statements. The Church has a right to demand from politicians that they should only act after the closest investigation, and on the fullest information.

H. GRANVILLE DICKSON.

ART. V.—THE PRONUNCIATION OF LATIN.

Cambridge Philological Society. Summary of Answers received in Reply to Circular of Inquiry on Reform of Latin Pronunciation.
Pronunciation of Latin in the Augustan period. Trübner and Co.

THE replies sent by head-masters, lecturers, etc., to the questions of the Cambridge Philological Society, show that there is—as there has been for some time—a strong party in favour of changing our English pronunciation of Latin. Out of 51 answers, 41 were favourable, 4 neutral, 6 unfavourable. The scheme of pronunciation, as put forth this last year (1887), may be taken to be the newest utterance on the matter, being mainly the same as that sent round to the members of the Society nearly two years ago.

In Greek as well as in Latin many are nowadays urging a change of pronunciation, ridiculing us as insular and isolated. But, curiously enough, while they bid us pronounce Greek as the Greeks pronounce it now—giving up not only the English, but altogether the so-called Erasmian pronunciation (or attempt at old classical) as guesswork and invention—in Latin we are not to regard much how the Italians speak now, but are to reconstruct a pronunciation—surely guesswork in part, however good the guessers. "Speak Greek as it is spoken in A.D. 1887; Latin as it may have been spoken B.C. 87." The arguments for the modern Greek, though not quite convincing, seem to me stronger than those for the Augustan Latin; but it is only with the latter I am now to deal.

It is bold to criticise a scheme backed by such names as the Bishop of Durham, Dr. Hayman, Dr. Peile, and Mr. Whitelaw; yet Mr. Mayor and Mr. Welldon oppose, and (I hope) many more who do not appear. Three questions occur:

1. Is the universal adoption of such a new system practically possible?
2. Does this, or can any new scheme, give us a pronunciation really correct for, say, any half-century?
3. Grant it correct, and adopted, what shall we have gained or lost?

As to (1), Englishmen are not likely to adopt with readiness such a change. And a partial and slow adoption would entail such inconvenience and confusion in schools and education that on this score alone the wisdom of the attempt appears questionable.

As to (2), a restoration of the Augustan pronunciation can but be approximate, and open to objection in details. This scheme may be the best possible. The criticisms of it offered here shall be brief. Doubtless the Italian vowels (which in the main are adopted) are more correct than our English ones. Demonstrative proof has hardly yet been given about the invariable hardness of the consonants *c* and *g*, even before *e* and *i*. Soft they have become in the derived languages; there seems to be a tendency that way. When they lost their original hardness—whether everywhere at the same time—is difficult to decide. The same may be said of the hard *t*, which it is proposed to restore in such words as *natio*. And is it not rather strong to say "it is a gross mispronunciation" to let *th* sound as in "thin," *ph* as *f*? For *th* and *ph* are for Greek θ and ϕ, which surely sound now with Greeks as in "thin" and "fin," whatever they may once have been. "Philosophia," too, has been "filosofia" in Italy for a long time.

But by far most important is question (3). By this scheme what is gained? What in study of languages, in comparison, say, of Latin with Italian and French? In Italian little, if anything; for while the vowels would bring our Latin nearer to Italian, the hard consonants would put it farther away. "Viva voce," English-wise, is about as near Italian as "weewah wokey." In French the changed vowels would be more like the French of to-day in some simple cases: but plenty of French vowel sounds would remain just as different. While in the consonants *c*, *g*, and *t* before *i* our English use is now something like the French; but would then be utterly unlike. On the whole, Latin spoken Augustan-wise would be no greater help to French; probably less.

But a great use—nay, the greatest—to many Englishmen the only use of Latin (beside the power of reading the Latin authors, which does not depend on pronunciation) is its bearing on their own tongue. No half-dozen lines of English can be taken which do not present many words from the

Latin—words better understood by a knowledge of Latin, which now at once to the sight and by their sound reveal their parentage. But read Latin with the reformed pronunciation, and much of this light is lost; scores of like words become unlike. "Face, space, civil, vigil, adjacent, vice-regent" tell their own tale now to a very moderate Latinist, but will they do so as plainly when "fakkeeays, spattium, wiggil, keeweelis, adyakens, wikkey-reggens" have become imperative and habitual?

And to our English boys or girls learning Latin, what additional difficulties! "As easy to start with one set of vowels, etc., as with another." But we all *do* start with our English ones. And it is a gain, an interest at every step, to find our own tongue helping us to another—the other helping us more thoroughly to know our own. Is all this to be sacrificed? Ready enough are some to cry out that we spend too much time on Greek and Latin, too little on English. These will have more reason if we make Latin harder by making it more unlike our own tongue, and yet not like any other.

Scholars of different nations could understand each other better, it may be urged. Latin scholars in England nowadays (if worthy of the name) know some modern languages: they can learn a continental pronunciation of Latin in a day or two. Or let the learned of different lands, if they like and can, agree on a common pronunciation for their own use; not, however, needed now as once, when they exchanged their thoughts mainly through Latin.

But the present proposal is for a Ciceronian or Augustan pronunciation to be taught throughout the schools of England. After all was done, John Bull's accent would be still recognisable by Frenchman, German, or Italian, and assuredly by Cicero, Augustus, and Virgil, could he converse with those shades. Nay, let us contentedly remain English in utterance. The proposed change, with a show of learning, might (*quod absit!*) hinder rather than help the extension of learning; this attempt to mimic the sounds of the mighty dead might cause fewer to study their thoughts and sense.

W. C. GREEN.

Art. VI.—THE CHURCH AND ITS UNITY.[1]

BEHIND all general questions of ecclesiastical polity, and all particular questions of ordinances and order, and all personal questions of duty or liberty in regard to them, stands the great question, "What is the Church?" What is the fundamental conception of it, underlying all secondary uses and varying applications of the word? What do we mean by the Church, when we make it an article of faith, recognising it as "one," and characterizing it as "holy catholic and apostolic?"

There is need of this inquiry; for men's minds are apt to be arrested at the particular forms in which the Church exists for them, without going behind them to the general definition within which these must fall. They are clear as to the foreground, and see something of the "middle distance," but beyond that there is only a haze of vague indeterminate ideas. Their own side of Jerusalem stands out in sunshine, but it is an isolated object surrounded by mists rather than by mountains. Such a view of things is unsatisfactory. In order that it may become more clear and comprehensive it is necessary to consider what the word "church" in its larger sense should mean; what regions of thought and fact it should be held to cover, and what effect the view so taken should have upon our principles of judgment and of action.

The Church, as an article of faith, holds a prominent and suggestive place. When I say the Creed I pass from belief in the Holy Ghost to belief in the "holy catholic Church" or (Nicene Creed) "in one catholic and apostolic Church." The Article follows those which acknowledge the several persons of the Trinity, as expressing that the society so named is a consequence of the manifestation of the Son and the coming of the Holy Ghost; and it precedes the compendium of human salvation, as showing this society to be the proper scene and home of that history of the redeemed, which begins in the "forgiveness of sins" and ends in "the resurrection of the body and the life everlasting."

I go forth into the world of fact and history, and my eyes grow dim and my mind confused, in seeking the realization of this article of the faith in the dubious and dislocated scene. I need not describe it. The story is familiar, and the scene is still before our eyes. We have all traced in Church history the secular aspect which it soon presents, the intermingling of alien elements, the growth of corruptions, the development of usurpation; then the disappearance of apparent unity in the

[1] The substance of this paper was given at the Islington meeting.

breakdown of the factitious framework, the detachment of national masses of Christianity, and that subsequent progress of disintegration which treats easy and endless separation as if it were proper to the spirit and genius of the Gospel.

What an escape for the perplexed mind—what a relief to the harassed feelings is opened by the doctrine of an Invisible Church, from which are eliminated all things that offend, in which is essential and universal holiness, an election which is already sure, or fixed in divine foreknowledge, and a spiritual oneness in Christ high above all earthly occasions and expressions of division. So great is the relief, that the doctrine has been sometimes spoken of as invented for the purpose of affording it; as, for instance, by persons suffering under the trial of exclusion from the visible Church. Certainly it was a natural resource for those who found themselves denounced by authorities to which they were subject, and disowned by a brotherhood to which they belonged, to remember that there was a higher authority and a nearer brotherhood, and a spiritual church-membership which none could take away; as dying Port-Royalists, denied the offices of the Church, could breathe the words of assurance, "Doubtless Thou art our Father; though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not." Men of another sort, not touched by these loyal feelings, and thinking only of direct relation to God, have come to treat with disparagement, and almost with contempt, the privileges and obligations of the earthly communion, as mere matters of circumstance, in presence of the vision of the spiritual Church, and in the assurance of their personal part in it.

Yet this vision has not risen on men's minds in consequence of any exceptional cases, whether of unkind usage of persons by the visible Church, or of inadequate estimate of the visible Church by the persons themselves. It is not a refuge conjured up for a purpose, though a refuge it is—and one of unspeakable consolation. The spiritual man has always looked, and always must look, beyond the visible scene for the ideal, which in it is only suggested, the reality which in it is only typified, the perfection which in it is only begun. Thus the conception of the Church mystical disengages itself from that of the Church visible, and rises behind it and above it, as a background of truth and glory; in clear distinction from it, though in close relations with it. And thus only do we see a fulfilment of much of the loftier language of the Prophets and Apostles as to the kingdom and mountain of the Lord and the holy city, "Jerusalem which is above, mother of us all, and the Church of the Firstborn enrolled in heaven," and "the glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle or

any such thing," "the spouse of Christ," "the bride of the Lamb."

This mystical Church was present to the mind of the earliest Christians. I read, for instance, in "the first example of a Christian homily:"[1]

> Brethren, if we do the will of God our Father, we shall be of the *first Church*—the *spiritual Church* created before sun and moon. Let us choose to be of the *Church of life*, that we may be saved. The books and the Apostles testify that the Church existeth not now for the first time, but hath been from the beginning (p. 329).

The Platonic cast of thought and the mystical interpretations which follow do not disguise the leading idea present to the mind of the preacher and his auditors.

This conception of the Invisible Church is susceptible of different degrees of expansion or contraction. By some it is extended to comprehend the elect angels and whatsoever may be included in "the dispensation of the fulness of times," which will "gather together in one" (or sum up under one head) "all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are in earth" (Eph. i. 10). But as Dean Field says:

> For that the sons of men have a more full communion and perfect fellowship, being all delivered out of the same miseries by the same benefit of gracious mercy; therefore, they make that more special society which may rightly be named the Church of the redeemed of God.

Of the Church in this sense Barrow's account may serve:

> The whole body of God's people—that is, ever hath been, or ever shall be, from the beginning of the world to the consummation thereof—who, having formally or virtually believed in Christ and sincerely obeyed God's laws, shall finally, by the meritorious performances and sufferings of Christ, be saved, is called "the Church."

And he afterwards further describes it as—

> The Catholic society of true believers and faithful servants of Christ diffused throughout all ages, dispersed through all countries, whereof part doth sojourn on earth, part doth reside in heaven, part is not yet extant, but all described in the register of divine preordination, and to be re-collected at the resurrection of the just. (Discourse on the "Unity of the Church," vol. vii., p. 628.)

He cites Augustine for this extension in the past—"Ex quo vocantur sancti, est ecclesia in terra;" and Gregory the Great—"Sancti ante legem, sancti sub lege, sancti sub gratia, omnes hi perficientes corpus Domini in membris sunt ecclesiæ constituti" (Epist. 24).

The company thus gradually gathered out of this world into the world unseen, in preparation for a future destiny, is an

[1] See Bishop Lightfoot's "Clement of Rome. Appendix on the Newly-Discovered Portions." Preface and notes to the MSS. called "Second Epistle of Clement"—really the fragment of a Homily not later than A.D. 140.

object of contemplation effectual to strengthen, elevate, and console. But the application to it of the word "Church," as meaning not a collection, but a society, is a transfer of the term from this world to another, and to one in regard to which we have but very restricted information. "Only," as Hooker says, "our minds by intellectual conceit are able to apprehend that such a real body there is: a body collective, because it containeth an huge multitude; a body mystical, because the mystery of their conjunction is removed altogether from sense" (Book iii. 1). This "mystery of their conjunction" in Christ underlies the separations which precede its final manifestation, and which may be noted as follows:

1. Those who compose this company have passed into it through very different dispensations and religious histories and opinions.

2. They are apart from each other in different worlds, some in the body and some out of it.

3. Those in the body are severed from each other in their own apprehension — as, for instance, children of God in the Roman obedience from those (we will say) in the Baptist connection, or true believers among orthodox Christians from those who have been found in heterodox communities.

4. As to those now in the intermediate state, we are not now informed what communion they have among themselves, or whether they have any relations with the Church on earth. Thus the attribution to them of such society and fellowship as is suggested by the word "Church" must be made with reservations. They are one elect company in the sight of God, Who knows and has foreknown them all. They are *one* in their personal relation to Christ, and in the effects of that relation on their several states and characters; but their actual collection and constitution as a society is, as far as we know, yet in the future, when "the Bride shall have made herself ready," and "the holy city new Jerusalem shall come down from God out of heaven."

Meantime, the members of this "first and spiritual Church, the Church of life," as that ancient homily describes it, are in course of preparation and collection until God shall have "accomplished the number of His elect;" and "the mystery of their conjunction," at present is properly described not by the words "Catholic Church," but by that of "the Communion of Saints." This Article, which came later into the Creed, was not adopted without reason. I cannot regard it (with some of our great authorities) as an added interpretation of the former Article,[1] but as declaring a fact distinguishable from it, though

[1] *E.g.*, Barrow. "As I conceive, the meaning of these words do not much differ from the precedent article. Perhaps it was added for interpretation thereof."

contained within it—namely, the common participation of all that are truly sanctified, wherever abiding, in the grace and the life and the kingdom of Jesus Christ their Lord.

II.

It is certain and evident that the Church invisible or mystical, of which we have spoken, is not created in the way of immediate and independent origination. It is the product of a precedent dispensation. The kingdom of God has a history, and passes through an earthly stage and visible form of existence, in which, according to our Lord's teaching, it is already "the kingdom of God." Such it is in its essential character, notwithstanding the large deductions from its perfection which His parables describe and all His doctrine recognises. The order of things thus established, in the present age or period in which we are now living, is in the form of a society visible in the world, continuous from generation to generation, which we know as "the Church of Christ." It is this visible Church, with its mingled character and under its actual external conditions, which is distinctly intended in the largest number of passages bearing upon "the Church" in Holy Scripture. It is this which was undoubtedly meant, and has been always understood, in the accepted use of the same word in the Creeds.

We ought therefore, in the first place, to consider the category in which we place the Church as among things to be *believed*. In the Church mystical we expatiate at ease. All is spiritual; all is true. We deal from the divine standpoint with absolute certainties, or from the human standpoint with the distant and unknown. But in the visible Church we descend to earth, and are arrested at the foreground, and encounter facts difficult to interpret, in which the human is complicated with the divine. We call the Church visible, and it is very visible indeed. As a constituted society and recognizable institution or, (as seen superficially), aggregate of institutions, it is conspicuous in the scenery of the world, and has been a potent factor in its history. Its organization and assemblies, its acts and functions, its officers and representatives, are as distinctly in the region of sensible fact and under natural observation as are those of any secular communities or associations. How, then, do we translate it into the region of faith? Why do we place it in the Creed after the confession of the several Persons of the Holy Trinity, and before the acknowledgment of the Forgiveness of Sins, the Resurrection of the Body, and the Life Everlasting? I answer: It is the subject of faith because the things which constitute its essence are so. Its origin, the ends it is to serve, the powers

supplied for those purposes, its relations with things above—these are not of man, but of God. It follows not only subsequently, but consequently, on the manifestation of the Son of God and the coming of the Holy Ghost; and it is by divine ordinance and action in closest relations with that spiritual, mystical, or invisible Church, the presence of which is always behind it, and the consciousness of which I have already invoked as a condition necessary to any true understanding of this part of the subject. I *believe*, then, in "the Holy Catholic Church," or in "one Catholic and Apostolic Church," as *of Divine origination*, founded by Jesus Christ in person. I read this in that fundamental declaration, of which an absurd and indefensible Romish perversion has given a groundless impression that it involves some difficulty to be evaded. In the words "I will build My Church" the Lord announced that He would be the builder of a community as yet in the future (not then existing), which should be His—a "Church of Christ;" and that in the building He would use human material which He had chosen, and forenamed for the purposes of foundation-work, (in which, in fact, Peter was employed). Yet further, "the gates of *Hades* shall not prevail against it." A word is used representing death, destruction, obliteration from the world, intimating the powers which would rise in long and fierce persecution for this purpose, and the assured futility of their assaults. Yet further, the words following (on the use of "keys," and on things to be "bound on earth") keep us still in the terrestrial scene. That the Lord did commence the building of a visible Church is as clear as that He died and rose again; for if to gather a company of disciples, to place in the midst of them twelve apostles, to give them commissions to be "stewards" of His house and "shepherds" of His flock, to charge them to disciple all nations, to entrust them with the witness of Himself to the world, to institute sacraments for perpetual use, and to promise His own presence and power of His Spirit to the body thus created and commissioned—if this was not to found the Church and begin the building of it, it would be hard to say what action could be so described. Again, if the Church so founded is not the same which exists at this hour—if it ceased and determined in that age or any age afterwards—then the gates of Hades have prevailed against it. I believe, then, in the Christian Church in this world as divine in its origin, being the institution of Christ Himself. Other characters which make this Church an object of faith are such as follow naturally from this origin—as that it exists only by profession of His revealed Name, and as the witness of supernatural truths, and as the home of a spiritual covenant; that Christ is present in it, and the Holy Ghost

works in it; that God's children are born in it, and educated in it; and that it thus supplies through successive generations the members of that unseen Church for the sake of which it exists. These are facts for faith, not for sight; and inasmuch as they are the reason of the Church's being, and constitute its essential nature, they make the Church a proper object of faith, and justify its place in the Creed.

The *relations of the visible to the invisible Church* are various as well as close. It is a representative relation by profession and testimony; it is a generative and formative relation through the ministration of word and sacraments; and the one is fused and identified with the other in the persons of its spiritual members. Hence comes that free and comprehensive language of Holy Scripture, using the word "Church" in various measures of meaning, from the smallest company, simply regarded in its external character, up to the congregated election, presented without fault before the throne of God.

It may be observed, further, that to particular and local portions of the Church the collective term is frequently applied, with all the high spiritual character which, for the reasons I have just given, is attached to the collective body. Thus the presbyters in Ephesus are told that "the Holy Ghost has made them bishops, to feed the Church of God, which He purchased with His own blood." In accordance with this, in our Ordination Service the Bishop charges the priests, "Remember how great a treasure is committed to your charge. For they are the sheep of Christ, which He bought with His death, and for whom He shed His blood. The Church and Congregation whom you must serve is His Spouse and His Body." In like manner Timothy, placed in general charge of the same Ephesian Church, is instructed "how he ought to behave himself in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and stay of the truth;" in which words one great office belonging to the collective body is shown to increase responsibility for conduct in any part of it.

In regard to this passage, some minds, moved by the false conclusions drawn from it, have thought that it says too much to be applied to the visible Church. But it can apply to nothing else. A pillar and (ἑδραίωμα, *firmamentum*) solid support, to bear up the truth in the world and maintain it in public view, cannot be anything invisible; moreover, the instructions which these words are meant to impress are upon the conduct of bishops and deacons and their family life, as officers in this "house of God;" and it is in the visible Church that these are found. As to the office ascribed to the Church,

it is simply one of the main purposes for which, as a visible society, it exists; namely, to be the witness and keeper of the Word, and by testimony and confession to uphold the revealed truth in the world, and so prevent its sinking out of sight and being lost in the swamps of human opinion. The Romish use of the text perverts the pavement and pillar, which should sustain the truth once delivered to the saints, into a factory for producing and issuing new articles of faith, which were not delivered to them; and the argument that, because the Church is the upholder of the truth, therefore everything which the Church may at any time promulgate is true, is the same as if we should say that, because the sovereign power is the proper fountain of justice, therefore everything that the sovereign power may do is just.

III.

If, for the reasons given, or for others like them, we accept the visible Church as properly a subject for faith, we have then to consider in what sense it is *one*.

The unity of the Church mystical is in Christ, as the Head, the centre and the life of the whole. The unity of the visible Church is in its relation to the same Lord. It consists in being the Church *of Christ*. But the relations with Him in the two cases are not the same; for in the one case they are simply spiritual, in the other they are through means. In the one they are the same collectively and distributively; that is, the relation of the whole body and that of the several members of it are identical in character and in truth. In the other this is not so. Collectively the body may be in true relation with the Lord; but distributively it includes many members who are not united to Him in faith and love.

Speaking, then, of the Church as an enduring and catholic society (as distinguished from the personal condition of its several members), I may mention four lines of connection by which it is manifestly united to its Lord: 1. The confession of His Name, and, through that, of the Eternal Trinity. 2. His Word, held and preached in it. 3. The Sacraments, as His own seals affixed to it. 4. The continuity of its life, from His own foundation of it. Where these requisites exist the Church has the essential union with its Founder, and has in that union a fundamental oneness underlying all differences of ecclesiastical polity and all actual external divisions. Here we might rest if these requisites were beyond question or mistake. But they are not. Questions may be, and must be raised as to every one of them. For instance: "The confession of the Name." What confession? what meaning given

to the Name? Will an Arian or Sabellian confession serve? "The Word." It is a large, comprehensive term. What measures of completeness are necessary? "Where the *pure* Word of God is preached," says the Article. How is this pureness to be estimated? Historically, and, in fact, there are variations of doctrine. What amount and kinds of them will consist with our statement? "The Sacraments." They must be "duly administered according to all those things which of necessity are requisite to the same." What are those things? and how are they *duly* administered? How far, for instance, does the denial of the cup go to invalidate the act? or, again, the want of commission for administration? "Continuity of life." Wherein does it consist? The central and conspicuous line of this continuity is in the offices and the ministry. Then arise questions on the nature of the offices and the transmission of orders. What is their effect on the line of descent from the Church of the Apostles? and how far is this invalidated by schism or impaired by obligatory or excusable separation? These questions suggest that many more of like kind might be asked, and they are mentioned here only to show that the realization of the Church ideal is a matter which admits of degrees. As it is undeniable that any one or every one of the constituent elements which have been specified may exist in any division of Christendom in greater or less perfection or imperfection, it follows that the visible Church, which they constitute, may, so to speak, be more or less a Church of Christ, or more or less visibly such. Hence the conception cannot well be marked off by strong indisputable lines, but will be broken on its borders by detached masses and shade off into dubious conditions; as an orb in heaven may throw off its satellites or lose its distinct outline in nebulous surroundings.

In the Roman obedience, these questions are all disposed of by the Papal theory. But we who see that theory to be a human invention, who know its rise and all its story, who lay to its charge the accumulation and perpetuation of gross errors and corruptions, can only regard it as a principal destroyer of unity; directly, by its own false principles of comprehension and exclusion; and indirectly, by the disintegrating reaction, which naturally ensued on discovery of their falseness and the break-up of a long usurpation. For preservation of a certain kind of external unity, it might be convenient to have had the lines made clear by divine appointment of one particular church as the centre of the whole and its head as Christ's vice-gerent upon earth; but doubtless such an economy would have been attended with spiritual danger and damage to the truth; as the pretence of it has certainly and conspicuously been. However

that be, it is certain that no such appointment is revealed, and, therefore, that God has laid upon churches (that is, upon men in society), responsibilities of judgment and action akin to those which he has laid upon them as separate persons.

Since the divine wisdom, in laying the foundations of the Church, did not constitute any local society or any official person to be an earthly centre of unity, but only gave principles, motives, and charges for unity; and further, did not command any complete system of ecclesiastical polity, but only gave intimations, and sanctions, and records, of the beginning of such an order of things—a certain liberty of action remained to the Church in after times, which involved rights of legitimate, and possibilities of illegitimate, variation and adaptation, reformation and change.

This liberty of action taken in connexion with the supernatural character of the Church, creates a very grave responsibility in respect of any corporate action, which the Society, or any part of it, may at any time take; and also for individuals in respect of the public effect of their personal course in Church matters. "If any man corrupt the temple of God, him shall God corrupt;[1] for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." Of the depraving of the temple or "house of the living God" by heresies, false principles, or hurtful precedents, there is much to be said, which none would contravene. On damage done in respect of unity there is a far greater insensibility, caused by historical circumstances and actual familiarity with division.

But unity is an evident and eminent feature of the Church according to the will of God to be studied and sought in all ways consistent with the truth of the Word, and truthfulness in ourselves. We are "to mind or think one and the same thing; to stand fast in one spirit and one mind; to walk by the same rule; to be joined together in one mind and one judgment; with one mind and one mouth to glorify God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." There is to be "one body and one spirit" as there is "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all." The central act of communion typifying us as "one bread," the frequent and stern condemnations of divisions and separations, and, indeed, the whole tone of the Gospel and the very idea contained in the word "Church," all impress the importance of this unity, as a prime object to be

[1] 1 Cor. iii. 17. There is no English word which can adequately or exactly represent the φθείρει φθερεῖ. The A.V. has taken two sides of it, in "defile, destroy," the R.V. adopting the latter word; but, as commonly understood, it is too strong and complete, and such words as "damage, or mar," would be too weak. Yet the usual equivalent for the Greek word can only serve with a special explanation.—See Grimm, *in loc.*

sought, and mark external division as alien to the spirit of Christianity.

With regard to the divisions which do exist, and which have arisen from historic circumstances, not here to be reviewed, they are either such as separate the Church in one nation from communion with that in another (as *e.g.* the Church in England from that in France or Italy), or they are such as divide Christians in the same nation into different religious communities, as in the case of the sects around us. The first is an incidental result of corporate action by a Church within itself. The other is a perpetuated secession of individuals or companies from the Church in their own nation. In the first, severance is a consequence. In the second, it is an act. The act, if not justified by a real necessity, involves a principle, which is soon asserted as proper to Christianity: and this separatist principle stands out in higher relief in proportion as it does not seem necessitated by wide divergence of doctrine. The logical tendency of its free and admitted working is first to sever the Christianity of a people into sections and then to break it up into fragments.

Thus does the one Church lie before our view, damaged and dislocated on its surface by human perversity and infirmity; complicated with secular accidents and appendages, and with boundaries scarcely to be defined. Yet (to use the words of Hooker), "the visible Church of Christ is one, in outward profession of those things which supernaturally appertain to the very essence of Christianity, and are necessarily required of every particular Christian man." And "This Church hath been from the beginning, and continueth unto the end, of which all parts have not been always equally sincere and sound." As this is the case with the parts of it, so much more with its several members. The open door receives those whom the servants gather, "all as many as they find, both bad and good." The drag-net sweeps along, and "gathers of every kind," the good to be stored secure, and the bad to be cast away: merely nominal Christians, dubious characters, evil livers, are among the worthless or rotten materials (*τὰ σαπρά*,) which the Lord foresaw in His Church. But they *are* in it, or as the parable expresses it, in "the kingdom of heaven," as that now is. "If by external profession they be Christians, then they are of the visible Church of Christ," says Hooker, and he includes in a measure those who are partially severed even in this external respect, arguing that "heretics are not clean cut off from the visible Church of Christ;" and "as for excommunication, it neither shutteth out from the mystical, nor clean from the visible, but only from fellowship with the visible in holy duties." (Book iii. 13.)

But the mingled character of the members does not affect the essence of the Church. The house is distinguishable from the guests who gather in it, and the net from its contents. So any chartered society consists, not in the persons who at any time compose it, but in its purposes, regulations, offices, legal status, corporate and permanent life; and the members are worthy of their place in it in proportion to their just apprehension of these things and faithful fulfilment of the intention of them. So it is with the Church of Christ, which is "the whole congregation of Christian men dispersed throughout the world," that "holy Church universal," which we pray God to "rule and govern in the right way," to "cleanse and defend," and to "inspire continually with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord." In this largest sense we survey it, and feel ourselves parts of it. Yet, forasmuch as, in so wide a range of profession, its character is more distinctly realised in some parts than in others, nothing hinders but that we may sometimes, in our thoughts, prayers, and discourses, restrain our meaning to the more perfect examples; as men early employed the term Catholic, not so much in the sense of expansion, as by way of distinction from communities which they deemed to be infected with heresy or detached by schism.

1. It remains that we live in our own branch of the Church universal, as that which unites us with the whole, through which we are members of the society supernatural, founded in first inception by Christ Himself, and in its formation through His commissioned agents (in virtue of which it is termed Apostolic), and that we duly estimate the powers and the responsibilities which attach to its divine origin and intention.

2. We must maintain a constant sense, first, of the distinction between the visible society on earth thus formed and endowed, and the Church mystical known to God; and, secondly, of the intimate relations which the one has to the other representatively and instrumentally.

3. In accordance with the view here taken, we have a definite line of feeling and action in respect of the religious divisions which surround us. We can hold the individual members of separated bodies as dear brethren in Christ, and as presumably included in the final family of God. We can also regard the communities in which they are found as parts of the whole visible Church, though detached parts, and in some cases maimed or mutilated. But we cannot rightly take any course which would justify or allow the separatist principle which that detached position represents, as such a course would be either to abandon the doctrine of unity, or to admit that the character of the Church of England is such to justify the violation of it.

4. With regard to the separation of the English Church from the large mass of Christianity which is held together by the Papal theory, that is a consequence of the fulfilment of the obligations of self-reformation which clearer light created. The consequence was painful, but it was not to be avoided at the price of accepting doctrines which were seen to be untrue, and a usurpation which was proved to be unjust. The acknowledgment by the English Church of the duty of unity, her reverence for antiquity, her value for every token of continuity and every feature of true catholicity, are sometimes cited by those who desire reconciliation with Rome as invalidating the force of her protest. They do, in fact, increase it in the highest degree. If a man of conservative habit, in making some momentous change, were to show in the very act that his mind was still open to every consideration which ought to weigh on the other side, and to every sentiment which would naturally incline him to it, who would not feel that he had given to the reasons which determined him the strongest testimony of adhesion which they could possibly receive? In like manner the Protestantism of the Church of England has a weight which no other Protestantism possesses. Bitterness eager to denounce, vehemence ready to destroy, cannot have the same value in the way of testimony as steps deliberately taken against the pressure of opposing feelings. At the cost of suspension of communion abroad, and of a consequent weakening of the principle of unity at home, the behests of loyalty to the truth of the Gospel, to the written Word, and to the primitive Church, were faithfully and conscientiously obeyed.

In that loyal adhesion to the written Word the Church maintained that which is really the central principle of unity for all scattered and broken Christianity; for the canonical Scriptures are the one common bond, the one recognised authority for reference and appeal, which even the additions of Rome do not question, however far they go to supersede it. Whatever unity remains circles round that one centre from which, it may be, reuniting influences may yet proceed.

Not without deep thankfulness and a sense of grave responsibility, do we observe the exceptional and central position which the Church of England holds. With the masses of Romanism on the one side, and fragmentary Christianity on the other, asserting the solitary supremacy of Scripture, and distinct in the primitive doctrines of the faith, cast in that episcopal form in which the universal Church appears on emerging into the light of history; inheriting a succession of orders transmitted through the intervening centuries, worshiping in words which have been heard through all the ages,

maintaining the true relations of the Word and Sacraments, admitting large liberty of thought and action, in harmony with the character of the nation, rooted in its soil and intertwined with its history, endowed with proved faculties for self-renovation and expansion; and now, in presence of unprecedented openings for evangelizing the world, this Church of England stands a monument of Providential care in the past, and a ready instrument for Divine use in the future. But all advantages are vain unless the Spirit be poured upon us from on high, which may God vouchsafe to grant for His dear Son's sake!

T. D. BERNARD.

Correspondence.

PROFESSOR BIRKS AND MR. ELLIOTT ON PROPHECY.

To the Editor of the CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—In justice to myself as well as to Professor Birks, whose view of the Vision of the Seals seems to me far more true than that of Mr. Elliott, I have subjoined a few extracts from his "Thoughts on Sacred Prophecy." This was his latest work on the subject, and was in part, moreover, written expressly to avow his unchanged dissent from Mr. Elliott's scheme. Whatever, therefore, be the exact force of the passage in the "Outlines of Unfulfilled Prophecy" to which Mr. E. B. Birks in his letter to you refers, it seems plain that it is cancelled by the strength and clearness of the later statements which I have quoted. In any case, I can hardly doubt that most candid readers will admit that they gave me strong warrant for the statement to which Mr. E. B. Birks objects in my review of Guinness's "Romanism and the Reformation." On no other point but this did I hint at any difference between his father and Mr. Elliott; and on this point it still seems to me that they may not unfairly be said to have disagreed completely to the end of their lives. The last extract gives the only hint which I can find in Birks's latest work of anything like an approach to Mr. Elliott's scheme. A master of all the arts of controversy and fully aware of the issues at stake, Professor Birks decided (and doubtless rightly) that the restatement of his own opinion was of more importance to the cause of truth than the preservation by silence of the seeming unanimity of his school. Had it not been so, we should all have trusted Mr. Elliott's words and never doubted but that he and his most powerful opponent were at length at one on the meaning and historical connection of the Vision of the Seals.

Yours very truly,
ARTHUR C. GARBETT.

Southwell, February 4, 1888.

Extracts from Professor Birks's "Thoughts on the Times and Seasons of Sacred Prophecy" (with a preface by E. B. Birks, M.A.), published in the year 1880.

Suddenly he [the author] discovered that in the fifth edition of the late Mr. Elliott's *Horæ Apocalypticæ* he was credited with a conversion to notions to which he had never been converted, ... and he felt it his duty to protest. —Preface, p. i.

I will specify three main questions in which I think Mr. Elliott wholly wrong. The first is the structure of the Apocalypse. The second is his interpretation of the seven Thunders; and the third is his exposition of the first four Trumpets.—Chapter I., p. 5.

The view of Mr. Elliott is thus demonstrably untrue and baseless. I am so far from sharing it, that I have not the least doubt it has rendered his first volume a step backward and not forward in the onward march of Apocalyptic interpretation.—*Ibid.*, p. 7.

This view of the structure, then, is one which I had maintained for twenty years as of primary importance, both in two writings of my own, and in eight successive editions of Mr. Bickersteth's work; an interval now enlarged to nearly forty years without a single word of public retraction.—*Ibid.*, p. 44.

Mr. Elliott's view of a fulfilment [that is, of the Seals] in successive stages of the degeneracy of the Roman State, from the peaceful state of the Antonines to the persecution of Diocletian, needs to be completed by the view which he so strongly rejects, of their application to the decline of the visible Church from its first purity to one of intense corruption and opposition to the truth, before the coming of Christ.—*Ibid.*, pp. 46, 47.

Review.

Tenants of an Old Farm; Leaves from the Note-book of a Naturalist. By HENRY C. MCCOOK, D.D.; with an Introduction by Sir JOHN LUBBOCK, M.P. Illustrated from Nature. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1888.

HARDLY any study is more healthful to the mind, more full of pure pleasure, and in its tendency, at least, more directly religious than the study of natural history. Even in its simplest branches, it throws an ever-growing interest over many of the most obvious facts of the world in which we are placed, while it brings us into the closest contact with the wondrously varied workings of Almighty God. As Howe long ago argued, it is hard to know how we could ever be convinced by works of might and wisdom of the real existence of an Almighty and All-wise Creator if the glorious works with which the world is filled, and of which we form a most significant part ourselves, are not enough to bring a full and awe-inspiring conviction of the truth. No reasoning can really shake the substance of the so-called argument from design, as men have ever felt its force from Socrates to Paley—however wise may be a re-adjustment of its verbal statement to the growth of modern knowledge. All such books, therefore, as that which Dr. McCook has given us under the title of the "Tenants of an Old Farm," deserve a hearty welcome. Conceived and written in a religious spirit, they can only do good to all into whose hands they chance to fall. In the present case, moreover, the mere pleasure of perusal is fully equal to the wealth of solid knowledge which the book contains. Though the colloquial and slightly story-like way in which the chapters are written may prove at first distasteful (as the author fears) to purely scientific readers, yet to the young and those who lack a scientific training this method will be doubtless found to give a charm, and so to win a hearing which otherwise might not so soon have been obtained. The style is so clear that a well-taught child will follow easily the writer's meaning, and only here and there in phrase and spelling does anything occur which betrays a trans-Atlantic origin. But though the author is an American, and in America of great repute, the truth and exactness of his facts are

guaranteed to any doubting English readers by the high authority of Sir John Lubbock, who, like Dr. McCook, has made the ways of insects, and particularly ants, the subject of his special study. The print and paper, finally, are alike beautiful, and the illustrations, with which the work is richly decked, are so well-chosen and well-wrought that it needs a strong effort to tear the eye away and read the text which makes their mysteries plain. From the spiders and the moths to the crickets and the ants, Dr. McCook has given us a delightful book—so delightful that for the rest of this notice our readers will be glad that he should speak for himself.

Take, for instance, this passage on the music of the crickets (chap. xv., p. 292):

"Now we are ready to consider how and why the crickets make their music. The old insects, for the most part, die on the approach of cold weather; but a few survive the winter by sheltering themselves under stones, or in holes secure from the access of water. Of these are the solitary stragglers who make their way into our houses, and warmed up by the genial fire to some dim suggestion of summer, are awakened into a sense of their forlorn estate, and creek out their loneliness to some imagined mate. The same sounds are heard over all our fields, and almost without cessation from twilight to dawn during our autumn months. There is no music in summer, for pairing does not begin until Fall, and the cricket's music is a love-call. It is the male's signal to his mate, and if ever there was a persistent, vociferous and self-satisfied serenader it is he.

"Do you tell us that the female doesn't sing?" asked Abby, with some surprise.

"Neither males nor females *sing*, for the insects have no vocal organs. But the gift of music, such as it is, is bestowed upon the male alone. Whether Madam Cricket is a loser thereby may be doubted, but the human species is the gainer; for, if Nature had endowed both sexes with the power of shrilling, the night discords would have been scarcely bearable."

Take next a passage on the industry of the harvesting-ant (chap. xvii., pp. 341, 342):

"Presently I saw an ant come up out of the gate" (of its nest), "carrying in its jaws something which it dragged across the yard" (or clear space around the gate of the nest), "and dumped upon a heap of similar objects lying in the grass at one side. I took up some of these, and found them to be the husks of a sort of grass known as ant-rice, or needle-grass. That was proof number one.

"Next I noticed that the ant-workers were continually running along the roads, across the yard, and disappearing through the gate with some kind of seed, which they bore in their stout mandibles or jaws. I tapped several of these porters on the back in order to make them drop their burdens, which I then examined, and found to be whole seeds of the ant-rice. That was proof number two—the ants were actually carrying the grain into their nests.

"Once more, I saw that workers were continually leaving the gate and travelling along the roads outward toward the grass. I stooped down upon hands and knees to follow one of these. Off it went at a lively pace further and further, until the roadway began to narrow into a thin line, when it darted off to one side into the thick grass. It kept me on close watch to keep the busy insect in sight. It twisted back and forth, around and around among the grass stalks, now and then stopping to put its jaws upon objects lying upon the ground which I soon discovered to be fallen seeds. At last the fastidious creature found one that suited her. She turned this way and that until it appeared to be balanced to her mind, then wheeled about, and started toward home.

"What a time she had with that seed! All sorts of little obstacles lay in her path—little to us, that is, but great to her. There were blades of grass bent down to the ground; there were sticks, stocks and stones

"lying in the path ; there were close-growing tufts of grass like small "thickets in the way. These were to be flanked, or climbed over, or "pushed through, and right nobly the little carrier did her task. Now "she went straight up and forward ; now she backed to this side, "dragging her burden along ; now she sidled around the obstacle ; now "she plunged into a hole, and after a moment's rallying bravely mounted "the wall and went on her way. So she journeyed, winding her laborious "path through the grass-forest of her harvest field until she reached the "road. Then, conscious that her way was clear, she broke into a smart "trot, and made straight headway for her nest, and soon disappeared "within the gate. The burden which she bore was a seed of ant-rice, and "that was proof number three that this ant, at least, as Solomon said, "'provideth her meat in the summer, and gathereth her food in the "harvest.'"

Lastly, take a passage which touches on that strange discord in the human race which did not escape the eye of the philosophic Pliny, himself a natural historian, and on which in our time the Duke of Argyll has written nobly, though it is Scripture only that gives the full solution which is needed (chap. xx., pp. 418-420):

"Pardon me," I said ; "your lesson is not less profitable because it awakes mirthfulness. But really, Aunt Hannah, you have done the worm injustice by your metaphor. The creature never eats itself out of house and home after the fashion of our species ; it cuts windows and doors through its leaf partitions, passing thereby from one to another, but the instinct which urged it to its first act of protection prevents it from destroying its outer defences."

"In other words," said Abby, speaking up sharply, "a worm will do better for itself under the sway of Instinct than some men under the rule of Reason. Why is that?"

"Excuse me, Miss Abby, if I decline to follow up your question fully. It would lead us into very deep waters, indeed, and we should perhaps need Dr. Goodman to bring us back to harborage. But let me say there is some strange element which somewhere in man's history has overpassed the bounds and bars of the common laws of Nature and found place within him. It is peculiar to him—alien from his fellow-creatures of the lower orders. It has jarred his nature at many points, and made it discordant with the catholic Unity and Law. It has set him upon paths that lead to depths below the brutes. Sovereign of the creatures as he is, it has yet betrayed him into inferior traits, and shown him the baser and weaker vessel. At some point in history man's inner constitution has undergone a strange—a terrible revolution. When was it? What is it? I cannot say—at least I will not say now. I do not know——"

"Friend Mayfield, *I* know, if thee does not!" Aunt Hannah dropped her work into her lap, and broke into my unfinished sentence with very firm but tremulous voice. "It is an old, old truth. Why should thee spare to speak it? 'God hath made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions.' That is the strange element, the fact, the revolution which you are thinking about ; *Sin hath entered in!*"

Here we take leave of Dr. McCook, though we might have quoted several passages of equal interest and beauty with those which we have chosen, in the hope that all our readers will quickly buy his book, and make themselves acquainted with its charming story of the wonderful ways of God in some of the less known parts of the universe which He has made.

ARTHUR C. GARBETT.

Short Notices.

Studies in the Life and Character of St. Peter. By Rev. H. A. BIRKS, M.A. Pp. 280. Hodder and Stoughton.

THE purpose of this little book is explained in a paragraph of the introduction, from which we quote a few words:

> The following studies . . . make no profession of learning. I leave it to others to press forward to higher fields. . . . I am content if on a lower level I may but linger lovingly and pick a few sweet blossoms here and there which others may indeed have noticed but not stopped to cull, intent upon an enterprise more arduous.

But in this paragraph the author scarcely does himself justice. A later paragraph expresses the substance of the book better:

> We have in the great Apostle a noble example for our own lives, and as we come to know and love him more from patient pondering upon his conflicts and his struggles, his hopes and fears, and humbled following of his great Master Christ, the knowledge of his life gives a fresh force and power to his words, and they strike home to conscience and to heart with strength unfelt before. Instead of a mere abstract exhortation, we begin to hear in the words of Peter the voice, as it were, of a human friend, rich in his human sympathy, and glowing with the ardour of an undaunted hope. We feel, as it were, the grasp of a powerful man laid gently and firmly on our shoulders, and bringing us to Christ himself.

From these two paragraphs it may appear for what sort of readers the volume is chiefly meant; not so much for learned theologians, or for doubters of the truth of revelation, or for anxious inquirers after the way of salvation, or for wilful wanderers from it, as for that large class who profess faith in Christianity, but have not realized what that faith means; who have been taught that the Bible is God's Word, and look on Bible-reading as a religious duty, but have not learned to take God's testimonies as "the men of their counsel"; who believe that Jesus died for them and is their Saviour, yet know but little of Him as He showed Himself to His disciples. To all such this book will, we believe, be very helpful. Yet no divine, however learned, but may find something fresh and well worth pondering in it, and no reader, however far from being a divine or caring for volumes of divinity, can fail to be impressed by the ingenuousness of the writer. To those who look on Christian faith as something obsolete except in Christian pulpits, a book like this must be a puzzle in its very naïve simplicity. We think it is a pity that the writer has not followed the Apostle more persistently to the close of his life. These "Studies in the Life of Peter" may, however, be conducive to what the Church yet lacks, a study of the life of Peter as a whole.

M.A.

The Prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, arranged for reading in chronological order, together with Notes on the Transfer to the Christian Church of the New Covenant, and on Ezekiel's Temple Vision. With diagram and map. By E. S. ELLIOTT. Morgan and Scott.

"'Surely the chronology of Jeremiah's prophecies is somewhat confused!' exclaims a reader of its successive chapters; and, in the hurry and manifold occupations of everyday life, the Book is laid down, it may be, with little more than the selection of an isolated verse for practical service or spiritual enjoyment.

"'Oh, I have given up Ezekiel's Temple!' is full often the reply to an observation or inquiry concerning the last nine chapters of the prophecy.

'I suppose it has to do with the millennium, and we must wait till then to understand it! Besides, when so many people differ, who are far wiser than I, how can I expect to know about it?' And so the subject is easily, and apparently with little reluctance, set aside."

Should any of our readers here recognise an echo of their own words, we would suggest their possessing themselves of the pamphlet thus introduced. Representing, as it does, years of study, and evidencing an inheritance from the revered author of the "Horæ Apocalypticæ," of a spirit of patient and accurate chronological inquiry, no thoughtful student of its pages can fail to gather clear light and teaching from their perusal, while the Rev. J. Smith Warleigh's work—"Ezekiel's Temple"—here finds appreciative representation. Both this little work and "The Holy Seed,"[1] an illustrated chart previously issued by the same author, we heartily commend to the notice of all Bible students. M.A.

Joyce Tregarthen. By E. CHILLON. J. F. Shaw and Co.

This might be called a story of almost exceptional ability. The scene is laid in the Scilly Islands, and a good deal is made out of the local scenery, though not quite so much as might have been expected. The chief figure is the heroine, Joyce Tregarthen, who is improbable but not impossible, a sort of shadowy-substantial character, presented, however, with great consistency. She is a young girl who has always breathed in a religious atmosphere, and falls into the fatal idea that it is possible to live without sin, and that she has attained to this condition. Unfortunately she shares this revelation with the simple fisher-folk of the islands, who hang on her words as on a saint's. But she is roughly disenchanted when she finds herself sinning indeed grievously, and after a sore struggle (which the author paints vividly) she tells her disciples the truth. This "devilish-holy fray" between Joyce's pure mind and pure yet mistaken imaginings is the main idea of the tale; but the potent elements of love and humour are not wanting. The hero and transgressing lover is least satisfactory; Joyce's sister Effie is attractive and real; but Mr. Wells, the schoolmaster of the Isles, possesses a marked individuality. He is a misunderstood genius who has a scheme for regenerating the world by the aid of cookery; and he mixes up love, revenge, and indigestion beautifully. Altogether this little story teaches a true moral, and in a deeply interesting way.

Remarks on "Tithe Redemption." By the Hon. and Rev. GEORGE BOURKE, M.A., Rector of Pulborough, and Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. Pp. 12. Elliot Stock.

This able pamphlet opens thus: "The proposal to redeem the tithes throughout England and Wales is of such vast importance that no subject relating to the Church's property, or the temporal interest of the Church, more urgently needs the serious consideration of both clergy and laity at the present time than it." The author proceeds to say: "For my part I feel very strongly that the redemption of the tithe throughout the country, or in other words, the conversion of the Church's property from tithe or tithe rent-charge into money, would be nothing less than disastrous. The consequences, as they seem to me, of such a proceeding would be more far-reaching, more revolutionary, in fact, than people are aware of." We invite attention to Mr. Bourke's "remarks."

[1] "The Holy Seed," a chart (Bagsters, etc.), in gold and colours, demonstrating the connectedness throughout Scripture history of God's chosen-out remnant, in its relationship to the course of the world's kingdoms, up to the establishment of the millennial reign. Suitable for insertion in Bibles. Price one shilling, post-free. May be had at 66, Mildmay Park, N.

The Epistles of St. Paul to the Colossians and Philemon. By ALEXANDER MACLAREN, D.D. Hodder and Stoughton.

This new volume by Dr. Maclaren is the second of the "Expositor's Bible" series, to which we have already referred in reviewing the Dean of Armagh's "Commentary on St. Mark." It is satisfactory to find that this work as well most ably fulfils the intention of the series, as also sustains the already high reputation of the writer. As we conceive the purpose of these volumes to be that of supplying popular commentaries of an expository character for the general reader, and not merely the dry bones of criticism for the theologian, we must not find any fault with Dr. Maclaren's style, eminently suited as it is for the former work. To all readers of the Manchester Preacher's sermons his theological opinions will be already known; they are those of a deeply earnest man in touch with his age, equally unwilling to demand intellectual certainty on those subjects whereof it is written "Now we know in part" as he is to subject his own individuality to the theories of any particular school of thought. This volume will amply repay perusal, not only for its thoughtful exposition and literary grace, as for that tone of loving genial sympathy with his readers, which pervades all Dr. Maclaren's writings.

R. W. S.

Are Foreign Missions doing any Good? (Kegan Paul and Co.) is a little book to be specially noted for practical use. It is a selection of testimonies to the good results of Missions, gathered from many sources, particularly official reports and the speeches and writings of distinguished men, travellers, Anglo-Indian rulers, *savants*, etc. It is just the kind of quiet, cogent array of evidence that impresses a thinking man. Clergymen would do well to provide themselves with a few copies to keep by them handy, to give to the business men of their congregations, and to young men generally. The book does not emanate from a Missionary Society, and it is anonymous; but the dedication, by permission, to the Speaker of the House of Commons is a sufficient guarantee of authority.

The February *National Review* (W. H. Allen and Co.) is a very good number. "The Marquess of Wellesley and the Earl of Iddesleigh," by Sir H. Stafford Northcote, and "Are Rich Landowners Idle?" by Lady John Manners, are interesting papers. Canon Gregory on the "Extension of the Episcopate" is well worth reading.

In the *Anglican Church Magazine* (Harrison and Sons) appears an interesting review of M. Henri Lasserre's translation of the Gospels. After the review was written, M. Lasserre's book (adorned with the *imprimatur* of the Archbishop of Paris) was placed on the Index.

We gladly invite attention to *The Present Position and Future Prospects of the Church in Wales*, the admirable address of Lord Selborne at Lampeter, to which we referred at the time (Macmillan and Co.). The noble Earl quotes from the valuable pamphlets of Mr. Stevens, of Portslade, on Tithe, which were reviewed in the CHURCHMAN of last October.

In the *Church Sunday-School Magazine* (a good number) appears "In Memoriam: Bishop Ryan."

The Official Year-Book of the Church of England, 1888 (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge) appears to be quite as interesting, to say the least, as the preceding volume. Everywhere, as far as we see, there are the marks of singular care and good judgment, and the statistics are most encouraging.

THE MONTH.

PARLIAMENT met on the 9th. The result of the Irish legislation of last Session, according to the Queen's Speech, "is satisfactory. Agrarian crime has diminished, and the power of coercive conspiracies has sensibly abated." Local Government in England is the main subject for this Session. A measure "for modifying the procedure by which tithe rent-charge is collected" is promised, but the Glebe Lands Bill forms no part of this year's programme. The Tithes Bill, it is to be hoped, will be carried without delay.

In the first division, the majority of the Government was 95.

The *Guardian* contains some account of Bishop Bickersteth's energetic labours since his arrival in Japan. The general Mission outlook is "brighter than it has ever been before."

The operation of tracheotomy was successfully performed upon the German Crown Prince, at San Remo, on the 10th.

The treaty made some years ago between Germany and Austria has been published, and the frank comments of the German Chancellor may preserve the peace.

The *Record* severely criticizes the action of the Chapter of St. Paul's Cathedral in regard to the new reredos.

The Right Rev. W. Walsham How, D.D. (Bishop Suffragan), is to be the first Bishop of Wakefield. The *Globe* remarks that his work in London "has been successful beyond hope, and the regret which will be felt at his removal will be deep and universal." It was hoped and believed in the North that a Yorkshireman would be appointed. —The Ven. Sir L. T. Stamer has been appointed Bishop-Suffragan or the Diocese of Lichfield.

The Cambridge correspondent of the *Record* (the 17th) writes:

> The four days' mission to the University, conducted by Mr. Webb-Peploe has proved to be a time full of encouragement and of signs of blessing. The afternoon addresses on Spiritual Life in Trinity Church were very largely attended, more and more so day by day, and right helpful they were, both in teaching and in appeal. The evening meetings, for University men only, in the Guildhall, were large, but not remarkably so, on Friday and Saturday; but on Sunday the great room was quite full. At the very least 1,000 men were present, a full third of the University, and truly they heard the eternal truth spoken.

The Rev. C. A. Stevens, Vicar of Portslade, as some at all events of his friends expected, has been again successful, the Court of Appeal deciding that a clergyman has the right to deduct the cost of collecting tithes from the amount for which he is assessed for income tax. The hearty thanks of rural Incumbents are due to Mr. Stevens.

The spirit of politics, says the *National Church*, is destroying the life of Nonconformity in Wales.[1]

[1] Touching the vernacular press of Wales, the *National Church* writes: "At length —late enough in the day—the veil has been torn aside, and the world is beginning to know (and presently will know more fully) what the vernacular press is; that, in language most coarse and violent, it is responsible for sentiments which are not merely dishonest, but seditious and even blasphemous. It has further come to light that the men who are responsible for it are—save the mark—professed ministers of religion, the very class who seek by the disestablishment of the Church to have more of the religious training of the people placed in their hands."