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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

NOVEMBER, 1889.

ART. I.—THE CHURCH AND THE "WORKING CLASSES."

WE are living in times fraught with much that may well occasion grave anxiety. There are undercurrents of thought and feeling which may be characterized as nothing less than revolutionary. Every now and then—witness the recent strike—there rises to the surface enough to warn us of what is festering or simmering beneath it. A great change is coming over the face of society in every department of it with which we are conversant. There are pressing social questions which imperatively demand attention, which cannot much longer be burked or ignored. Political power is rapidly passing into the hands of the so-called "working classes," who, as a rule, are the least qualified to wield and exercise it; and though the "demagogue," pure and simple, is not so far a success in Parliament, the expression "the future democracy" is being freely bandied about by public speakers and leading politicians. Everything points to the influence which ere long the working classes will command. We must look this inevitable fact in the face, momentous not only from a political but from a higher point of view, for who can doubt that "righteousness exalteth a nation," and that her real prosperity and influence depend on her religious condition? Now the question may be asked, "Are what we call 'the working classes,' as a body, religious? Are they sensibly influenced and actuated by religion?" I use this word *working classes* in its generally accepted sense, difficult as it may be to understand how it ever came to be exclusively applied to a particular class of workers in the busy hive of men. All work is not of the same kind. Some work with brain, some with hands. Our statesmen, philanthropists, professional men, scientists, students, who think and labour for the good of their fellow-creatures,

each in his own department of life, are surely of the "working classes." They are not drones; they are as much entitled to be called "working men" as is the mechanic, artisan, or tiller of the soil. And it is possible that the fact of our thus labelling, in common parlance, a certain section of humanity, has contributed not a little to that tendency to classify, which loses sight of the great law of God's kingdom of mutual interdependence. The tendency of our day is to disintegrate rather than to amalgamate, and hence a certain class of men come to consider themselves as a peculiar and privileged class, whose state and condition of life is somewhat exceptional. And this will be so, with an ever-widening chasm, increasingly difficult to bridge over, so long as we constantly speak of "upper ten thousand" and "lower strata," of the *οἱ πολλοί* of our common humanity. If any one truth is taught in the natural kingdom it is that "all are but parts of one stupendous whole." If any one truth was specially taught by Christ, it is that of the brotherhood of men. The Apostles lost no opportunity of enforcing this lesson "that God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on the face of the earth." It was Irving who so loved to insist on "the Fatherhood of God." To insist on this is not to advocate Socialism. It is not even to ignore all obvious and necessary distinctions; it is rather, with the comprehensiveness of such an expression and relationship, to recognise that, differing in many respects, we are members of one body. We have, however, in various ways so labelled different classes that interests come to be regarded not as mutual, but rather as separate. It is not difficult to see how class legislation with all its unfairness and inequality may spring out of this; *e.g.*, the closing of the public-house on Sundays, and no prohibition or restraint imposed on a West-end club. The political agitator makes capital of all this. He finds tinder ready for the spark, fuel at hand to excite into flame. He is not content with exciting ill-feeling in the mind of the mechanic and artisan; he shifts the scene of his operations to the more stolid and simple-minded agricultural labourer. He stirs up strife and promotes a spirit at variance with the mind of God and the Spirit of Christ. This process of disintegration, this sowing of the seed of discord, this scattering abroad of tares, is bringing forth its fruit, and not a few are seriously concerned at the mutterings of what may forebode an overwhelming storm.

Few would be bold enough to predict what in this direction is "coming upon the earth." This being so, the question arises—What is the attitude of one section of society to the other; rich to poor; more cultured to less cultured; more advantaged to those of fewer advantages; the man of title to untitled; employer to employé, well-dressed to poorly clad, luxuriously

housed and fed to the man who has little or nought beyond daily bread; one of leisure to him who has no leisure; the believer to unbeliever; the professing Christian to one who makes little or no profession of Christianity? What proportion of our titled, wealthy, well-to-do learned men and women, some with no little leisure, are really and intentionally endeavouring to bridge over the gulf which too often separates the East and West of human life; how many, naming the name of our common Lord, are bearing their part in a conscientious and deliberate endeavour, directly or indirectly, mediately or immediately, to make human lives, often less favoured or fortunate, better and brighter? For a selfish, self-pleasing life is to forget our brotherhood. God allows and sanctions in His kingdom real or apparent differences to teach us this which underlies these distinctions, that "no man liveth unto himself and no man dieth unto himself." Some flowers have exquisite foliage, but no perfume; some have delicate perfume and but poor foliage. Some birds are rich in plumage but not gifted with song; some again are of Nature's sweetest songsters, but of homely plumage. Everything in this world has its place, use, purpose, and this very variety constitutes its unity or oneness. The men who till our fields, dig out our coal, who are engaged in callings perilous to life and deleterious to health; they who labour in dockyards or open fields, who toil in foundry and factory, by dint of whose sweat of brow and industry England is great, individuals become opulent, and society at large enjoys the fruit of ingenuity and skill—have not the great toiling class, on whom we so much depend, a large claim on our sympathy, and reasonable ground for looking for it? I do not ask what legislation is doing for them, but what is the Church doing for them? I have had large experience of the working classes, abundant opportunity of forming an opinion, and I am persuaded that it would be to do them a grave injustice to characterize them as irreligious as a body, or as averse to, though they may seem estranged from religion. In rural districts they will walk or drive for miles, if need be, to hear the Word of God and the simple message of the Gospel. In country parishes the infidels and freethinkers are few and far between. The Parish Church—for I have not to take into consideration Nonconformity—is regarded with deep affection, consecrated by many natural ties, and the parish priest, if he be an earnest and devoted man, is looked up to and respected. In the majority of cases in our rural districts, if the dissenting chapel be filled and Parish Church emptied, it is less from theological conviction than *faute de mieux*. The country parson has also this advantage over the vicar of large town parishes, that it is not impossible for him to know personally all his people. That the artisan in our

industrial centres is not averse, naturally and conscientiously averse, to religion is shown in the fact that very, very rarely is a child withdrawn from school lest it should be taught which be the principles of the doctrine of Christ; but it must be confessed that the parents are bad church or chapel goers. A very large percentage of the "working classes" go to no place of worship. The Church of England has not succeeded in persuading them. Nonconformity does not seem more attractive, for it is the middle class which is the mainstay of and affects Dissent. You have only to go into one of our large towns, whether London, Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, Halifax, Huddersfield, Bradford, Dewsbury, and similar industrial centres to see how Sunday is spent. You have only to analyze an ordinary congregation at any given Service to discover the missing link. Many and various causes are in operation to account for this.

There is one of a very general nature, of which the working classes themselves are probably unconscious, but which is continually exercising an influence prejudicial to spirituality. I refer to the moral and religious disadvantage of their ordinary employments. Few can realize the monotony of the work of a factory hand, mill-girl, and ordinary artisan. Over and over again, in conversation with such as these, have the more intelligent expressed to me how keenly this is felt. One of the many employés in the watch trade at Coventry told me that all his life from boyhood had been spent in drilling holes in dial-plates! Another in Lancashire that he had grown gray watching the planing-machine doing its automatic work! Look at a factory girl, a mill-hand, hour by hour at her loom! Such lives know but little or no variety; they become almost as much machines as the machines by which they hourly stand. A large part of their nature is undeveloped, uncultured, unused; and to my mind one of the pressing and very difficult problems to solve is how to provide healthy recreation and innocent amusement for such worn, jaded, and monotonous lives. But this is not all that may be said under this head. The working man, in the larger centres of industrial labour, becomes almost exclusively familiar with the works of his own hands and with the achievements of skilled labour. His acquaintance with Nature is but scanty. He lives in the midst of whirring wheels, the perpetual motion of machinery, shut out from sight of green fields and sunlit streams. Streets and squares, steam-engines and warehouses, belching smoke, tall chimneys, heated furnaces, dirt, grit, meet him at every turn. The surroundings and accessories, the implements and tools of industry, occupy thought, press on his every sense. Almost all that he takes cognizance of is what is *known, handled, seen.* It is purely *secular;* it is suggestive of nothing beyond. He practically

worships Force. We have had to invent a word which shall express his condition of mind. We call it "*Secularism.*" They who preach it affirm that secular business is the sole concern of man, that religious matters are too vague, too distant, too uncertain to deserve serious attention. The creed, if such we may call it, of Positivism with the more intellectual, of Secularism with the artisan, has not originated this condition of mind, but the attitude of the mind has assumed by degrees this definite form. An eminent metaphysician of the last century, Dugald Stewart, anticipated this evil, and lifted up his voice of warning. "Nothing," he says, "banishes moral impressions from the thoughts so much as the artificial objects with which we are everywhere surrounded in popular centres, because the Mind is too deeply engrossed by the productions of human skill and industry to have leisure to follow its natural direction." He might have added that as we find more and more how Mind controls Matter, how the great powers and forces of nature are being more and more made subservient to our use, we come to worship Force, we observe the phenomena, and not the God behind the phenomena. We are not surprised to find Secularism reduced to a system. Its adherents have organized themselves into a kind of non-religious sect. They have their lecture halls, and engage lecturers of no mean ability. They have their *Secularist Review*, and other well-known periodicals. They propagate their views with assiduity and persevering plausibility. In some places, where many hands are employed, the men contribute out of their wages to pay one of their number to read to them when engaged in their sedentary work. I believe I am correct in saying that Mr. Bradlaugh's income is considerably supplemented out of the wages of the artisans, who look on him as the apostle of freethought. And this condition of mind is encouraged and stimulated by the greater freedom, or, shall I say, unrestrained license of a certain portion of the press. In the days gone by infidel writers addressed themselves to educated persons in the higher walks of life, and in language studiously elegant and refined. Their object was to render vice and scepticism fashionable in court and palace, in club and drawing-room. During the last half century infidel writers have as much popularized their infidelity as Science is popularized in familiar Manuals.

In the days past "freethought" was affected as the thin veneer of a dissolute life. With increased education, not only is crime becoming more clever, but infidelity is being made more intelligible to the less educated. We have for long formed too low an estimate of the popular understanding. The late Lord Beaconsfield was amongst the first to recognise the place and influence of the provincial press. Not one artisan

out of a hundred reads the leading articles of our leading papers. He is influenced by the opinions of one nearer home. The working man can read. Whatever else he may part company with after leaving our schools, forget as he may his geography and history, the three R's stand by him. He may not understand technical terms or sententious phrases, but it is a mistake to think any *pabulum* or off-hand reply will satisfy him. To this the excellent "Christian Evidence Society," worthy of all support, is become alive. Its tracts and other publications give the working man credit for power of thought as well as appreciation of what is thoughtful. He discerns the difference between foolish preaching and the foolishness of preaching; infidelity addresses itself to his intellect, and insists on a reply. He is, moreover, bewildered at the prevalence of conflicting schools of thought. The old cry, "What is truth?" is asked by some earnestly, by others cynically. With no very definite opinion of his own, unanchored to any deep and strong convictions, he is open, as soil to winds of heaven, to every blast of doctrine. Nothing to him is more intelligible and plausible than undenominationalism. No one creed, he is told, possesses or sets forth all the truth. There is a measure, a *soupçon* of truth in all schools of thought. Board schools make headway, and heavy rates are forgotten to maintain them, because it is a conscience clause clothed in bricks and mortar. Tax his beer or necessaries of life to a twentieth of the same amount, and what a cry would be raised throughout the length and breadth of the land! Away with creeds! they are fetters on thought. Think as you like, and take your chance. Amidst these professing Christians, wrangling over altar lights and coloured stoles, surplice and black gown, mixed chalice and eastward position, with all the bitterness of party spirit, and recklessness of party organs, who shall I implicitly trust? For to himself he says it is not against vice and immorality that *Rock* and *Church Times* so much inveigh, as against those who conscientiously differ on matters not essential to salvation.

I might point out how prejudicial to morality, and of course to religious influence, is the home life of many of our poor. We hardly realize how much our daily surroundings affect our mental and moral habits. Overcrowding is one of the most wide-spread and painful causes of immorality and irreligion. Public attention is being drawn to this. "Rookeries," cellars in which you would not keep a favourite dog, the fact of families herding below the pavement, or occupying a single room for all the purposes of existence, these things are becoming such a scandal in our midst that the legislature is seriously taking it all in hand. Who knows not well the havoc that drink and gambling make of men's lives? But not to dwell on vices

which are by no means characteristic of, or peculiar to, the working classes, but which are doing their deadly work amongst all grades of society, there are other facts to be borne in mind. To some, *habits* of religion are foreign to their ways, and the nature of their calling is not favourable to serious or prolonged reflection. Granted that in some few cases the working man has been religiously brought up, has had godly parents, has been a Sunday-school scholar, has even been Confirmed and admitted to Holy Communion, how many slip through the net! We may some day have to acknowledge and confess the poor results of our Sunday-schools, compared with all the labour expended upon them. Who will have the courage of his convictions, and be brave and bold enough to say on this subject what, from experience and observation, he really thinks? But there is a *getting out of the habit* of attending a place of worship, and by degrees a shyness and reluctance to reappear. In many cases, if you question a man as to the reason why you never see him at church, it is not that he is averse to religion, but he has got, from one cause or another, "out of the habit." He makes the excuse of his old clothes, which he knows is only an excuse. Sometimes he pleads his excessive work as his excuse, but be the excuse what it may, he is not to be seen; and by degrees with him salvation must take its chance. Often have I asked my curates—and here I would record the deep debt of gratitude I owe to my many faithful and devoted curates—how did such an one, who never came to church or mission-room, die? What did he say to you during your visits to him in his last sickness? What evidence did he give of repentance towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ? As a rule he said nothing, for as a rule men die as they have lived. Salvation becomes a "perhaps." There is an idea, to be attributed to indefinite and colourless teaching, that, granted Christianity be true, the love of God is so great, His mercy in Christ so all-embracing, the acceptance of Christ is not a work of urgency, and a peaceful end rather than a holy life is the great desideratum. It is a fact that men who have lived irreligiously die apparently without misgivings or even a qualm of fear. They go down to their graves like the brutes that perish. The desire again to reconcile a careless life with the hope of final salvation has suggested a variety of expedients more or less plausible, *e.g.*, death-bed baptism, death-bed communion. Stories are afloat and quoted of the mercy of God so overtaking man at the last that others cling to the hope that such may be their happy experience. When Lord Seymour, in the days of Edward VI., was executed, his decapitation required two strokes of the axe. An eminent divine being appealed to, expressed his inability to determine whether the

dying and, as he was, wicked man, did not work out his salvation in the short convulsive interval between the first and second stroke! "When a man," said Bishop Latimer, "hath two strokes of an axe, who can tell but between two strokes he doth repent?" The same hope was expressed of one killed by his horse stumbling. "Who shall say," was the remark, "that salvation may not be found between the stirrup and the ground!" Would this persuasion be so wide-spread and so influential if this were more clearly taught, that the thief on the cross was saved once that none might despair, once that none might presume?

It is sometimes alleged by working men, as a reason why they are estranged from religion, that the clergy do not sympathize with them in their combination to raise their wages, and to uphold the rights of labour. This is scarcely within our province. These are difficult, delicate, intricate subjects. In some cases you might as well meddle with a hornet's nest, and too often our sympathy, naturally on the side of *authority*, is prevented from being exercised by the arbitrary prohibition which, in some instances, trade unions impose. There may be much to be said in favour of combination to protect the working man's rights; but all sympathy is gone so soon as the working man regards labour as undignified, is too indolent to do an honest day's work, or imposes tyrannous restrictions on those who, in sound health, and with a large family dependent on him, are not allowed to earn his daily bread. Few clergy have made these social questions their study. We are not all of the calibre and stamp of the late beloved and widely respected Bishop Fraser. Even he of late years was thought to meddle too much with social questions, and to make the pulpit too habitually the opportunity of expressing his mind on questions of this nature. As a rule, a clergyman very rarely gains influence by taking prominent parts in semi-social, semi-political questions. It is very easy to acquire a clap-trap popularity. If he do not take the working man's side his interference would most likely be resented, and if he take it he places himself in a doubtful and questionable position. The working man is shrewd enough to know that all this is not his parson's *métier*, and takes it at its worth. The safer and wiser course is to confine himself to his more proper and immediate ministrations, and I believe with the late Bishop of Ripon, when he said to me, "It is, after all, spiritual work which tells."

There are one or two other and much more serious facts which we have to face, and which reasonably account for the estrangement of our working classes from religion. The Pew system is a confessed hindrance. That is not a "free and open church" in which you find Prayer Book and Bible left. Free and open

means, in plain English, "free and open." First come first served. The poor do not like to be *labelled*. They open God's Word, and read that "God is no respecter of persons," that in His house rich and poor meet alike; the Lord is maker of them all. They come to His house and find pews appropriated; the rich sit here, the poor sit there. I am well aware of the technical difficulties in this matter. I know that churchwardens are legally bound to accommodate *bonâ-fide* parishioners. I fear I must add that the laity of the Church of England are not trained and taught from their childhood, as in Nonconforming bodies, to support voluntarily their clergy and the ministrations of religion. Endowments make voluntaryism apparently superfluous, and appropriation of pews, whether met by a recognised pew-rent or by "subscription," which really comes to the same thing, is to many a sufficient reason for a constitutional dislike to offertories, and for complaints at their frequency. But why should not seats be assigned to the working classes according to their means? My revered vicar, under whom for two years I served—Archdeacon Sinclair, then Vicar of Kensington—strongly maintained that the poor do not value what they have not to pay for. He encouraged the plan of allowing the poor to have their seats in church, varying from 2s. 6d. to 1s. a year; every seat was taken. I am under the impression, though open to correction, that there is one church in this diocese, built by one who bequeathed a sufficient sum for the purpose, on the condition that it should be a poor man's church, and that the poor should be encouraged to *rent* their sittings. But what becomes of our faith in God and our faith in the poorer classes, if we cannot believe that an earnest, loving, faithful ministry would never lack material support?

Again, there is this fact to face: The language of our Liturgy is archaic. Endeared by many associations, sacred to the cultured layman, how many words are absolutely unintelligible to the working man! How many illustrations we might give of this! Max Müller makes somewhere a calculation that a fairly educated man's vocabulary is limited to, say, eight hundred words; a poor man's to five hundred. For all practical purposes much might be Greek or Latin. It is not for him the "vulgar" or mother tongue.

Again, in how many churches is the Service much too long, much too ornate, the music too elaborate, the sermon above the poor man's head. I quite think that the demand of our age, speaking generally, is a reverent ritual and faithful preaching of "the truth as it is in Jesus"; that our churches, in all their surroundings and accessories to worship, should present an ideal and a marked contrast to the homes outside church doors; but all this need not be at the cost of

simplicity or of what is needful for the bulk of our people to ensure heartiness and spiritual refreshment. It ought not to be that the mission-room shall be a *pis-aller* or a kind of refuge for the destitute. It is grand exercise and discipline for a man to acquire the power of making himself intelligible to all classes without affecting on the one hand cleverness, or "condescending" to minds of less intellectual fibre. Do we not need to remember that old rule, "Let all things be done to edifying"?

Added to all these reasons, to which more might be added, is this, which, though it may not "hold water," is too commonly urged by the working classes as reasons for their apparent estrangement from religion, and that is the example set by the upper classes, who are for the most part without excuse. Look at the increasing desecration of God's holy day by those whose life is already one round of pleasure, and who cannot honestly plead overwork in the week-days as an excuse for their disregard of ordinances! Such examples as church parades, the "Zoo," dinner-parties, lawn-tennis on Sundays, filter down from upper to lower strata, and it irritates the working man to think that restrictions should be imposed on him which are not equally imposed on all! Look at the selfish extravagance of the upper classes, the lavish expenditure on a single entertainment or on some personal hobby when hundreds are in want of the necessities of life! A single entertainment recently at the Mansion House cost £2,000, and the day following a woman was discovered on a doorstep within reach of the Mansion House starved to death! Look at all the more than questionable methods to raise money for religious and charitable objects, such as bazaars, fancy fairs, charity dinners, fancy balls, methods unwarranted by Scripture, absolutely unworthy of the name and dignity of charity, patronized by bishops who ought to protest against such spurious methods of giving by purchasing, by feeding, by dancing! How shall we persuade the working man, sitting loosely to religion, that this is the Christianity Christ taught, and would have us practise? How shall we make them realize what Christianity is when it is so travestied, so misrepresented, so adulterated with a worldly spirit? It does not do for us to say hard and uncharitable things of the working classes. We must take into consideration the surroundings of their daily life, the monotony of their calling, the depressing influences of their home life, the *res angusta domi*, the corrosive care, the hindrances that come from without, the manifold disadvantages under which they live and labour from childhood upwards, before a verdict harsh or condemnatory be passed upon them.

The facts are confessed; the danger which may arise out of a mass of men practically unreached and unleavened by religion

is real and grave; the remedy ought not to be far to find. Tonic springs are often near fever-breeding plains. There is abundant room for the statesman, for the philanthropist, for a readjusting of the attitude, somewhat unfriendly, of one section of society towards another. Much is being done; great and laudable efforts are being put forth. All honour to those who would improve the dwellings of the poor, enforce sanitary laws, reclaim from intemperance, encourage thrift, lighten heavy hours with kindly presence and the consecration of any special gift. Penny readings, free concerts, working men's clubs, church institutes, mother's meetings, bands of hope and of mercy, sewing classes, anything of the nature of counter-attraction, not to speak of day and Sunday schools—who would disparage these? Who does not know that these agencies of any well-worked parish are, up to a certain point, remedial, corrective, and helpful. But do these things touch or reach the root of the evil? May we not err in the direction of not sufficiently endeavouring to evangelize the illiterate, rude, and rough?

Our blessed Lord, both by teaching and example, would point out the true method. The gospel of Christ, preached and lived, is the only true and reliable panacea for the world's evils. He did not send salvation; He brought it. He came into close contact with humanity; He gave Himself that we might live through Him. He persuaded men the most scornful, women the most forlorn, that He was real by a sympathy direct and self-sacrificing. The world will never outlive Christianity. It is not a new faith or creed we want; we want life and meaning put into the creed we profess. So far from the nineteenth century outgrowing Christianity, the need of its leavening influence becomes increasingly great. We do not want miracles to be wrought for His Church; we want wonders to be wrought by His Church in the power of the Holy Ghost. The evils which real Christians most deplore, those on which the enemies of the Cross fasten most readily for scorn and criticism, spring from the apparent neglect of the great purpose of Christianity in relation to the world. It is the charge brought by Morison in his "Service of Man," speaking on behalf of Agnostics, that our Christianity as now represented is intensely selfish. The urgency of the appeal to men to make "their calling and their election sure," the promises held out as lures for this world and the next, can scarcely fail, if we limit our idea of "salvation" to this to minister to our selfishness. We have to learn, we have to realize our responsibility in reference to the world's conversion. We cannot fully understand the blessings of Christianity, except as these tend through us to bless the world. "I am saved," cried the shipwrecked boy on recovering consciousness. "There is another lad on that sinking ship, go

and save him." We cannot—profess what we may—know the Fatherhood of God in Christ except as it lead us to personal consecration and a closer brotherhood with all that Christ has redeemed. If Christianity does not make greater headway; if it seem paralyzed here, powerless there, the fault or hindrance is not in the Creed. The great hindrance is un-Christlike Christians, men and women who will not lift a finger nor stir a foot for Him, whose faith is a collection of loose opinions, not of deep-rooted conviction such as influences their lives, and impresses as it influences others. To uplift and purify the religion of our time; to put into what we have the heroism and might of a conquering force, is our need. We do not want miracles; we should only ask for more were they vouchsafed. We want men and women advantaged above their fellows, some with abounding means, some with commanding position, some with high gifts, who will bridge over the yawning chasm, carrying on Christ's work in Christ's way, living over again Christ's life in the power which fitted Him for His blessed work. The responsibility of teaching truth, of enjoying Christian privilege, is really greater than the responsibility that attaches itself to any other possession or gift. It is a responsibility which attaches itself increasingly to the *laity* of our day, in proportion as they know more. The knowledge of Divine truth is no longer the privilege or possession of the few. There is room for an unordained as well as for an ordained ministry. It is not by sighs and sentiment that we shall win the world for Christ. It is not by spurious charity done from easy-chairs and at arm's length. It is not by spasmodic effort and galvanic shocks of impulsive benevolence. It is by sustained, persistent, unwearying effort that can endure apparent failure, and is not too impatient of success. It will not be by rich men, but it will be by holy men. It will be by those who come out from their exclusiveness, dignity, reserve, selfishness, indolence, and false views of life, and who look on a sin-stricken world through the pitiful eyes of Him who had compassion on the multitude and yearned over them. There is wealth enough in the world to meet all its poverty. There is intellect enough in the world to cross swords with doubt. There is sympathy in the world frozen up, as it may seem, in the Arctic regions of hearts that have never been melted by the constraining love of Christ. Oh for more of that spirit, and of His outpoured influence! Oh for more of the love of Christ shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost! And who shall say how the long-standing malady would be stanched, and all would become more truly one in Christ?

FRANCIS PIGOU.

ART. II.—THE THREE OXFORD REFORMERS.

THE vigorous concentrated life of the Universities has placed them in the van of every great religious movement in England: evangelical or rationalistic, tractarian or methodist. It was so with the greatest movement of all—the Reformation.

The Reformation, like all great events, sprang from many causes, remote or immediate, superficial or fundamental. Its origin was at once political, in the passions of Henry VIII. and the schemes of Wolsey and Cromwell; national, in the growing dissatisfaction caused by the usurped authority of the "Bishop of Rome"; doctrinal, in the results of Luther's struggle with the papacy; and literary, in the renaissance or revival of classical learning. The literary side of the movement was the earliest in point of time, and it is under a literary aspect that the origin of the Reformation in England must be sought at Oxford, embodied in the three Oxford Reformers — Colet, Erasmus, and More.[1]

At first sight both the adjective Oxford and the noun Reformer may appear inappropriate. Though the three friends met first at Oxford, yet they were there together for little more than a year (1498), and when they separated, they were still far from being united in thought and action. Nor was their future career the same; as the preacher, the scholar, and the statesman, they represent three widely different types of workers. Oxford witnessed only the commencement of Colet's work, while the small portion of Erasmus' work, which was done in England, was done in London or Cambridge. It might be thought that the three men had little in common, and that, even for that little, Oxford was not responsible.

Again, even the name "Reformer" will appear to some misplaced as applied to men who remained to the end in communion with the unreformed Church, and whose work differed so widely in aim and scope, and in want of definite dogmatic teaching, from the later Protestantism. Even if the name is grudgingly conceded to Colet, it will be withheld by many from the two who lived long enough to find themselves in collision with the later movement. But the history of the period clearly shows that the original impulse came from Colet; that this impulse was first imparted to the others during their intercourse with Colet at Oxford; that the others did come to share in Colet's convictions; and that their common work constituted a real and important

[1] The best modern works on the subject are Mr. Seebohm's "Oxford Reformers of 1498," published in 1867, and the Rev. J. H. Lupton's "Life of Dean Colet," published in 1887, to both of which this article is largely indebted.

factor in the progress of the Reformation. Others besides these three are entitled to rank as merely literary reformers. Grocyn and Linacre were before Colet in the work; Lilly gave effect to Colet's views; Wolsey and Henry VIII. carried on the work on a far larger scale; but the three Oxford friends occupy a position between the old and the new peculiar to themselves.

The revival of letters was due to the diffusion of the newly-discovered wealth of classical writings, brought into Italy by Greek exiles from Constantinople, and multiplied by the printing-press. But while in Italy the movement took a purely literary and speculative turn, tinged with semi-paganism, in England (as also, to some extent, in Germany) its aspect was, from the first, distinctly practical and religious. We may fancy we see the broad foundation of this fact in the practical and serious character of the Teutonic race; we are on narrower but surer ground if we attribute it to the deep religious earnestness of the man who formed the centre and soul of the movement—John Colet.

Colet had travelled in France and Italy to acquire the new learning, "like a merchantman seeking goodly wares." In Italy he soon abandoned the classics, and devoted himself to the study, partly of the Fathers, but far more of the Scriptures, "preparing himself even then for the preaching of the Gospel." It is uncertain whether he visited Florence, and came under the spell of Savonarola's life and preaching. It is certain that in Italy his eyes were opened to the mournful contrast between the ideal Church and the actual state of the papacy. His earnestness, while it led him to break with the old scholasticism, preserved him from the snares of the new infidelity, then fashionable at Rome, and from the worldliness and immorality by which either extreme was equally accompanied. His return to Oxford, and the announcement of his intention to lecture on St. Paul's Epistles, mark the dawn of that light which culminated in the Reformation. He had renounced the prospects of commercial success, which were doubtless open to him as the son of a former Lord Mayor of London. But as yet he had not taken deacon's orders, or obtained a doctor's degree, so that his lectures formed a startling innovation, the more so as they were given gratuitously.[1] The lectures were no less an innovation in style, method, and matter. The style was the outcome of the earnestness and reality of the man—telling and plain—resulting from genuine conviction, and producing conviction in the hearer. Erasmus truly describes it in his reply to Colet's introductory

[1] The question whether Colet was acting irregularly is discussed in Lupton, pp. 59, 60. The Bible was regarded as a dangerous weapon, to be trusted only in veteran and practised hands.

letter, which formed the opening of their friendship: "You say what you mean; you mean what you say." The method, too, was his own. Instead of taking detached texts, and using them as a basis to establish abstruse propositions (which was the method of his day), he sought to penetrate to the mind of the Apostle, and seize the "continuous sense" of his writings. Discarding the mystical and allegorical interpretations of the schoolmen, Colet starts from the literal and grammatical meaning of the text of Scripture, and exhibits it in its practical bearing.[1]

His method is rational, in the best sense of the term; free and fearless, and yet consistent with a reverence unknown to the schoolmen, who, while contending for the verbal inspiration of Scripture, had thrust Scripture itself into the background. Some instances may be taken from his general teaching. In his letters to Radulphus on the Mosaic account of the Creation, he treats it as a "summary," written with a special view to the *moral* instruction of the children of Israel—in other words, "accommodated" to their limited understanding. In a conversation at table, he attributes the rejection of Cain's sacrifice to the character of the offerer, as shown in the self-confidence which led him to till the ground that God had cursed. In discussing with Erasmus the "Agony in the Garden," he rejects the lower view which attributed it to fear of death, and follows Jerome in ascribing it to an overpowering sense in the Redeemer's mind of the awful guilt of His murderers. Thus he invests sacred subjects with a personal reality and interest entirely new. In his hands Scripture becomes a thing of life.

In this way Colet soon found himself a centre of influence at Oxford. Men were drawn to one who argued for truth, not for victory. Among his hearers were Grocyn, Linacre, and Prior Charnock, possibly, also, two men destined to widely different fortunes—Tyndale and Wolsey. Earnest inquirers visited him in private. He directed them to the fundamental truths of Christianity, to the teaching of the Apostles, to Christ Himself. His advice to young men was, "Keep to the Bible and the Apostles' Creed, and let divines, if they like, dispute about the rest."[2] When, in 1505, he was appointed Dean of St. Paul's, he did but carry to his new sphere the spirit and method which had already done so much to promote a more earnest study of the Scriptures, and a more enlightened faith in the halls and students' rooms of Oxford.

---

[1] Sometimes, however, he is betrayed into a mystical interpretation by his admiration for the spurious "Celestial Hierarchy," attributed to Dionysius the Areopagite. See Lupton, pp. 79-83.

[2] Seebohm, p. 53 (edit. 1867). On Colet's influence over the young see the Colloquy of Erasmus on "The Youth's Piety," in Bailey's Translation, pp. 48-55, edit. 1877.

Colet's life as Dean of St. Paul's was not a happy one; he accepted the office (says Erasmus) more as a burden than as an honour; he had to encounter the opposition and dislike of the Bishop on the one hand, the cathedral body on the other. He was engaged in a ceaseless struggle with the worldliness of the clergy, caused by the number of rich sinecures connected with the cathedral, and the immense wealth poured into its shrines. But contact with the world only deepened his loyalty to Christ, and brought into stronger relief the simplicity of his life. He still retained his plain black robe in place of the customary purple vestments; he still preferred a small circle of like-minded friends, and the quiet table-talk at the one meal of the day. Indeed, it was partly his simpler and more restricted hospitality which rendered him unpopular with guests, not only lay but clerical, who would have preferred a more luxurious board and less Scripture-reading.

His preaching now took the place of his lectures at Oxford. Not only the wealthy citizens, but the common people, heard him gladly. The Lollard came to hear the one man who had read Wycliffite books, and whose earnestness seemed to give him so much in common with himself. All saw in him one who lived up to the truth he taught. More writes that he was like a physician in whom the patient had confidence.

His most celebrated sermon was that preached, by Archbishop Warham's appointment, at the meeting of Convocation in 1512. This sermon "marks an epoch in the history of the English Church;" it is "the overture in the great drama of the English Reformation."[1] The text was from his favourite St. Paul, in whose cathedral he was preaching: "Be ye not conformed to this world, but be ye reformed in the newness of your minds" (Rom. xii. 2). Following the clauses of the text, he divided his sermon into two heads: Conformation and Reformation. Under the first head he depicts, in dark colours, the lives of the clergy, the pride, lust, covetousness, and worldliness in the Church. Adapting St. John's description of the world, he remarks, "We can truly say, 'all that is in the *Church* is either the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, or the pride of life.'" He quotes, from a sermon of St. Bernard's, a remark to the effect that the heresy of a depraved life is so much more pernicious than that of false teaching, as actions are stronger than words. Coming

[1] Lupton, p. 178. Mr. Lupton notes that Blunt (J. H.), in his "History of the Reformation," takes this sermon as his starting-point, and that Bishop Burnet intended to give it the same position "as a piece that might serve to open the scene." The sermon is given *in extenso* in Seebohm, pp. 162-178; Lupton, Appendix C, pp. 293-304, the latter from a translation made possibly by Colet himself, and preserved in the library at Lambeth Palace.

to the second head, "Reformation," he enforces the old proverb, "Physician, heal thyself;" urging that reform should begin with the bishops, and descend from them, first to the clergy, and then to the laity; that the existing laws as to the ordination of fit persons, and as to clerical residence and morals, should be "rehearsed" and observed; in short, that the Convocation should not break up without some practical result. No words could more forcibly describe the contrast between the true Christian ideal and the actual lives of the clergy. When we remember that the Convocation was called for the suppression of heresy, and that all the great ecclesiastics of England were present, especially Colet's own bishop, Fitzjames, who was anxiously watching for some occasion against him, we can feel that to speak in such words as these needed the courage of a true Christian reformer. Even Latimer, in a sermon, on a similar occasion, twenty-five years later, speaks in no clearer tones.[1]

It is, however, his educational work which has left most tangible results, and by which Colet is most widely known. Yet even this was distinctly religious in its character, and bore the impress of the deep earnestness of the man. His object in founding St. Paul's School was, as he declares in the "Statutes," "to increase knowledge and worshipping of God and our Lord Jesus Christ, and good Christian life and manners in the children."[2] His religious convictions even led him to condemn the classical authors as unfit to form part of a Christian education, and to prescribe, in his course of study, Christian authors who followed most closely the classical style.[3] The chaplain was ordered to instruct the children in the "Articles of the Faith" and the Ten Commandments in English. The scholars, on entering and leaving the school, "salute Christ with an hymn." The school was dedicated to the Child Jesus, whose image was placed over the master's chair, standing and in the attitude of teaching, with the motto (suggested by Erasmus), "Hear ye Him." The "Precepts of Living," for the use of his scholars, contained in the "Cathechyzon" prefixed to his "Accidence," show his care for their moral and religious welfare; while the preface rises to a level far above that of

---

[1] When, however, Mr. Lupton says (p. 189), "Had he been willing to play the part of a *Chenaanah* instead of a Micaiah, his course would have been smooth enough," he is unconsciously visiting the sins of the son on the father!

[2] Quoted by Seebohm, from Knight's "Life of Colet," p. 364.

[3] He even, in his Lectures on First Corinthians, applies to this question St. Paul's words in 1 Cor. x. 21, "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of devils." As might be expected, Erasmus took quite a different view.

mere classical education in the closing words, so often quoted in illustration at once of the gentleness and the piety of the founder: "And lift up your little white hands. for me, which prayeth for you to God, to Whom be all honour and imperial majesty and glory. Amen."[1]

We know not what qualities to praise most highly in Colet: the earnestness which made him the unwavering champion of the cause of truth; the fearlessness which led him to strike at the besetting sins of clergy, cardinal, and king; the liberality with which he devoted his fortune to the cause of Christian education; the common-sense which prompted his indignation at the superstitious veneration of relics; the unworldliness which kept him humble in a position of dignity and power, simple in the midst of pomp and luxury—or the spirit of genuine piety which marked his whole life, urging him, as Erasmus says, to "spend himself that he might gain men to Christ."

There are two full-length figures of Colet in stained glass—one in the hall of Christ Church, Oxford, the other in the Chapel of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. In the former he is placed with Linacre, More, etc., as one of the seven restorers of learning in England; in the latter he is placed in the same window with Tyndale, and opposite to Fisher and Cranmer. The positions of the two figures are significant of his twofold work—as a promoter of reformed learning, but still more as a champion of reformed religion.

Next to Colet in the group of Reformers stands Erasmus. The relative position of the two men may be expressed by the statement that, while Erasmus represents the scholarship of the movement, the devotion of that scholarship to the cause of Reform was due to the influence of Colet. Arriving at Oxford in 1497, the poor scholar was welcomed to the generous friendship of the ex-Lord Mayor's son. The appreciation was mutual; Colet admired Erasmus' wide and accurate scholarship, Erasmus admired Colet's high moral qualities. Colet seemed to him "as one inspired." Colet, however, sought in Erasmus not only a friend but a fellow-worker: he longed to see him devote his intellect to the highest cause; and he was keenly disappointed when, in spite of his entreaties, Erasmus, in 1499, left Oxford, without feeling his own views sufficiently matured to justify him in following Colet in the path on which he had entered.

But the constant intercourse of the friends, and their frequent discussions on Scriptural topics, had not been in vain; and

---

[1] The Catechism is given in Lupton, Appendix B, pp. 285-292. (See Wordsworth's *Eccl. Biogr.*, vol. i., p. 442.)

though, for a time, Erasmus was condemned by his necessities to confine himself to secular studies, yet when, in 1503, he published his "Enchiridion;" or, The Christian Soldier's Dagger, the tone of the book showed that he had resolved to yield to Colet's entreaties, and to devote his abilities to the cause of true religion. From that time he was the unsparing opponent of the old system. In his "Praise of Folly," written in 1510, while staying at More's house, shortly after a visit to Rome, he ridicules the schoolmen for their subtleties, which left them no leisure for the study of the Scriptures; he pictures the rejection of the monks at the Day of Judgment; he even lashes (not too obscurely) the pope himself, the ambitious and warlike Julius II. His "Jerome," published in 1516, was dedicated to Archbishop Warham, the common friend of the three Reformers. His great work was his "Novum Instrumentum," the first printed Greek Testament. In the "Paraclesis," or "exhortation," prefixed to this work, he gives an exposition of his views. He longs to see Christians more in earnest in the cause of their Prince: he would have Christianity open to all. "The sun itself is not more common and open to all than the religion of Christ." He would have the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue. He longs that even the weakest woman should read them; "that the husbandman should sing portions of them to himself as he follows the plough; that the weaver should hum them to the tune of his shuttle; that the traveller should beguile with their stories the tedium of his journey." What, he asks, are the writings of the schoolmen in comparison with the Gospels, which give us the living image of the mind of Christ? "Were we to have seen Him with our own eyes, we should not have so intimate a knowledge as they give, of Christ speaking, healing, dying, rising again, as it were, in our own actual presence."[1]

The "Paraclesis" was followed by some remarks on the "Right Method of Theological Study," which, in the second edition of the New Testament, were greatly extended, and subsequently published by themselves. His method is that derived from Colet. He urges, first and foremost, the need of reverence for the New Testament as the "food of the soul;" then a knowledge of the original languages, and of the writer's surroundings; the necessity of regarding the context, and not distorting the sense of individual passages; the desirability of using the best commentators—or none.

This method would impart to the study of the Scriptures not only light, but life. His method of interpretation, as seen

[1] See the condensed translation in Seebohm, pp. 255-258, or the extract in Green's "Short History of the English People," pp. 307, 308 (edit. 1875).

in his "Annotations," exhibits the same freedom as Colet's. He admits the possibility of mistake on the part of the New Testament writers, and holds that the Apostles quoted the Old Testament from memory. He draws his arguments for the truth of Scripture, not from external authority, but from the internal evidence of their general consistency and harmony.

Thus Erasmus consistently pursues the reactionary path in which Colet had led the way, and, as Colet's letters show, with his entire approval and admiration. Reference will be made later on to the preparatory character of Erasmus' work. One special feature of his teaching may be noticed here—his wide view of Christianity as embracing the whole of life. "The Christian," he writes in his "Christian Prince," "is not he who is baptized, or he who is consecrated, or he who is present at holy rites; but he who is united to Christ in closest affection, and who shows it by his holy actions." "Why" (he urges in the preface to a new edition of his "Enchiridion," published in 1518) "should we thus narrow the Christian profession, when Christ wished it to be as broad as possible? In *every* path let all strive to attain to the mind of Christ."[1]

Erasmus, then, represents the movement in its new features of breadth and toleration.

The third member of the group—More—may be dismissed with fewer words. At Oxford Colet and Erasmus were charmed with the ready wit and loving disposition of More; More, at the susceptible age of seventeen, was impressed with the earnestness and piety of Colet. But his father destined him for the bar, and soon removed him from Oxford. In London we catch occasional glimpses of him as the admirer of Colet, the host of Erasmus, the defender of the movement before Henry VIII. His political and official life lies outside the scope of our inquiry. It shows him as one who possessed the courage of his convictions, who "looked first to God, and after God to the king." It is in his "Utopia" that we see his sympathy with the new movement. While the satire of the "Utopia" resembles that of the "Praise of Folly," its earnestness is that of Colet's sermon on Reform. The moral philosophy of the Utopians is an attempt at reconciling Utilitarianism and Christianity — science and religion. Virtue is based on the Law of Nature, and consists in living according to Nature, from a motive of gratitude to Him who is the Father of Nature. Hence no man is to be punished for his religion; even atheists are not punished, but they are looked on as unfit for public trust. Confession was made to the heads of families, not to the priests; public worship was such

---

[1] Seebohm, pp. 298 and 365, 366.

that all could unite in it, the rites peculiar to each sect being practised in private.

In his dealing with social and political questions, such as labour, education, crime, and public health, More anticipates, in a remarkable way, the direction taken by modern reforms. Thus the "Utopia" represents the common views of the three friends on such subjects as the love of peace, the duty of toleration, the claims of the poor—in a word, the religious movement carried out in the realm of politics.

There is no need to dwell on the contrast between More's earlier and later life; between his advocacy of toleration in the "Utopia," and his official sanction of the persecution of Bainham, Fryth, etc.; between his youthful gentleness and courtesy, and his virulent attacks on Luther and Tyndale. He is not the first, and will not be the last, who has become alarmed at the power of the spirit he has himself conjured up, or whose official position has committed him to acts opposed to his personal convictions and character.

We are now in a position to recognise the common features of the movement, which had its starting-point in Oxford. It was an earnest effort to bring back men to the central and fundamental truths of Christianity; to make learning the handmaid of religion, and, by a deeper and more accurate knowledge of the Scriptures, to lead the way to an enlightened faith, before which the superstitions of the age should silently disappear. It was an effort to carry out Christianity in political life, in the relations of princes and peoples, in religious equality, in fair and moderate taxation, in the pursuit of peace. It taught men the true meaning of the much-abused phrase, a "religious" life—a life passed, not in the narrow limits of the cloister, but in the broad field of daily duty. We may estimate the value of the movement by regarding it from two separate points of view: as a reaction from the past, and as a preparation for the future.

The reality of the break with the past is seen in the hatred and opposition which the movement excited. Colet lived in an atmosphere of persecution. He writes to Erasmus that the Bishop of London "never ceases to harass" him. The articles of heresy, exhibited against him by the Bishop before Archbishop Warham, included such charges as that he had taught that images were not to be worshipped, and, according to Tyndale, that he had translated the Paternoster into English. Colet's danger was no imaginary one. The Bishop had condemned at least two heretics to the stake in 1511. Latimer, in a sermon forty years after, says that "Dr. Colet was in trouble, and should have been burnt if God had not turned the king's heart to the contrary."[1] Others scented heresy in the teaching of Greek

[1] Latimer's Sermons, p. 440; quoted in Lupton, p. 204.

at St. Paul's School. Colet wrote to Erasmus that one bishop had publicly spoken of the school as "a useless, nay, a mischievous institution; nay, a very home of idolatry." Erasmus came in for an equal share of execration. His New Testament was reviled, he says, by obscure men who had never seen even the covers. At one of the colleges at Cambridge it was forbidden to introduce it, "by horse or by boat, on wheels or on foot." The Dominicans, who found themselves unable to force him to re-enter their order, branded him as a renegade and a heretic. When he lay ill at Louvain, a false rumour of his death caused great exultation among his enemies. "He had died," said one of them, "like a heretic as he was: died," he added, in true monkish Latin, "sine lux, sine crux, sine Deus!" Erasmus himself could write of this illness: "When the disease was at its height, I neither felt distressed with the desire of life, nor did I tremble at the fear of death. All my hope was in Christ alone."[1] It is clear, then, that between the "orthodox" party and the Oxford Reformers there was a great gulf fixed.

A second proof of the value of the movement is found in the use made of its literature by the later Reformers. Erasmus, as has been said, represents the literary side of the movement. It was his writings which gave it extension and notoriety. His works passed through edition after edition, and were read all over Europe. Moreover, he was in correspondence with the greatest ecclesiastics of the day. Bishops and archbishops, even the pope himself, allowed him to speak his mind to them with the greatest freedom. No man exercised a greater influence on public opinion. At first, perhaps, we are tempted to think of him as merely a satirist. As we read his "Praise of Folly," or his "Colloquies," their sprightliness of style and range of subject hide from us the unity and seriousness of purpose which underlie them. The versatility of Erasmus' genius, and the keenness of his wit, obscure his earnestness. The first readers of the "Praise of Folly" did not discern its true drift. They dismissed it with a smile; and it was not till the subsequent publication of his more serious works had made Erasmus famous throughout Europe that men awoke to discover the taint of heresy in his earlier productions.

His satire, however, gradually opened men's eyes to the corruptions of the Church, to the empty pretensions of the schoolmen, the immoral lives of the monks. It paved the way for the broader satire of the "Letters of Obscure Men," and "Pope Julius shut out of Heaven." But Erasmus' works did far more than this. They prepared the way for more serious

[1] Seebohm, pp. 380, 381, from Erasmus' works.

effort: they furnished ammunition for the coming conflict; they brought the Bible to the front, and left it to do its own work. They won the approval of the later Reformers:[1] they were even more widely circulated after the rise of Protestantism than before. The "Enchiridion" was translated into English by Tyndale. The New Testament commended itself to Warham, who introduced it to the notice of "bishop after bishop." Fox, Bishop of Winchester, declared that it was worth more than ten commentaries; Latimer, then Professor of Greek at Cambridge, highly approved of it; Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, received the author as his guest. A copy of the "Paraphrases" was placed by Cranmer in every parish church in England. Some traces of his teaching may be found in the formularies of the English Church.

Thus, even if the Oxford friends stood only on the threshold of the Reformed Church, they threw open the door by which others might enter. They bequeathed their work to others. Tyndale followed Erasmus in his labours on the New Testament; Latimer and Fisher handed on the study of Greek; Latimer was Colet's worthy successor in the pulpit.

What, then, to come to the general question, is the relationship between the Oxford Reformers and the later Protestantism? We have already seen many points of resemblance. Luther himself could not surpass Erasmus in his contempt for the monks; in his estimate of the worthlessness of indulgences and pilgrimages, worship of images and adoration of relics; in his desire to substitute spiritual for ceremonial religion; in his longing to see the Scriptures brought within the reach and the understanding of every plain man; in his anxiety to thrust aside mediæval abuses, and to return to the Christianity of St. Paul. Neither Colet nor Erasmus left any provision for the saying of masses on their behalf, or for the support of religious houses. To a certain point the earlier and later Reformers trod in the same path.

But when we leave the negative aspect of their teaching, and come to its positive side, the divergence quickly appears. The Reformation for which Colet and Erasmus laboured was one in life rather than in doctrine. "The worst heresy is a bad life," taught Colet. "The great question," says Erasmus, "is not whether a man understands the doctrine of the procession of the Spirit, but whether he has the fruits of the Spirit." Though they combated the views of the schoolmen, they looked on them rather as useless subtleties than as doctrinal errors.

The Oxford Reformers were impatient of dogma. They looked

[1] Melanchthon speaks of Erasmus as "the first to call back Theology to her fountain-head."

on the exact and formal definition of doctrines as a thing mischievous to attempt, and impossible to realize. Every definition was a misfortune, as leading to difference and division. Division was the very thing they dreaded. They would never have dreamt of casting off the papal yoke. It could not be otherwise. Erasmus was the personal friend of Leo X., to whom he dedicated his New Testament. He had been the schoolfellow of Adrian VI. Their battle was with the abuses of the papal system, not with the system itself. Colet, after careful search, prepared for himself a retreat among the Carthusians at Sheen. It follows as a natural consequence of their views, that they never desired the position of leaders. Colet deprecated the idea of founding a sect. Erasmus exclaimed against Eck's use of the term "Erasmians": "I hate that term of division. We are all Christians, and labour, each in his own sphere, to advance the glory of Christ." He laments, in his "Colloquies," that "Christ's seamless coat is rent asunder on all sides."[1] He would fain see the Church a common bond of union between Christians. He longed that men would cease disputing about abstract doctrine, and unite in dwelling on things necessary to salvation. He looked back with regret to the time when there was but one creed, and that the shortest of the three. It is clear, then, that Erasmus' idea of reform was very different from Luther's. He writes to Melanchthon that as to Luther's doctrines there were different opinions. He writes to Luther himself, advising courtesy rather than impetuosity, urging him to attack abuses of papal authority, not popes themselves. He felt that Luther's bolder work was an interruption to his Scriptural labours. His own work was one for which he was pre-eminently fitted, and in which he had received the sympathy and the pecuniary support of English scholars.

Moreover, there was between them a divergence, not only in method but in doctrine. Luther had seen this from the first. He had been keenly disappointed on reading Erasmus' "Annotations," finding them deficient on the questions of freewill and original sin. He especially disliked Erasmus' free method of interpretation, as destroying the spiritual sense of Scripture. That which, to Erasmus, was "unto life," Luther found to be "unto death." To Luther, Erasmus' views seemed loose and unorthodox; to Erasmus, Luther's views seemed rigid and intolerant. Erasmus admits, in the preface to his "Colloquies,"[2] that young students will find in them many things which oppose the opinions of the Lutherans. In truth, the two methods are irreconcilable. The leader of broader and more moderate views hopes for everything from the quieter course

[1] Bailey's Translation, p. 226.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. xvi.

of internal reform, and looks on more extreme and decided measures as leading only to a catastrophe. The bolder spirit is impatient of paths which seem to lead nowhere, hates what appear the half-measures of a mere trimmer and time-server, and longs for freedom at whatever cost.

Each of the two sides has found supporters. To the mere philosopher the more purely intellectual movement appears preferable. Goethe held that Luther only undid the work which Erasmus had begun.[1] Mr. Seebohm (who is followed by Mr. Green in his "Short History of the English People") contends that the Protestant Reformers were behind, not before, the Oxford Reformers; that they did but replace the scholastic yoke by the Augustinian, from which the Oxford Reformers had endeavoured to set men free. So, too, Colet's latest biographer, Mr. Lupton, speaks of the reviving tendency to trace back the Reformation to Colet, and to see in him a connecting-link between the old and the new.

On the other hand, Mr. Froude (in his "Three Lectures on the Times of Erasmus and Luther") sees in the two men the contrast between intellect and faith, speculation and conviction, caution and conscientiousness. He looks on the former as a type of leader unsuited to the times, and unequal to the work to be done. "Erasmus, in preaching moderation, was preaching to the winds." "Erasmus believed himself that his work was spoilt by the Reformation; but, in fact, under no conditions could any more have come of it." This paper has been written in vain, however, if it has not shown that there is much more in the work of the Oxford friends than the caution and speculation of a merely intellectual movement. Even if Mr. Froude's verdict on the character and work of Erasmus were accepted, it might still be contended that much which is true of Erasmus would not apply to Colet. As Mr. Lupton remarks, "To say that Erasmus wanted the single-mindedness of Colet, or the intrepidity of More, is merely to say that his character was not a perfect one." It is idle to speculate what might have happened had Colet lived to witness the later Reformation in England. Yet it seems more than probable that the sentence he so narrowly escaped would have overtaken him, and that he would have manfully laid down his life in defence of the truths he believed and taught.

To conclude, then, we indicate at once the strength and the weakness of the movement in speaking of it as preparatory. Widely as the earlier and later Reformers differed—sorrowfully, even bitterly, as each looked on the other—yet each was neces-

[1] Froude's "Short Studies on Great Subjects: Erasmus and Luther," vol. i., p. 48. Cf. pp. 86, 87, 114-135.

sary to the success of the other's work. Unless the minds of men had been first aroused and enlightened by the writings of the earlier Reformers, Luther, when he made his great stand, would have failed from want of support. As the monks said, "Erasmus laid the egg, and Luther hatched the cockatrice." And unless a more vigorous hand had carried on the earlier work, it would have failed of its due effect. Erasmus' mainly destructive criticism might have driven some unstable souls into partial infidelity, or have thrust back others, in despair, into deeper darkness. In times of darkness and death two things are needed—light and life. If the special characteristic of the former movement was light, that of the later was life.

There have been times in the history alike of states and of churches, when quiet constitutional methods of reform seem unavailing, when the slumber of men's souls has been too profound to be shaken by anything less than the shock of some great convulsion. The Reformer for such times must be a son of thunder, a man of sterner stuff than the noble Colet, or the tolerant Erasmus, or the polished More. Such a time was that which preceded the Protestant Reformation: such a Reformer was Martin Luther.

W. E. PLATER.

ART. III.—SIR WALTER SCOTT—(CONTINUED).

"THE Lady of the Lake," which depends for its chief interest on incident and romantic situation, but which is also full of light and colour, martial ardour, and national feeling, was published in May, 1810. Scott's reputation had so steadily increased that he sold the copyright for double the price that "Marmion" had produced. A lady, a cousin of his, who, when the work was in progress, used to ask him what he could possibly have to do so early in the morning, and to whom he at last told the subject of his meditations, tried to dissuade him from publishing a poem after "Marmion," fearing lest its popularity should stand in the way of another, however good. "He stood high," she said, "and should notrashly attempt to climb higher, and incur the risk of a fall; for he might depend upon it a favourite would not be permitted even to stumble with impunity." But he replied, in the words of Montrose:

> He either fears his fate too much,
> Or his deserts are small,
> Who dares not put it to the touch,
> To win or lose it all.

As the last sheets were passing through the press he writes to Morritt: "If I fail, as Lady Macbeth gallantly says, I fail, and

there is only a story murdered to no purpose; and if I succeed, why, then, as the song says:

> Up with the bonnie blue bonnet,
> The dirk and feather and a'."

Success was not for a moment doubtful. "The Lady of the Lake" appeared in all the majesty of quarto, with every accompanying grace of typography, and with, moreover, an engraved frontispiece of Saxon's portrait of Scott; the price of the book, two guineas. This edition of 2,050 copies disappeared instantly, and was followed, in the course of the same year, by four editions in octavo, namely, one of 3,000, a second of 3,250, and a third and a fourth, each of 6,000 copies; thus, in the space of a few months, the extraordinary number of 20,000 copies were disposed of.

The interest which the poem excited in Edinburgh, for two or three months before it was published, was unprecedented. A great poem was on all hands anticipated. None of the author's works were looked for with more intense anxiety, nor did any of them, when it appeared, excite a more extraordinary sensation. The whole country rang with the praises of the poet. Crowds set off to view the scenery of Loch Katrine—till then comparatively unknown; and as the book came out just before the season for excursions, every house and inn in that neighbourhood was crammed with a constant succession of visitors. From the date of the publication of this poem the post-horse duty in Scotland rose to an extraordinary degree; and, indeed, it continued to do so regularly for a number of years, the author's succeeding works keeping up the enthusiasm for the scenery, which he had thus originally created. Jeffrey preferred the new poem to either of its predecessors. "The diction," he says, "is more polished;" indeed, he compared it at times to "the careless richness of Shakespeare":

> The versification is more regular, the story is constructed with infinitely more skill and address; there is a larger variety of characters more artfully and judiciously contrasted. There is, nothing, perhaps, so fine as the battle in "Marmion," or so picturesque as some of the scattered sketches of "The Lay"; but there is a richness and a spirit in the whole piece which does not pervade either of those poems; a profusion of incident, and a shifting brilliancy of colouring that reminds one of the witchery of Ariosto; and a constant elasticity and occasional energy which seems to belong more peculiarly to the author.

This is a candid and discriminating judgment, but I think the verdict of the general public is different, and that, both in regard to the painting of nature, and the description of war, in its passionate excitement and its poetical power, "Marmion" carries off the palm. Nevertheless, there is marvellous vigour in some of the martial episodes in "The Lady of the Lake," and two or

three brilliant passages in the description of battle carry us completely away. Soldiers in the field have felt their power. We read, in Lockhart's "Life of Scott," that, "in the course of the day, when 'The Lady of the Lake' first reached Sir Adam Fergusson, he was posted with his company on a point of ground exposed to the enemy's artillery, somewhere, no doubt, on the lines of Torres Vedras. The men were ordered to lie prostrate on the ground; while they kept that attitude, the Captain, kneeling at their head, read aloud the description of the battle in Canto vi., and the listening soldiers only interrupted him by a joyous huzza when the French shot struck the bank close above them." We can imagine how such a passage as the following would thrill the hearts of the Scotch soldiers as they lay on the ground to shelter themselves from the French guns:

Their light-armed archers far and near
  Surveyed the tangled ground,
Their centre ranks with pike and spear
  A twilight forest frowned,
Their barbèd horsemen, in the rear,
  The stern battalia crowned.
No cymbal clashed, no clarion rang,
  Still were the pipe and drum;
Save heavy tread, and armour's clang,
  The sullen march was dumb.
There breathed no wind their crests to shake,
  Or wave their flags abroad;
Scarce the frail aspen seemed to quake,
  That shadowed o'er their road.
Their vaward scouts no tidings bring,
  Can rouse no lurking foe,
Nor spy a trace of living thing,
  Save when they stirred the roe;
The host moves, like a deep sea-wave,
Where rise no rocks its pride to brave,
  High-swelling, dark, and slow.
The lake is passed, and now they gain
A narrow and a broken plain,
Before the Trosachs' rugged jaws;
And here the horse and spear men pause,
While, to explore the dangerous glen,
Dive through the pass the archer-men.
At once there rose so wild a yell
Within that dark and narrow dell,
As all the fiends, from heaven that fell,
Had pealed the banner-cry of hell!
  Forth from the pass in tumult driven,
  Like chaff before the winds of heaven,
    The archery appear:
  For life! for life! their flight they ply—
  And shriek, and shout, and battle-cry,
  And plaids and bonnets waving high,
  And broad-swords flashing to the sky,
    Are maddening in their rear.

Onward they drive in dreadful race,
  Pursuers and pursued ;
Before that tide of flight and chase,
How shall it keep its rooted place,
  The spearmen's twilight wood ?
"Down, down," cried Mar, "your lances down !
  Bear back both friend and foe !"
Like reeds before the tempest's frown,
That serried grove of lances brown
  At once lay levelled low ;
And closely shouldering side to side,
The bristling ranks the onset bide,—
"We'll quell the savage mountaineer,
  As their Tinchel cows the game !
They come as fleet as forest deer,
  We'll drive them back as tame."

Scott had begun "Waverley" in 1805, and then laid it aside and resumed it in 1810, but still left it unfinished. In 1811 he published "The Vision of Don Roderick;" and in the original preface to this poem, he alludes to two events which had cruelly interrupted his task: the successive deaths of his kind friend, the Lord President of the Court of Session (Blair), and his early patron, Henry Dundas, Viscount Melville. The immediate proceeds of the poem were forwarded to the board in London, formed for the purpose of affording relief to the Portuguese who had suffered from the war in the Peninsula. Scott says, in a letter to Mr. Morritt, who had lost a dear young friend in the battle of Barrosa:

> Silver and gold have I none, but that which I have I will give unto thee. My lyrics are called, "The Vision of Don Roderick;" you remember the story of the last Gothic King of Spain descending into an enchanted cavern to know the fate of the Moorish invasion,—that is my machinery. Pray do not mention this, for someone will snatch up the subject, as I have been served before ; and I have not written a line yet. I am going to Ashestiel for eight days to fish and rhyme.

The poem was received with favour, and called forth letters of admiration from Canning, Sir Adam Fergusson, and Lady Wellington ; but though it contains some fine stanzas, yet we must admit the justice of Mr. Palgrave's criticism, who describes it as "an unsuccessful attempt to blend the past history of Spain with the interests of the Peninsular war."

The year 1812 was an eventful one in Scott's life. As the death of Mr. Horne had placed him in the enjoyment of the clerkship of Session, his income was now £2,000 a year, independently of any profits from his literary labours. He felt, therefore, he could indulge a desire, long entertained, of possessing a house of his own. His lease of Ashestiel was about to expire, and he resolved to purchase a piece of ground sufficient for a cottage and a few fields. These stretched along the Tweed,

near half-way between Melrose and Selkirk; and the whole farm, of one hundred acres in extent, once belonged to the great Abbey of Melrose, of which it commanded a fine view. Its name was Abbotsford. The farm-house was small and in bad condition, but it was situated on land connected with many romantic associations, and the site was one of great natural picturesqueness and beauty; while the Tweed, which he loved, flowed broad and bright through undulating grounds, and was overhung by the alder and the birch. The price was moderate, about £4,000; and, as Lockhart says, "his prophetic eye already beheld rich pastures, embowered among flourishing groves, where his children's children should thank the founder." At first his idea did not go beyond a cottage with two spare bedrooms, with dressing-rooms, each of which on a pinch would have a couch-bed; and as he eagerly pressed the work on, it was sufficiently completed to allow of his removal to it in the summer of 1812. He and Mrs. Scott "were not a little proud," as he writes to his brother-in-law, Mr. Carpenter, "of being greeted as the Laird and Lady of Abbotsford;" and he celebrated his occupation of his new abode by a grand gala to all the Scotts in the county, from the duke to the peasant, who were to dance on the green to the sound of the bagpipes and drink whisky-punch. "We are very clannish in this corner."

Of the £4,000 which Scott paid for the original farm of Abbotsford, he borrowed one-half from his eldest brother, Major John Scott; the other moiety was raised by the Ballantynes, and advanced on the security of the, as yet, unwritten, though long-meditated, poem of "Rokeby." He had requested Mr. Stark, of Edinburgh, an architect of some talent, to give him a design for an ornamental cottage in the style of the old-English vicarage-house, but, before this could be done, Mr. Stark died. Checked for a season by this occurrence, Scott's plans gradually expanded; and twelve years afterwards the site was occupied, not by a cottage, but a castle.

Scott was now engaged upon two poems, of which the longer, "Rokeby," appeared first, being published at the beginning of the year 1813. The scene is laid near Greta Bridge, in Yorkshire, the seat of his friend Morritt. Scott, when on a visit to his friend, had been struck with the extreme loveliness of the place—its romantic variety of glen, torrent and copse, and the flow of two beautiful rivers, the Greta and the Tees, which unite their streams in the wooded demesne. He now made it the scene of a poem whose action was laid in the civil war of Charles I. The whole edition of 3,250 copies was sold off within a week, but the demand was sooner satisfied than that for his earlier poems; and though Lockhart is warm in his praise of many incidents and passages, he is "compelled to confess that

it has never been so much a favourite with the public at large as any other of his poetical romances." Scott's own description of it to Mr. Ellis was that of a pseudo-romance of pseudo-chivalry. He had converted a lusty buccaneer into a hero with some effect, but the worst of all his undertakings was that his rogue, always in spite of him, turned out his hero. But, in defiance of this perversion or conversion, he hoped the thing would do, chiefly because the world would not expect from him a poem of which the interest turned upon *character*. "If it was fair for him to say anything of his own poems, he would say that the force in the 'Lay' is thrown on style; in 'Marmion,' on description; and in the 'Lady of the Lake' on incident."

There is no doubt that "Rokeby" shows exhaustion, and though Morritt assured Scott that he considered it the best of all his poems—his judgment no doubt being biased, as he was lord of the beautiful demesne where the scene is laid—yet Moore ventured to raise a good-humoured laugh at it, as the poem owed its existence to being the abode of a friend, hinting that if Scott had any friends equally valued in the more southern counties, their seats might come to be celebrated in the same manner. "Mr. Scott," he wrote,

> Having quitted the Borders to seek new renown,
> Is coming by long quarto stages to town;
> And beginning with Rokeby (the jade's sure to pay),
> Means to do all the gentlemen's seats by the way.

Nevertheless the poems contains some graceful and spirited songs. Here is one:

> "A weary lot is thine, fair maid,
> A weary lot is thine!
> To pull the thorn thy brow to braid,
> And press the rue for wine!
> A lightsome eye, a soldier's mien,
> A feather of the blue,
> A doublet of the Lincoln green,—
> No more of me you knew,
> My love!
> No more of me you knew.
>
> This morn is merry June, I trow,
> The rose is budding fain;
> But she shall bloom in winter snow,
> Ere we two meet again."
> He turned his charger as he spake,
> Upon the river shore,
> He gave his bridle-reins a shake,
> Said, "Adieu for evermore,
> My love!
> And adieu for evermore."

Here is another, "The Cavalier":

While the dawn of the mountain was misty and gray,
My True Love has mounted his steed and away,
Over hill, over valley, o'er dale, and o'er down ;
Heaven shield the brave gallant that fights for the Crown.

He has doffed the silk doublet the breatplate to bear,
He has placed the steel-cap o'er his long flowing hair,
From his belt to his stirrup his broadsword hangs down,—
Heaven shield the brave gallant that fights for the Crown !

For the rights of fair England that broadsword he draws ;
Her King is his leader, her Church is his cause ;
His watchword is honour, his pay is renown,—
GOD strike with the gallant that strikes for the Crown.

They may boast of their Fairfax, their Waller, and all
The round-headed rebels of Westminster Hall ;
But tell these bold traitors of London's proud town
That the spears of the North have encircled the Crown.

There's Derby and Cavendish, dread of their foes ;
There's Erin's high Ormond, and Scotland's Montrose !
Would you match the base Skippon, and Massey, and Brown,
With the Barons of England, that fight for the Crown !

Now joy to the crest of the brave Cavalier !
Be his banner unconquered, resistless his spear,
Till in peace and in triumph his toils he may drown
In a pledge to fair England, her Church, and her Crown !

Scott's other poem, "The Bridal of Triermain," was published anonymously early in the year 1813, and in the hope that even his most intimate friends would not discover the author. "He had even," as he afterwards said, "tried to mix something that might resemble (as far as was in his power) the feeling and manner of a friend who was more than suspected of a taste for poetry, Mr. Erskine." Lockhart thinks it next to impossible that many should have been deceived ; but the Reviewer in the *Quarterly* was taken in—though it was probably Scott's own intimate friend, Mr. Ellis. The Reviewer spoke of the poem as "an imitation of Scott's style ; one which, if inferior in vigour to some of his productions, equals or surpasses them in elegance and beauty, and is more uniformly tender." The diction "reminds him of a rhythm and cadence he had heard before ; but the sentiments, descriptions and character have qualities that are native and unborrowed." The subject was taken from the Arthurian legends, though the particular episode in his history was due to the poet's own invention, and the scene was laid in the lovely vale of St. John. This valley had an especial charm for Scott, for it was at a ball in the neighbourhood that he first met his wife, and in the vision of Lyulph he describes the most striking features in a district of the English Lake Country, which is "beautiful exceedingly." Those who have visited the valley of St. John on their way from Keswick to Grasmere, know well the black rocks and the roaring stream, the lofty hills and the narrow dale, the mound that rises with airy turrets crowned,

which in the dim twilight, or when the mists and clouds gather round its head, seems like a castle's massive walls. But here is the passage itself:

He rode, till over down and dell
The shade more broad and deeper fell,
And though around the mountain's head
Flowed streams of purple, gold, and red,
Dark at the base, unblessed by beam,
Frowned the black rocks, and roared the stream.
With toil the king his way pursued
By lonely Threlkeld's waste and wood,
Till on his course obliquely shone
The narrow valley of Saint John,
Down sloping to the western sky,
Where lingering sunbeams love to lie.
Right glad to feel those beams again,
The king drew up his charger's rein;
With gauntlet raised he screened his sight,
As dazzled with the level light,
And, from beneath his glove of mail,
Scanned at his ease the lovely vale,
While 'gainst the sun his armour bright
Gleamed ruddy like the beacon's light.

Paled in by many a lofty hill,
The narrow dale lay smooth and still,
And, down its verdant bosom led,
A winding brooklet found its bed.
But midmost of the vale, a mound
Arose, with airy turrets crowned,
Buttress, and rampire's circling bound,
And mighty keep and tower;
Seemed some primeval giant's hand
The castle's massive walls had planned,
A pond'rous bulwark, to withstand,
Ambitious Nimrod's power.
Above the moated entrance slung,
The balanced drawbridge trembling hung,
As jealous of a foe;
Wicket of oak, as iron hard,
With iron studded, clenched, and barred,
And pronged portcullis, joined to guard
The gloomy pass below.
But the gray walls no banners crowned,
Upon the watch-tower's airy round
No warder stood his horn to sound,
No guard beside the bridge was found,
And, where the Gothic gateway frowned
Glanced neither bill nor bow.

Once more, and for the last time, did Scott court the judgment of the public with a poem; but before he did so, he had broken new ground as a novelist, and the reception which "Waverley" received induced him for the future to devote himself to prose as a vehicle for fiction.

Before proceeding to speak of his novels, I shall conclude

what I have to say of his poems. Not long after the publication of "The Bridal of Triermain," he had the flattering offer from the Prince Regent, of his own free motion, to make him Poet Laureate; but though finding a difficulty in declining an honour which was meant both as a compliment and a service, yet his own judgment induced him to do so, and his friends approved of his determination. He feared that "if he accepted the post he should be well quizzed," and dreaded lest, favoured as he had been by the public, he might be considered, with some justice, as engrossing a petty emolument which might do real service to some poorer brother of the Muses. He was the more satisfied with his decision when, through his influence, the offer was made to Southey, the man nearest himself in literary reputation, and whose circumstances did not make him equally indifferent to an increase of income.

The scenery of the Western Isles had impressed his fancy as full of poetical suggestion on a visit to the Laird of Staffa, and he resolved to place the action of the "Lord of the Isles" amidst the mountains and mists, the lakes and islands of Skye and Arran. It was published in January, 1815. Both the *Edinburgh Review* and the *Quarterly* spoke in warm praise of its glow of colouring, its energy of narration, and its amplitude of description. "Mr. Scott," says the *Quarterly*, "infuses into his narrative such a flow of life and, if we may so express ourselves, of animal spirits, that without satisfying the judgment, or moving the feelings, or elevating the mind, or even very greatly interesting the curiosity, he is able to seize upon, and, as it were, exhilarate the imagination of his readers, in a manner which is often truly unaccountable." Each reviewer tempered his praises with a suggestion of defects both in the language and in the composition of the story, and complained that the poet neglected to bestow on his work "that common degree of labour and meditation which it is scarcely decorous to withhold." The poem contains, however, many fine passages, and the character of Robert the Bruce, who is its real hero, is delineated with surpassing power, while the picture of Bannockburn in hardly inferior to the description of Flodden Field in "Marmion." The heroines, too, are painted with the utmost delicacy, and their difference of character is indicated by exquisite and beautiful touches.

The first edition of 1,800 copies in quarto was rapidly disposed of, but the demand was not sustained as had been that of the former poems, and the falling off was decided; and Scott, who was wholly unprepared for this result, felt keenly the disappointment. There is no doubt that this decline in his popularity as a poet was owing in a great measure to the rising of a new and brilliant star in the poetical horizon, and that

Byron, who was now throwing off his Eastern tales with unexampled rapidity, was supplanting Scott in public favour. In the "Giaour," the "Corsair," the "Bride of Abydos," and "Parisina," Byron, by the intensity of his passion, the richness of his imagination, and his mastery over language, took the fancy captive, and, for the time being, rendered all competition hopeless. Scott felt that he was overshadowed by the genius of Byron, and, only expressing a wonder that his poetical popularity should have lasted so long, determined to confine himself to the writing of novels.

In his last poem, "The Lord of the Isles," there is the same feeling for colour, the same glow as in his other poems; the same passionate love of the beautiful and picturesque; the same rush and force in the battle scene, and the same life thrown into Nature, though he never lends her a soul as does Wordsworth, so notably in that magnificent poem, "Tintern Abbey." There is a graphic piece of word-painting in the following description of Lake Corriskin:

"This lake," said Bruce, "whose barriers drear
Are precipices sharp and sheer,
Yielding no track for goat or deer,
Save the black shelves we tread,
How term you its dark waves? and how
Yon northern mountain's pathless brow,
And yonder peak of dread,
That to the evening sun uplifts
The grisly gulphs and slaty rifts,
Which seam its shivered head?"—
"Corriskin call the dark lake's name,
Coolin the ridge, as bards proclaim,
From old Cuchullin, chief of fame.
But bards, familiar in our isles
Rather with Nature's frowns than smiles,
Full oft their careless humours please
By sportive names for scenes like these.
I would old Torquil were to show
His Maidens with their breasts of snow,
Or that my noble Liege were nigh
To hear his Nurse sing lullaby!
(The Maids—tall cliffs with breakers white,
The Nurse—a torrent's roaring might.)
Or that your eye could see the mood
Of Corrievreken's whirlpool rude,
When dons the Hag her whitened hood."
Huge terraces of granite black
Afforded rude and cumbered track;
For from the mountain hoar,
Hurled headlong in some night of fear,
When yelled the wolf and fled the deer,
Loose crags had toppled o'er;
And some, chance-poised and balanced, lay,
So that a stripling arm might sway
A mass no host could raise,

In Nature's rage at random thrown,
Yet trembling like the Druid's stone
On its precarious base.
The evening mists, with ceaseless change,
Now clothed the mountains' lofty range,
Now left their foreheads bare,
And round the skirts their mantle furled,
Or on the sable waters curled,
Or, on the eddying breezes whirled,
Dispersed in middle air,
And oft, condensed, at once they lower,
When, brief and fierce, the mountain shower
Pours like a torrent down,
And when return the sun's glad beams,
Whitened with foam a thousand streams,
Leap from the mountain's crown.

Let us now turn to the immortal Waverley novels, in which Scott shone without a rival, and in which his genius is most fully displayed. "Waverley," the first of the brilliant series, appeared on the 7th of July, 1814, and was published anonymously, being left to win its way in the world without any of the usual recommendations. Begun in 1805, it had been laid aside, and was now finished in a time incredibly short, the last two volumes having been written in three weeks. It had a success unprecedented in the case of an anonymous novel, and put forth at what is known among publishers as "the dead season." The whole impression of 1,000 copies disappeared within a few weeks, and edition after edition was rapidly called for. Scott's aim as a novelist was to attempt for his own country something of the same kind with that which Miss Edgeworth had so fortunately achieved for Ireland—something which might introduce her natives to those of the sister kingdom in a more favourable light than they had hitherto been placed, and might "tend to procure sympathy for their virtues and indulgence for their foibles." Till near the close of his career as an author, Scott clung to his incognito; one reason for secrecy being lest a comparative failure, or even a moderate success in fiction, should endanger the great reputation he had gained as a poet. Another reason may have been that it stimulated his imagination, and gratified the boyish pleasure which he had in wearing a mask to the outside world. As Morritt, however, foretold, his disguise was penetrated by some of his friends, and the Reviewer in the *Edinburgh* closed his notice of the book with the suggestion that "if it were indeed the work of an author hitherto unknown, Mr. Scott would do well to look to his laurels." The disguise Scott persisted in maintaining, even after it had been seen through; and it was not till after the ruin of Ballantyne's affairs that novel after novel was issued with any other description of the writer than as "The Author of

'Waverley.'" There is an anecdote told of Scott when, in the height of his fame, he paid a visit to London in the year 1815. The Prince Regent, wishing to do him honour, asked him to dinner; and as the authorship of "Waverley" was still unavowed, the Prince thought he could make a custom, usual in those days at dinner-tables, available to extract a confession of the truth. The Regent filled his glass, and called for a bumper, with all the honours, to "The Author of Waverley." Scott was not a man to be taken by surprise. He, too, filled his glass, and "since His Royal Highness looked as if he thought he had some claim to the honour of this toast," explained that he had no such pretensions, but promised to "take care that the real Simon Pure should hear of the high compliment that had been now paid him." But neither was the Regent to be baffled in his purpose. Once more he filled his glass, and demanded "another of the same to the author of 'Marmion'; and now, Walter, my man," he added, "I have checkmated you for once!" —the checkmate being an allusion to an anecdote that had just before been told by Scott of a well-known Scotch judge. Other dinner-parties followed, and all of them flattering to the distinguished guest; and as a lasting memorial of his visit, the Prince gave him a golden snuff-box, set with diamonds, and further embellished with his own portrait on the lid.

Scott's power as a novelist is seen in the ease with which he takes you back to days long gone by, and paints them with a truth and with a freshness unsurpassed and unrivalled by any other writer but Shakespeare. It is not merely the life of his own time and country that he describes, but he transports you to the distant scenes of the past, and makes us live amid the political and religious controversies of those days, showing us how the men long dead were affected and influenced by the public strifes and social interests of their age. Not that he neglects the private passions of individuals, but these are not the all in all of the story, but are closely associated with the public life and the historical interests of the epoch in which the scene is laid. Not only does he paint the lights and shades of Scottish life and character, its richest humour and its purest pathos, but he portrays for us the ambitions of the great, the jealousy of nobles, the forethought of statesmen, the craft of kings, the policy of courtiers, the tenderness of women; and so great is his power that we "weep with them that weep, and rejoice with them that do rejoice." And what a variety of characters he has drawn for us in his novels! He paints with a life-like brush kings and queens, princes and peasants, statesmen and courtiers, lawyers and farmers, freebooters and preachers, gipsies and beggars.

Scott's heroes may sometimes be a little colourless, with not

enough of decision in their character, prone to reasoning when action is demanded; and hesitating when it would have been more natural to yield to their sympathies, or to be carried away by impulse. He confessed himself the weakness of his own heroes. "Edward Waverley," he said, was "a sneaking piece of imbecility;" and "if he had married Flora she would have set him up upon the chimney-piece, as Count Borowlaski's wife used to do with him. I am a bad hand at depicting a hero, properly so called, and have an unfortunate propensity for the dubious characters of borderers, buccaneers, highland robbers and all others of a Robin Hood description."

But Scott does himself injustice; many of his men are living and informed with the very spirit of genius, Scott breathing his own life into the character. I cannot think that Carlyle judges him aright when he says that "these great types of his are drawn from the outside, and not made actually to live":

> His Baillie Jarvis, Dinmont, Dalgettys (for their name is legion) do look and talk like what they give themselves out for; they are, if not created and made poetically alive, yet deceptively enacted, as a good player might do them. What more is wanted, then? For the reader, lying on a sofa, nothing more; yet for another sort of reader, much. It were a long chapter to unfold the difference in drawing a character between a Scott, and a Shakespeare, and a Goethe. Yet it is a difference literally immense; they are of a different species; the value of the one is not to be counted in the coin of the other. We might say in a short word, which covers a long matter, that your Shakespeare fashions his characters from the heart outwards; your Scott fashions them from the skin inwards, never getting near the heart of them. The one set become living men and women; the other amount to little more than mechanical cases, deceptively painted automatons.

But is it true of Scott that he "fashions his heroes from the skin inwards, never getting near the heart of them"? Can this be said of Balfour of Burley, or Dalgetty, of Rob Roy, of Richard the Lionhearted, or Saladin? Can it hold for one moment when you consider how powerfully he has drawn the great figures of Louis XI. and Charles the Bold, as he paints for us the historical portraits of the Dukes of Argyle, and Claverhouse, and Monmouth, of Sussex and of Leicester; of Elizabeth Tudor and Mary Stuart? And what a gallery of fair women we have in the romances and novels! Lucy Ashton and Amy Robsart, Catherine Seyton, Di Vernon, Edith Bellenden and Alice Lee, Jeanie Deans and Madge Wildfire, Meg Merrilies and the fascinating Queen of Scotland! And all are drawn with such an exquisite touch that we know not which most to admire, the purity of the conception, or the delicacy of the execution. These women are all the direct intuitions of genius, and will live so long as the English language is spoken—will live beside Juliet, and Desdemona, and Imogen; beside Beatrice, and Portia, and Viola, and the other lovely

pictures of pure womanhood for which we are indebted to Shakespeare. Many, too, are the scenes in the novels which are unsurpassed for vividness and brilliancy, and which, taking us back to the times and events which they describe, impress us with their grandeur, or touch us by their force. They are certainly "painted from the heart outwards," and not "from the skin inwards." Instances of such scenes will occur to the reader when he recalls "Quentin Durward," "Ivanhoe," "The Talisman," "Old Mortality," "The Bride of Lammermoor," and others of the same interest, picturesqueness and beauty, whether dealing with Scotland or with other countries. As to descriptions of nature, I will give only one passage, in which, as Ruskin says in one of the numbers of his "Præterita," "he has contrasted with the utmost masterhood the impressions of English and Scotch landscapes." Few scenes of the world have been oftener described, with the utmost skill and sincerity of authors, than the view from Richmond Hill sixty years since; but none can be compared with the ten lines in "The Heart of Midlothian":

> A huge sea of verdure, with crossing and intersecting promontories of massive and tufted groves, was tenanted by numberless flocks and herds, which seemed to wander unrestrained and unbounded through the rich pastures. The Thames, here turreted with villas, and there garlanded with forests, moved on slowly and placidly, like the mighty monarch of the scene, to whom all its other beauties were but accessories, and bore on his bosom a hundred barks and skiffs, whose white sails and gaily fluttering pennons gave life to the whole.

As the Duke of Argyle looked on this inimitable landscape, his thoughts naturally reverted to his own more grand and scarce less beautiful domain of Inverary.

> "This is a fine scene," he said to his companion, curious, perhaps, to draw out her sentiments; "we have nothing like it in Scotland." "It's braw rich feeding for the cows, and they have a fine breed o' cattle here," replied Jeanie, "but I like quite as weel to look at the craigs of Arthur's Seat, and the sea coming in anent than as at a' these muckle trees."

Ruskin, in the same number of "Præterita" (vol. iii., chap. iv.), after, in my opinion, a somewhat unjust judgment of the novels that deal with the history of other nations, makes these eulogistic remarks on the *Scotch* novels: "'Waverley,' 'Guy Mannering,' 'The Antiquary,' 'Old Mortality,' 'The Heart of Midlothian,' 'The Abbot,' 'Redgauntlet,' and 'The Fortunes of Nigel'—they *are*, whatever the modern world may think of them, as faultless throughout as human work can be, and eternal examples of the ineffable art which is taught by the loveliest Nature to her truest children."

But let us return to Scott himself. Towards the end of November, 1818, Scott received from his friend Lord Sidmouth, then Secretary of State for the Home Department, the formal announce-

ment of the Prince Regent's desire to confer on him the rank of baronet. The offer was made by the Regent in this year, though it was not actually conferred till after George's accession, on the 30th of March, 1820. He was the first baronet that George IV. made on succeeding to the throne after his long regency, and Scott accepted the gracious and unsolicited honour, not only gratefully, but with extreme pride, because it was offered by the King himself, and was in no way due to the prompting of any Minister's advice. "Several of my ancestors," he writes to Joanna Baillie, "bore the title in the seventeenth century, and were it of consequence, I have no reason to be ashamed of the descent, and the respectable persons who connect me with that period, when they carried into the field, like Madoc,

> The Crescent, at whose gleam the Cumbrian oft,
> Cursing his perilous tenure, wound his horn ;

so that, as a gentleman, I may stand on as good a footing as other new creations."

It speaks well for George IV. that he knew how to value Scott; and if his friendship did honour to the poet, it equally did honour to the King. Scott had no doubt a strong personal devotion to his sovereign, despite all his vices; but it betrays a weakness in his character to know that, after his intimacy with the Regent, he began to change his tone with regard to the Princess of Wales. For at first his relations with her were most friendly, and he spoke of an invitation to dine with her at Blackheath, in 1806, as a great honour. In the introduction to the third canto of "Marmion" he wrote a tribute to her father, the Duke of Brunswick:

> Or deem'st thou not our later time,
> Yields topic meet for classic rhyme ?
> Hast thou no elegiac verse
> For Brunswick's venerable hearse ?

And, at the close of the passage, he has the following spirited lines:

> And when revolves, in time's sure change,
> The hour of Germany's revenge,
> When breathing fury for her sake,
> Some new dominion shall awake,
> Her champion, ere he strike, shall come
> To whet his sword on Brunswick's tomb.

In acknowledgment of this tribute to her father's memory, he received from the Princess a handsome silver vase. He had written, in 1806, some lines on Lord Melville's acquittal when impeached by the Liberal Government, and in these he introduces this verse about the Princess Caroline:

> Our King too, our Princess,—I dare not say more, sir,—
> May Providence watch them with mercy and might !

While there's one Scottish hand that can wag a claymore, sir,
They shall ne'er want a friend to stand up for their right.
Be damn'd he that dare not,
For my part I'll spare not
To beauty afflicted a tribute to give;
Fill it up steadily,
Drink it off readily,
Here's to the Princess, and long may she live!

But however ready he may have been at this time to "stand up" for the Princess, it shows that he shared in the weaknesses common to humanity; for after his intimacy with the Prince Regent began, he grew colder towards her, and, deserting to the other side, spoke of her only with severity.

(*To be concluded.*)

ART. IV.—THOUGHTS ON THE DECALOGUE.

THE Decalogue is the centre and pivot of the Old Testament revelation, as the doctrine of the Cross is of Christianity. Sinai and Calvary are the sites on which were reared the two temples in whose shrines respectively the Mind of God was revealed in justice and in mercy, in righteousness and in grace, in demanding from us and in giving to us, or, to use more theological terms, our sanctification and our justification. Hence, as "the Old Testament is not contrary to the New," as the seventh Article of our Church hath it; and, in the well-known words of St. Augustine, "the New Testament is concealed in the Old, and the Old is revealed in the New," they must not be separated, as the Gnostics of old and some of the sectaries of our own day have taught; nor should we join in the raid made against the Hebrew Scriptures, by attacking the authorship of the books, changing the order and sequence of the facts, disputing the validity of the laws and the futurity of the prophecies contained therein, as is the sad wont of the rationalistic school; but our part should rather be to follow in the footsteps of the Apostles and early Fathers and all orthodox teachers in all subsequent generations, and learn, in the suggestive features of the type, to fill in the perfections of the antitype. The Old Testament must be our pædagogue to lead us to the School of Christ. The Ten Commandments, the moral law, have ever been held by the universal Church of Christ to be the embodiment of our duties to God and to man. It is true, and must ever be remembered and carefully guarded, that our justification before God is not the result of the poor and partial obedience which the Christian renders—yet inasmuch as the law is the revelation of the Mind

of God, and is therefore, like God Himself, unchangeable, it must ever remain the standard of our obedience, and all that have the "mind of Christ" must seek not "to destroy but to fulfil the law;" the motive in so doing not being to justify ourselves thereby, but to glorify God by loving gratitude. Our obedience to the law is the effect, and not the cause, of our acceptance with God, but it is the effect, and, as such, is as necessary to our faith as the fruit is to the tree or the harvest to the field. Whatever, therefore, throws light upon any portion of this code of laws, will furnish a theme of interest to the Christian student. It is not our purpose to attempt an exposition of the Commandments, but only to throw out some general remarks, and then select a few passages for special consideration.

If we inspect the two tables of the law, allotting five commandments to each table,[1] we shall be struck with the fact that each table begins with the most heinous sin of its class: the one against God, and the other against our neighbour. And as the commandments proceed in order, the sin forbidden is, relatively speaking, a less grievous one than that which is prohibited in the next preceding commandment. This holds good in both tables: a violation of the second commandment is not so awful an act of presumption as the violation of the first, nor of the third as of the second, and so on. In like manner, in the second table, the perpetration of murder is a deed of deeper dye than the act forbidden in the seventh, which, in turn, is a worse crime than theft, and so on.

But then, it must be observed, that, as the sins prohibited in each table decrease step by step in awfulness and atrocity, so, by inverse ratio, does the spirituality of obedience to the commandments increase. This may best be traced by reflecting that a man who would not dishonour his parents would not dishonour God; that he who would not break the Sabbath would surely not profane God's Name; that he who revered the Name of God would certainly not make an idol: and the man who abhorred idolatry would never set up a rival against the one true God. In like manner, the man who would not covet his neighbour's goods would certainly not do him a worse injury by false testimony which might endanger his character or even his life, and he who respected these might be well trusted not to steal his neighbour's property; and he who would not rob him of the less would not deprive him of his greater and dearer treasure; and he who would shudder at the thought of such a deed would never be guilty of depriving him of the greatest possession of all, that is, his life.

Further, it is worthy of notice that each commandment specifies, and is directed against, the greatest and grossest sin of its class. The purport of this is not to exclude the less, but

[1] See CHURCHMAN, No. xxix., New Series, p. 249.

to include all the sins of every degree that come under that particular category. Thus our Lord Himself explained that the sixth commandment prohibited anger as well as bloodshed; and that the lustful eye was as guilty in the judgment of God as the lustful act. This key to the interpretation of the Decalogue opens out before us a vast array of indictments; and as we examine our thoughts and words and works under the scrutiny of such a test, we must confess that "the law is holy and just and good" in itself; but when its strong glory-light is turned upon our hearts, it is a "ministry of condemnation."

Having ventured to throw out these thoughts for the consideration of our readers, we pass on to examine some special passages, which contain features of interest to the critical student. The first passage that seems to contain much more than it appears to do when viewed in the garb of our English translation is the First Commandment: "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me," A.V. The R.V. has the same, with the trifling exception of "none" for "no"; but it adds a marginal rendering, "beside Me." With these we may compare the Prayer-Book version in the office of the Holy Communion and in the Catechism: "Thou shalt have none other gods but Me." Let us turn to our Hebrew Bible, and the literal rendering of the words is, "There shall not be (sing.) to thee other gods in addition to My face." Before entering on an investigation of these words, it may be well to see how they were translated in the early versions. The LXX. has *Οὐκ ἔσονταί σοι θεοὶ ἕτεροι πλὴν ἐμοῦ*. The other Greek versions have not been preserved in this place. The Syriac has, "There shall not be (pl.) to thee other gods beside me" (*lebar meni*), literally, *outside from Me*—that is, *extra Me, beside Me*. The Vulgate renders, "Non habebis deos alienos coram Me." Some have found a difficulty in the verb in the Hebrew text being in the singular, but this should really cause no surprise, as when the verb stands before its subject in Hebrew it is often in the singular, though its subject which stands after it in position is plural. It will be observed that both the LXX. and the Syriac have avoided all difficulty by rendering the verb in the plural. The word of chief interest in the Hebrew sentence is *My face* (literally, *faces*). What are we to understand by this phrase? As the face is the exponent of a man, of his person, character, abilities and powers, this term is employed in Scripture to convey to us the manifestation of the invisible God, of His being and purposes; the "face of Jehovah" is therefore equivalent to the more frequent phrase, the "Angel of Jehovah." Thus, in Exod. xxxiii. 14, we read: "My face shall go," and in the next verse Moses replies: "If Thy face go not, carry us not up hence." By com-

paring this passage with ch. xxiii. 20, 21, the identity of the "face" with the "Angel" of Jehovah will be apparent. In Isaiah lxiii. 8, 9, this identity is still more emphasized: "He (Jehovah) became their *Saviour . . . and the Angel of His face saved them,*" where we undoubtedly have a combination of the two passages in Exodus. Now, according to the plainest inferences from Holy Scripture, and according to the unanimous consent of the fathers of the ante-Nicene period, the Angel of Jehovah was identified with the pre-Incarnate Son, the Wisdom and Word of God, the Second Person in the ever-blessed Trinity. And as we have identified the "face" with the "Angel," it follows that by "face" we are here to understand that Divine Agent or Administrator of the Father, by whom He made the worlds and revealed His will and purposes to His people. We must now give our attention to the preposition that stands before this word. The preposition עַל, which the LXX. rendered by πλήν, the Syriac by *lebar*, and the Vulgate by *coram*, signifies, radically, *higher*, hence *over* and *above* a thing, and frequently, by a natural consequence, *in addition to*. In this sense we find it in Gen. xxviii. 9, "in addition to his wives." Similarly, in Gen. xxxi. 50, "in addition to my daughters." Deut. xix. 9, "in addition to these three." And in ch. xxiii. 13 (probably), "in addition to thy weapon." And Psa. xvi. 2, "in addition to thee." This seems to have been the interpretation intended by the LXX., as πλήν is a contraction of πλέον, *more than Me, beside Me*. So also the Syriac. The Vulgate, from which evidently our English versions are derived, is wider of the mark. It is worthy of notice that all these authorities identify the "face" with God Himself. Taking, then, the preposition in the above sense—"in addition to My face"—we arrive at the following interpretation: Thou shalt have no other gods in addition to My presence or manifestation, as made in the "Angel of the Covenant"—the Logos, who ever represented and manifested the Deity to the patriarchs, and who afterwards, in the fulness of time, became flesh and manifested His Father's glory to the world. Hence in the commandment which seems to insist upon the unity of God with a special emphasis, we find a testimony to the Person of the Son; and this commandment, which teaches the unity of the Godhead, takes us, therefore, a long way on the road to the acknowledging of the doctrine of the Trinity.

The next passage which we select for consideration is the closing portion of the Second Commandment, comprising the latter part of the fifth verse and the sixth: "Visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate Me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love Me and keep My command-

ments." (A.V.) The R.V. renders: "Visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, upon the third and upon the fourth generation of them that hate Me; and showing mercy unto thousands, of them that love Me and keep My commandments." And a marginal alternative is given for "thousands," "A thousand generations," see Deut. vii. 9. The difference between the two versions in the suggested interpretation of the passage is chiefly marked by the introduction of the comma after "thousands" in the R.V. With reference to the earlier portion of this passage, it is held by some that there is an inevitable heredity of sin, that children, both in moral character and physical constitution, inherit the fruits of parental and ancestral misdoings, and that this is a continuous evidence of the judgment of God against sin, but that such a transmission of suffering for the sins of others is restricted to our present condition, and does not extend to our future state of being. This limiting of the punishment to the third or, at the utmost, to the fourth generation, shows a purpose. Man not unfrequently lives to see the third and sometimes the fourth line of his descendants,[1] and if so, he would survive to see the evil results of his own iniquities, and no chastisement can be more terrible to anyone than to see sons and sons' sons, and those that are born of them, labouring under pains and woes which are the outcome of his own sins, while the sufferers themselves are guiltless before God. On the other hand, the Targum and various other authorities, patristic and modern, hold that such a dark legacy bequeathed from preceding generations was only effective of calamity and disgrace in the case of those who followed the evil example of their progenitors. The objection to this interpretation seems to be that it is self-evident that sinful children are punished as well as sinful parents. In the latter portion of the passage a question arises, does the "thousands" refer to the vast multitude of the obedient, descendants or non-descendants of the pious, all who have been connected with them by any ties? In other words, is the sinfulness of one party transmitted in direct lineage, and confined to such, whilst goodness is diffused generally and collaterally among all the belongings? Or is there here a special promise to the thousandth generation from the starting-point, including all that intervene, and so is the phrase equivalent to *for ever?* We must turn to the original,

[1] Fuerst takes the "third" generation to mean *grandchildren*, and "fourth" *great-grandchildren*. Gesenius and most other critics place each of these a generation more remote. "*Sons' sons*," they argue, is the proper phrase for grandchildren. By this computation grandchildren are omitted from the catalogue, which is very unlikely.

and then consult the versions. We translate the Hebrew literally, and arrange it so as to show the parallel contrasts:

Visiting iniquity of fathers
On sons, on third and fourth (generations),
  in case of My haters;
And doing mercy
  to thousands,
In case of My lovers,
And keepers of My commandments.

It will be noticed that the preposition עַל is used before "sons," and before the ordinal adjectives "third" and "fourth," but לְ before "My haters," "thousands," and "My lovers." The parallel is clear between "visiting iniquity" and "doing mercy," also between "My haters" and "My lovers." Thus "on sons, on third and fourth," will be left to correspond with "to thousands." The same preposition לְ being used in the three last places has caused confusion, but this will disappear when we remember that the verb *to visit* is used with עַל, and not with לְ, whereas *to show mercy* is used with לְ, and not with עַל. The necessities of the language demanded this difference; thus the parallel between "third and fourth generations" and "thousands" had to be expressed by the variation above stated.

The sense will thus be plain that God visits the iniquity of fathers on children unto the third and fourth generation in case of those that hate Him, and shows mercy to children of the thousandth generation in case of those that love Him and keep His commandments. It may be added that another cause of confusion exists in the fact that "third and fourth" are ordinals, whereas "thousand" is a numeral; but in Hebrew an ordinal form for this number does not exist. "Thousands," therefore, stands for thousandth — that is, the thousandth generation. This interpretation is substantiated by Deut. vii. 9, "keeping the covenant and the mercy in case of those that love Him and keep His commandments to a thousand generations." The difficulty above-named, that the passage states a truism, vanishes when we reflect that if a son saw the iniquity of his father and turned from it, he would at once break the continuity and commence a righteous generation; the meaning must, therefore, be that the punishment of parental sin is laid up for the third and fourth generation on its own account. It may be averted by repentance on the part of the son or descendant; but if unrepented of and repeated, it goes on accumulating guilt and treasuring up judgment. Such was the cause of the Babylonish captivity (2 Kings xxiv. 3, 4). This seems also to be the interpretation which our blessed Lord gave to this awful law of retribution—"Fill ye up then the measure of your fathers... that

upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily, I say unto you, all these things shall come upon this generation" (Matt. xxiii. 32, 35, 36). The LXX. and Vulgate give the somewhat loose rendering of the whole passage which our A.V. does. Whereas the rendering advocated above has the support of the Syriac and the Targum, the former of these expressly adds, "the thousandth *generation*."

The Third Commandment invites us to investigate its meaning. What is meant by the word לשוא? The LXX. has ἐπὶ ματαίῳ, Aquila gives εἰς εἰκῆ, the Syriac gives a paraphrase rather than an exact translation—"Thou shalt not swear by the name of the Lord thy God in a lie," and the Vulgate supports the LXX., "Non assumes Nomen Domini Dei tui in vanum." Both the A.V. and the R.V. give the familiar rendering, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain," the latter adding a marginal alternative, "or *for vanity* or *falsehood*." We have already said that each commandment expresses the most heinous form of the particular class of sins denounced. The sin here denounced is the profanation of the name of God. The exact meaning of the words contained in this commandment ought, therefore, to set before us the most aggravated example of this sin, which will, of course, include all lesser branches of the same. The verb, though its application is various, signifies to *lift up*, to *raise*, to *make to ascend*. In the words that follow, "the name of Jehovah thy God," the *name* is specified to be the great and incommunicable name of *Jehovah*. The radical passage which forms the basis of the one before us is Exod. iii. 13-15, with which may be compared Ex. vi. 3, but the word *name* in Hebrew usage does not mean simply the designation by which a person, whether Divine or human, is distinguished, but the essential qualities, character and attributes of the person. The "name" here, therefore, involves all that is comprehended in that name, the self-existence, the unchangeableness, the faithfulness of God. In the last word of the sentence the preposition means *to*, in the sense of "*belonging to*," hence it will signify, so as to *make it belong to*. And the noun signifies a *vanity*, a *nothingness*, a *lie*.[1] In this sense it is applied to *idols*, as in Ps. xxxi. 7, *the vanities of a lie, i.e.*, of an idol; and in Jer. xviii. 15, "They burnt incense to a lie," *i.e.*, to an idol. The *lie* throughout Scripture is closely allied to idolatry. This word seems chosen here with a special purpose. As the first commandment forbids the belief in any god but the true one, and the second forbids

[1] The cognate verb implies to be *vain, empty, false, lying*.

the making and worshipping the image of any creature, so does the third forbid the confusion of the true God with an idol. They were not to worship God under the form of an idol, or to ascribe the name of God to any such image. This was the sin of Aaron when he made the golden calf; he called it by the name of God: "These be thy gods," or rather, "This is thy God, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt;" and "To-morrow is a feast to Jehovah" (Ex. xxxii. 4, 5). He ascribed the name of God to a senseless vanity. The commandment thus interpreted will read: "Thou shalt not lift up (or ascribe) the name of Jehovah thy God to a vanity," that is, to an idol of any kind. We see, therefore, the different degrees and forms of idolatry forbidden, and each commandment has its own proper and peculiar scope. It is needless to repeat that this interpretation, which gives the greatest sin of its class, includes all false swearing, perjury and profane speech, which are all an applying of the sacred name to what is vain and empty and unreal.

This is not the place to enter upon what is called the Sabbath controversy; our purpose is only to point out some latent features of interest in the Fourth Commandment. The opening word "Remember" has a twofold aspect: it reminds us of the past, when God created the world, and rested on the seventh day, and sanctified it, and it also points to the future, that in all generations we should observe the day of rest. This commandment is a sacramental one. The Sabbath is a sacrament, whose outward sign is consecrated time, and its inward signification is the "rest that remaineth for the people of God." This "Remember" may be compared with the *ἀνάμνησις* in the institution of the Eucharist; it is the memorial of the past, and the assurance of the future. Another feature of interest is that this commandment, which concerns the *seventh* day, is itself divided into *seven* sections, and the central section contains *seven* particulars, thus: (1) Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy; (2) Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work: (3) But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; (4) [In it thou shalt not do any work—i., thou; ii., nor thy son; iii., nor thy daughter; iv., nor thy man-servant; v., nor thy maid-servant; vi., nor thy cattle; vii., nor the stranger that is within thy gates]. (5) For in six days the Lord made the heaven, the earth, the sea, and all that in them is, (6) and rested the seventh day, (7) wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it. Thus the signature of the covenant number of *seven* is imprinted on the commandment, itself witnessing, as it were, to its purport. The whole framework of the composition has been minutely and elaborately worked out in Forbes' "Symmetrical Structure of

Scripture," where much interesting matter, in addition to the above sketch, will be found. Some difficulty has been felt, especially of late years, that man should labour for six days, and rest on the seventh, for this reason, that in six days the Lord made the heaven and the earth, etc., as though the days in both these instances denoted the same periods of duration; but this is by no means stated, neither is it necessarily to be inferred. It is now granted almost universally that the *days* of Gen. i. were not days of twenty-four hours in length. This is evident from the statement that the sun was not appointed to his present office till the fourth day, according to the narrative; the three previous days, therefore, could not have been regulated or limited by his influence. Moreover, according to the Hebrew mode of reckoning, a day begun in the evening and ended in the evening following, but these days began with an evening and terminated with a morning—that is, the space of half a day—they could not, therefore, be days after the ordinary mode of computation, rather were they days in the calendar of heaven, and not reckoned according to the almanac of earth. They were æons or ages of a more exalted chronology —not meted out by the rising and setting sun, but by the eternal word of God. We may at first sight be somewhat puzzled that the language makes no distinction between the vast periods of Divine energy, and the narrow boundaries that circumscribe man's little labours, but this ceases when we remember that the word *day* is employed in Holy Scripture for various spaces of time. Thus it designates the ages that were occupied in the works of creation, and also the period of the earth's revolution on her axis. As there is in this commandment a comparison made between the works of God and the works of man, so is there between the incalculable ages and the few brief hours that refer to each respectively. The æon of the former is microscopically reflected in the latter. As the tiny pupil of the eye reflects the gigantic orb of the sun, so does man's working time reproduce in miniature the ages of creation, and man's Sabbath the rest into which God entered and still continues on the seventh day.

The Ninth Commandment is very freely rendered in our Bible and Prayer-book, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour." The literal translation of the original is, "Thou shalt not answer against thy neighbour as a witness of a lie" (עד שקר). In the corresponding passage in Deut. v. 18, we find, "A witness of a falsehood." The LXX. in both places has οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις—μαρτυρίαν ψευδῆ, the Vulgate "Non loqueris falsum testimonium," and similarly the Syriac. In a former paper we have shown that in the parallelistic arrangement of the decalogue the ninth commandment corresponds

with the third. The connection between them is striking. "Thou shalt not lift up *the Name* to a falsehood, whether concreted in an idol as a lying likeness of Deity, or uttered by the lips in attestation of a lie." Compare with this, "Thou shalt not answer against thy neighbour as a witness of a lie." In both cases a libel is forbidden; in both cases the "honour due" is implicitly insisted on and enforced.

In the Tenth Commandment, "Thou shalt not covet" is repeated before both "house" and "wife." In Ex. xx. 17 the verb is the same, but in the copy of the law as given in Deut. v. 18, "wife" stands first and "house" second. The verb before "wife" is the same as in Exodus, but the verb before "house" is אוה. The LXX. has ἐπιθυμήσεις in all places. The Syriac also has the same verb throughout, and the Vulgate in Exodus has "non concupisces"—"nec desiderabis," and in Deuteronomy it has "concupisces," and does not repeat the verb. Neither the repetition of the verb in the original in Exodus, nor the variation of the verb in Deuteronomy, denotes a separation of the commandment; but there is an interesting difference between the meanings of the verbs in Deuteronomy which we may notice. חמד signifies *desire*, as excited by some object outside one's self, and אוה, a *desire* that arises from within; the former is the result of incentive, and the latter of impulse.

These sporadic notes may stimulate the student to seek and find other latent thoughts in this portion of Holy Scripture—the law in which the Psalmist delighted to have his meditations all the day long.

F. Tilney Bassett.

Correspondence.

THE THEOLOGY OF BISHOP ANDREWES.

To the Editor of The Churchman.

Sir,—The excellent articles on Bishop Andrewes in The Churchman for July, 1889, p. 21, and for August, 1889, p. 587, by Rev. N. Dimock, are most seasonable; but attention should also be directed just now to Dean Goode's masterly examination of his views in his remarkable work, "The Nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist" (Hatchards), vol. ii.

Yours sincerely,

Littleton Drew, Sept. 27th. C. H. Davies.

Sir,—Will you allow me to say a few words on Mr. Dimock's notice of Hooker, in his article on Bishop Andrewes?

At page 528 he says: "An attempt has been made to isolate the teach-

ing of Hooker. This attempt," he says, "will be found to break down completely under examination."

Now, in every other respect I readily own that Mr. Dimock's defence of Hooker is perfect. But where Hooker is isolated is as to bread being the means of conveying the grace. I know that the part of the Catechism which teaches of Sacraments was not written till after his death. He cannot, then, be accused of controverting an existing formulary. But his teaching does.

First, let us hear Hooker: "The question is . . . whether, when the Sacrament is administered, Christ be whole within man only, or else His body and blood be also externally seated in the very elements themselves; which opinion they that defend are driven," etc. So he goes on to speak of transubstantiation and consubstantiation, as if there was no possible theory of grace accompanying the bread—that grace being what St. Paul calls His body and blood. We have Hooker again (vol. ii., p. 352, Keble's edit.): "The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not, therefore, to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament." Again: "I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ, and where the bread is His body or the cup His blood, but only in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth them."

So much for Hooker. Now for the Catechism. We have a Sacrament defined: "An outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us . . . as a means whereby we receive the same." So much for both Sacraments. Then specially for the Eucharist: "The bread and wine are the outward and visible signs" by which the inward part, the spiritual grace, is received. This grace St. Paul calls the body and blood of Christ. *Bread* is the outward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual grace which St. Paul calls the body of Christ. This outward and visible sign is ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the inward *spiritual grace.* The presence, then, is to be sought elsewhere than in our hearts, even in the bread when it is given to us. It may be said that if the grace comes on us in the eating of the bread, that meets the requirement; that there must be two parts in the Sacrament. But unless the grace comes to us *with the bread* the Catechism errs, and the bread is not the means whereby we receive the grace.

I do not want to discredit "the judicious." I am only defending the language of the Catechism, and showing that, in comparison with that, Hooker must be said to be "isolated."

Your obedient servant,

CHARLES CROSTHWAITE
(Canon and V. G. of Kildare).

We have sent Canon Crosthwaite's letter to Mr. Dimock, and he replies as follows:

I feel sure that upon further examination Canon Crosthwaite will find that there is no real difference between the teaching of Hooker and the teaching of the Church Catechism.

The subsequent addition to the Catechism on the subject of the Lord's Supper is but a breaking into *two* of what had been *one* answer in Nowell's Smallest Catechism: "The body and blood of Christ, which in the Lord's Supper are *given* to the *faithful*, and are by them taken, eaten, drunken, only in a heavenly and spiritual manner, but yet in truth . . . our souls are refreshed and renewed by the blood of Christ through faith; in which way the body and blood of Christ are received in the Supper. For Christ as surely makes those who trust in Him partakers of His body and

blood, as they certainly know that they have received the bread and wine with their mouth and stomach."

And this teaching is nothing more than was constantly defended and maintained—and rightly so—by the Reformed.

I must only ask space for one or two examples :

1. Bishop Hooper (who led "the extremer school of Reformers," see Mr. Medd, Intr. to first book of Ed., p. xii.) says : "I believe and confess . . . that always and as often as we use this bread and wine, according to the ordinance and institution of Christ, we do verily and indeed receive His body and blood." (Later Writings, P.S. edit., p. 49.)

2. Bishop Jewel (stigmatized as "an irreverent Dissenter," but whom Hooker pronounced to be "the worthiest divine that Christendom hath bred for the space of some hundreds of years"—Ec. Pol., B. II., ch. vi., § 4) says : "We teach the people, not that a naked sign or token, but that Christ's body and blood indeed and verily is given unto us ; that we verily eat it ; that we verily drink it ; that we verily be relieved and live by it." (Sermon and Harding, P.S. edit., p. 448.)

It may be worth while to add a selection of a few extracts from Reformed Confessions of Faith.

1. The later Swiss Confession, 1566, says : "By this holy Supper . . . the faithful . . . receive the flesh and blood of the Lord." (Hall's Harmony, p. 317.) "By spiritual meat we mean not any imaginary thing, but the very body of our Lord Jesus, given to us : which is received of the faithful . . . by faith." (*Ibid*, p. 318.)

2. The Belgian Confession, 1566, confirmed 1579, declares : "As truly as we do receive and hold in our hands this sign . . . so truly we do by faith . . . receive the very body and true blood of Christ." (*Ibid.*, pp. 336, 337.)

3. The Irish Articles of 1615 say : "But in the inward and spiritual part, the same body and blood is really and substantially presented unto all those who have grace to receive the Son of God, even to all those that believe in His Name." (Neal's "History of Puritans," vol. iii., p. 517.)

A comparison of Hooker, Ec. Pol., B. V., ch. lxvii., § 7, 8, 11, and 12, will show that his teaching did not fall short of this teaching of the Reformed.

I have been as brief as possible, but I venture to add that I have endeavoured to enter fully and at some length into the subject in "Papers on the Eucharistic Presence," No. VI., where much additional evidence will be found.—Yours faithfully,

N. DIMOCK.

Eastbourne, October 9th, 1889.

Review.

The Epistles of St. John. Twenty-one Discourses, with Greek Text, Comparative Versions and Notes, chiefly exegetical, by WILLIAM ALEXANDER, D.D., D.C.L., Brasenose College, Oxford, Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe. Hodder and Stoughton. 1889.

AS an expositor of the writings of St. John, the Bishop of Derry—the Chrysostom of the Irish Bench, has very special qualifications. In the volume before us the critical powers of the theologian are not more apparent than the spiritual insight displayed, combined as it is with an earnest and tender appreciation of all that is best in modern culture. The plan pursued is eminently popular, inasmuch as while no real difficulty is evaded, much of the extra-critical matter is deferred to

footnotes or to the notes at the end of each chapter, moreover there is the additional advantage for scholars and ordinary readers alike, that the full Greek text is given along with the Latin translation, and that of the A.V. and R.V. in parallel columns, to which is added a translation from the Bishop himself, the many felicities of which are ample excuse for its insertion here.

The connection between Epistles and Gospel is strongly insisted upon as the only method for a full comprehension of either, just as the historical record of some many-sided and eventful life has its ideas and impressions elucidated for the general reader by an accompanying introduction or appendix.

The discussion of the polemical element in these Epistles is as admirable as it is just now important in the face of much modern writing in novels and reviews, distinguished rather for sentiment than logical consistency. "The method of this widely diffused school is to separate the *sentiments* of admiration which the history (of our Lord) inspires from the *history* itself; to sever the *ideas* of the faith from the *facts* of the faith, and then to present the *ideas* thus surviving the dissolvents of criticism as at once the refutation of the facts and the substitute for them."

In a review of Dr. Plummer's edition of "The Pastoral Epistles," some time ago in the CHURCHMAN, we took occasion to commend his method of linking present subjects of moral and intellectual controversy with manifestations of the same spirit under different forms in the past. This fresh volume of the same admirable series gives abundant and successful evidence of a similar desire on the part of the expositor. We are convinced by daily experience that to allow the plausible, though often utterly groundless, statements in regard to historical Christianity, to pass unheeded in the pages of novel and magazine, read as they are by uncritical and unthinking readers, is to most faithlessly *disregard* the Apostolic precept, "Contend earnestly for the faith, once for all delivered to the saints." As we read writings such as this of the Bishop of Derry—written, as he tells us, amid the often distracting cares of an Irish Bishop; begun in the noonday of life, completed with life's sunset shining in his eyes—we of the clergy at least ought to give up the idea of trying to live in a fools' paradise, spending time and energy, if we be contentious, upon matters of "mint and anise and cumin;" if we be peacefully disposed, upon even the infinitely nobler work of attending to our parishes and "feeding Christ's flock," while all the time the cry of maimed and doubting hearts is asking of us, their teachers, "How can these things be? Answer me this, and this, and this." And even though it were true, that such doubts did not now arise among, such questions were not asked by, the members of our Bible-classes, our Communicants' Unions, or even our congregations as a whole, still, a loosening of the components of popular belief around us, a growth of the idea that the mere components of belief—the specific articles of a creed—matter little, if at all, may possibly, nay, rather must, affect ourselves. It is only a truism to mechanically repeat that the Gospel-records are quite able to take care of themselves; that those who *will* doubt must doubt; that doubt itself presupposes sin or indicates a relaxation of the moral standards. Thus did not the Master act: "Behold My hands and My feet." He allows the possibility of honest doubt; He admits, nay, sanctions, the duty laid upon the truth to vindicate itself by all lawful means.

It is with such convictions that we welcome this new volume from the pen of the gifted Bishop. In the light of an old man's experience, with the aid of a deep and many-sided culture, above all, by faith in God once "manifested in the flesh," he can face the gathering problems of his age fearlessly and hopefully, and he tells out to us, his

younger brethren, his thoughts on all these things, the meaning of his confidence, the secret of his strength. "All the long chain of manifold witness to Christ is consummated and crowned when it passes into the inner world of the individual life. 'He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness *in himself*.' But that sweet witness in a man's self is not merely in books and syllogisms. It is the creed of a living soul. It lies folded in a man's heart, and never dies—part of the great principle of victory fought and won over again in each true life—until the man dies, and ceasing then only because he sees that which is the object of its witness."—P. 253.

RICHARD W. SEAVER.

Short Notices.

Murray's Magazine. October. John Murray.

Church and People. No. 3. Quarterly Paper. Church Pastoral Aid Society.

The Newbery House Magazine. October. Griffith, Farran, Okeden and Welsh.

"BROTHERHOODS of the Poor" is the title of an article by Archdeacon Farrar, in the first of the three periodicals which we have here placed together. The Archdeacon says that "the Brothers of the Poor, whose establishment is in question, will not be monks in any sense of the word. Their vows will never be permitted to be permanent." But in the *Newbery House Magazine*, the Rev. C. H. Sharpe writes:

> In the question of the duration of vows, it may be said that those truly called of God will *ipso facto* remain to the end. *Nemo Christianus nisi qui ad finem perseveraverit.* . . . But if those truly called of God *would* remain to the end, there can be no possible objection to their having the great benefit of being allowed to take perpetual vows.

In *Church and People* appears a very interesting paper, containing the opinions of eminent clergymen and laymen on this subject.

The Church Monthly. An illustrated magazine for home reading. London: *Church Monthly* Office, 31, New Bridge Street.

Among good and cheap gift-books or prizes, or books for the parish library, this annual will rank high. Bright, informing, and attractive as regards both matter and illustrations, it will be welcome and useful. Two of the illustrations are "Bishop Barry" and "Knapdale," the mansion in Upper Tooting given by Mr. Macmillan, the eminent publisher, for the Bishop Suffragan of Rochester. The volume, cheap as it is, contains no less than 200 fine engravings, and contributions from many representative writers, with capital Tales.

The Quiver. New and enlarged series. 1889. Cassell and Company.

Our opinion of the *Quiver* has been several times expressed during the past year, and it is enough now to commend the Annual.

The Brook and its Banks. By the Rev. J. G. WOOD, M.A. The Religious Tract Society.

This volume is wonderfully well turned out, and among choice "Christmas Books" it will on all grounds rank high. How Mr. Wood could write of the Brook and its banks, who does not know?

Stronger than Fate. By MARY BRADFORD WHITING, pp. 250. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

This Tale is thoroughly good. It is well written, and has promise of

literary success; the religious teaching is sound, and free from "goody-goody." Here and there, perhaps, among the incidents (of which, by-the-bye, there are plenty) is a little improbability; but the story goes with a swing, and the characters are life-like. A village lad, self-willed, very clever and ambitious, runs away; finds friends, and becomes a London doctor and a popular author; but he learns the lesson of dependence, that is—duty. Phyllis, whom in the end the doctor marries, is charming. Many readers, among the classes as well as among the masses, will be pleased with this story, and be all the better for it.

We have received a copy of the January number of the *Church Monthly*, the magazine so ably edited by Mr. Fredk. Sherlock. It is well adapted for use as a parish magazine, and will doubtless be localized in thousands of parishes.

We have received, too late for review, a curious and very interesting book, by Mr. Wratislaw, a valued contributor to the CHURCHMAN, *Sixty Folk Tales*, Tales from exclusively Slavonic sources. (Elliot Stock.)

The October *Dignitaries of the Church* (Hatchards) is also excellent. We have here the Archbishop of Armagh, Dr. Knox, the Bishop of Bath and Wells, and thirdly, the Bishop of Edinburgh, Dr. Dowden.

In the *C. M. S. Intelligencer* appears the first of what will be a very useful series on the Home Work of the Society, by the Rev. H. Sutton.

The new *Quarterly* comes to us too late for a worthy notice. Churchmen will take a special interest in "Ward and the Oxford Movement," "The Inhabitants of East London," and "Presbyterians and Independents," (based on Gardiner's Civil War). Other interesting articles are "John Locke" and "The National Party of the Future." Mr. Courthope's Pope is ably handled, and there is a lively and informing paper on the Zoological Gardens. Altogether this is a capital *Quarterly*.

A pleasing little volume, *Stories from Genesis*, (pp. 320) with thirty-nine illustrations, is sent out by the Religious Tract Society as the first of a series. The "Series," we think, will be very useful.

We heartily recommend Part I. of a monthly issue of Dr. Geikie's *The Holy Land and the Bible*, with original illustrations by Mr. Harper (Cassell and Co.).

Those of our readers who may desire to see a reply from Mr. Miller, Secretary of the Church Association, to the article by Mr. Gedge in the September CHURCHMAN, will find it in the October *Church Intelligencer* (14, Buckingham Street, Strand).

The *English Illustrated Magazine*, a wonderfully cheap sixpennyworth, having regard to matter, illustrations and type (Macmillan and Co.) contains a paper by Mrs. Jeune on Children in Theatres. With the accomplished writer we cannot, on all points, quite agree.

From Messrs. Eyre and Spottiswoode, Her Majesty's Printers, we have received two of their latest issues: a new *Portable Bible* and a fresh edition of the famous *Teacher's Bible*. With the "Portable" Bible we are greatly pleased, and make no doubt that on account of its large type and portability it will be warmly welcomed. It is a really admirable piece of work. The new edition of the "Teacher's Bible" (containing the celebrated "Aids to the Bible Student") is also excellent. Gold medals with special mention, we observe, have been recently awarded the Queen's Printers for superiority in printing and binding. Now and then, in the last ten years, we have invited the attention of our readers to their publications, and we heartily recommend the two volumes just published.

THE MONTH.

THE Congress at Cardiff will hardly do for the Church in Wales, we fear, all that was hoped. Yet much that was advanced about the Principality was sound and highly practical. In regard to the Church as a whole, it is doubtful whether the words, "one of the most successful Church Congresses," will be generally accepted. Some of the papers read—such, *e.g.*, as Dean Perowne's on "Home Reunion," Mr. Moule's on "The Christian's Relationship to the World," and Sir John Kennaway's on "Missions"—were truly admirable. The speeches of the Dean of Llandaff (Dr. Vaughan) were happy and effective. At one of the churches, in an "official" opening service, the ritual was of the extremest. It embraced (said a protest) the following:

1. Lighted Candles; 2. Vestments, including Chasuble, Alb, Tunicle, Dalmatic, Biretta; 3. The frequent use of Incense; 4. The use of "Wafer Bread"; 5. The mixed Chalice; 6. Hiding the Manual Acts; 7. The use of the Crucifix and a Banner with a figure of the Madonna in procession; 8. The attendance of Acolytes, carrying lighted Candles, and dressed in scarlet Cassocks and Cottas; 9. The elevation of the Elements, and Prostration before them; 10. The use of the Sacrine Bells; 11. The singing of the *Agnus Dei* immediately following the Prayer of Consecration; 12. Ceremonial Ablutions.

The Bishop of Llandaff regarded the protest as "a most proper one." In the *Record* (of the 11th) "An Old Soldier" writes: "This Cardiff Congress event shows clearly what steady progress Ritualism is making in the land under the fostering influence of the 'let alone' system."

At the St. Leonards meeting of the South Coast Clerical and Lay Union the Dean of Canterbury (the President) commended the Protestant Churchman's Alliance.

On the proposed new Brotherhood several letters have been published in the *Times*. A leader on the *Church and People* article has done good.

A valuable speech on the Tithe Question has been made by Lord Selborne, and will, we hope, be published.

In Dr. Cust's able article in the last CHURCHMAN reference was made to the work which has been and is being done by Protestant Damiens in leper settlements. In this month's *Blackwood* appears an interesting note from "An Old Cape Reporter," who gives the information which a correspondent has sent ourselves, about Mr. Wilshere. The "Reporter" says:

All honour that can be paid should be paid to that noble and devoted man [Father Damien], who fell a martyr to his devotion to duty; but the self-denying labours for many years of the Rev. Canon Baker, of Kalk Bay, late Chaplain at Robben Island, should not be forgotten; and he has, I am sure, from personal observation and the manner in which the poor wretches whose lot he does his utmost to mitigate, a worthy successor in the Rev. H. M. Wilshere, the present chaplain at that "speck in the ocean" where is congregated so much of human misery and suffering.

The Bishop of Durham's words (at his Diocesan Conference) about vows, were wise and weighty. When they speak of "dispensable" vows, said the Bishop, "this is language to which I entertain the strongest objection."