THE

CHURCHMAN

FEBRUARY, 1894.

ART. I.—SURVIVAL OF ANCIENT HERESIES IN MODERN ROMANISM.

PART II.

THE EUTYCHIANISM OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

THE doctrine of Eutyches, which was condemned by the Council of Chalcedon, was the too natural sequence of the heresy of Nestorius and a kind of rebound of popular feeling from one extreme of theological error to another. In the fruitless and dangerous attempt to define in unscriptural language the union of the two natures in Christ, the one error involved a division, and the other a confusion of those natures. Against the Eutychian heresy, now represented and carried on by the Monophysite churches of Alexandria and Antioch, that clause of the so-called Athanasian Creed is directed, "One, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of Person." Now, it was a favourite argument of the Eutychians that the change effected in the human nature of Christ by its union with the Divine nature had a clear illustration in the Eucharist, where they alleged that a similar change of substance took place, a change resembling that of transubstantiation. Theodorit, to whose testimony we have already referred on the *dulia* and *latria* controversy, has supplied us with the argument of the Eutychians and its refutation by the Catholics in three dialogues supposed to be carried on between a Eutychian and a Catholic (Eranistes and Orthodoxus). The former asserts: "As the symbols of the Lord's body and blood are different before the invocation of the priest, but after the invocation are changed (*μεταβάλλεται*) and become another thing, so the Lord's body after the ascension was changed into the Divine substance." To this the Orthodox person replies: "You are caught in your own net. For the mystical symbols do not depart from their nature after the sanctification, but remain in their former substance and form, and can be seen and touched

as before."[1] Eranistes then raises the objection that they have nevertheless, changed their former name and appellation, to which the Orthodox disputant replies: "It is not only called the 'body,' but the 'bread of life.'"

The same Eutychian argument and the same reply were put forth in the Western Church at a somewhat later date, when Pope Gelasius wrote the memorable passage which has been one of the most effective historical documents against transubstantiation in every subsequent age.[2]

"Without doubt" (he writes) "the Sacraments of the body and blood of Christ which we receive are a Divine thing, by reason of which and through which we become partakers of the Divine nature. And yet it ceases not to be the substance or nature of the bread and wine. And assuredly the image and likeness of the body and blood of Christ is celebrated in the action of the mysteries. This gives us a sufficient proof that we are to think of our Lord Christ Himself in the same sense as that in which we profess, celebrate, and receive His image; that as in this, they (the elements) pass into a Divine substance through the operation of the Holy Spirit, and yet remain in their own proper nature, in like manner in that chief mystery itself, whose efficiency and virtue the Sacraments truly represent, while the elements of which it consists properly remain, the one Christ remains in truth and integrity." In the same sense and by means of the same comparison all the orthodox writers against the Eutychian heresy illustrate the union of the two natures in Christ, and prove that transubstantiation is simply the principle of Eutychianism applied to the Sacrament, and that the ancient Church would have rejected it as involving the confusion of the two natures in Christ. For it annihilates the natural substance of the bread and wine and substitutes for it the corporal presence of Christ.

Berengarius and the early denouncers of the doctrine of the material change in the Sacrament saw clearly its danger in connection with the mystery of the Incarnation. "The Word made flesh" (he writes) "took up what He was not before, and did not lose what He was, and thus the consecrated bread upon the altar loses its worthlessness, loses its inefficacy, but does not lose the properties of its nature, which nature is divinely increased thereby in dignity and efficacy."[3] In another place he writes: "As the person of Christ consisted of a

[1] This last sentence proves that Theodorit did not conceive the possibility of a miracle being wrought unless it was testified by the senses.

[2] Liber de duabus nat. in Christo.

[3] De S. Cœna adv. Lanfr., p. 98 (Berl., 1834).

Divine and human nature, so the sacrifice of Christ is of a visible and invisible thing, a sign and a thing signified (*sacramento et re sacramenti*)."[1]

If the Roman controversialists were to interpret the passage "the Word was made flesh" (John i. 14), on the same principle as that on which they interpret "This is My body," they would at once adopt the creed of the Monophysites, who might reasonably charge them with inconsistency in failing to carry out their first principles.

The Nestorianism of the Doctrine and Devotion of the "Sacred Heart."

The worship of the Heart of Jesus as distinct from His humanity and separated from the other members of His sacred body, founded on the sensuous visions of a diseased and epileptic nun, was at first rejected by the theologians of the Roman Church, as a revival of the heresies of Eutyches and Nestorius in a seductive and most perilous form. The arguments adduced against the devotion by Pope Benedict XIV. when he was "Promotor Fidei," are complete and unanswerable, and the plea of the Cardiolaters was twice rejected by the Congregation of Rites, and would have been undoubtedly prohibited by Pope Clement XIV. had he lived to complete his warfare with the Jesuits. It was well described as the revival of the errors of Nestorius and Eutyches, "*sotto il velame di una dolce e facile divozione, ma falsa ed erronea.*" Its dangers were ably exposed by Bishop Ricci of Pistoja, by Bishop Pannilini of Chiusi, by the "dissertations of the Advocate Blasi, and the luminous writings of Father Giorgi, Master of the Sacred Palace." These proved to demonstration that the practice of this devotion, whatever care was taken to prevent it, betrayed the worshipper into the danger of Nestorianism, in which unhappily it frequently resulted."[2] Its moral dangers were fatally and conspicuously revealed in the convents of the Dominicans at Prato, where the horrible disclosures made by the Tuscan Government in the examination of the sisters Buonamici and Spighi, led to the transmission of the case to the supreme authorities at Vienna. None of the proofs of the inevitable Nestorianism of Cardiolatry is more complete than that which is given by Bishop Pannilini in his Pastoral addressed to the Clergy of Chiusi and Pienza, and incorporated in the Acts of the Assembly of Bishops at Florence in 1787.

"The devotion of the Sacred Heart," writes the Bishop,

[1] De S. Cœna adv. Lanfr., p. 283 (Berl., 1834).
[2] Vie de Ricci, tom. i., p. 66.

"regarded as a symbol, is not necessary, and, moreover, not expedient, and the devotion of the carnal (or fleshly) heart, is in its nature erroneous, and conduces to the Nestorian heresy. The Roman Inquisition itself has made it a duty to exact from all the heart-worshipping writers a protest, in order to be sure that they do not in that devotion regard the heart as more than a symbol. . . . I will only give here a brief analysis of the Catholic doctrine. Adoration is due only to a person—*Adoratio debetur hypostasi.* The Humanity of Christ is not His Person, so that to the Humanity alone you ought not to give the true worship of *latria* or adoration. Father Berruyer laid down two propositions on the adoration of the Humanity of Christ; the eighth and the ninth of which are proscribed by the Sorbonne as "rash, erroneous, superstitious, scandalous, subversive of the worship and religion of Christ, and fomenting the heresies of the Arians and Socinians." Both of these declare that the human nature in Christ is to be worshipped in itself directly and immediately (*in recto*), and with the worship of *latria*."

Against this error the Bishop asserts the rule of antiquity, that the humanity cannot in itself and through its union with the Divine Person become the object of the worship of *latria*, which is due only to God. In the words of the Sorbonne censure: "Ex fide consequens est sanctissimæ Christi humanitati prout unitæ substantialiter personæ uni divinæ, non deberi in se directè et in recto adorationem latriæ.' Otherwise the Nestorian error would inevitably follow, of two persons in Christ, every time this adoration proper to the Divine Word is offered to the human nature *in se directè et in recto.*"

"This" (continues the Bishop), "is a most certain truth. The object of our direct worship cannot be any other than a person. Therefore it cannot be the humanity, far less the heart, which forms a part of it. The adoration given to Christ ought to be one and entire—the adoration can only be due to a person—the person is not the humanity. The worship of *latria* cannot be given to the whole or to a part of the humanity, but to the Divine Person. The worship ought not to reflect back upon its object, but to be given directly to the object.[1] This is what our faith teaches us. To give to a portion of the humanity, or to the whole of it, the adoration due to the Divine Person, is precisely the error of Nestorius and Berruyer, which has been anathematized by the Church."[2]

Theodotus of Ancyra, in the Council of Ephesus, has wisely cautioned us against dividing the two natures of Christ, even

[1] Il culto non deve ridondare nel *supposto*, ma deve darsi al sopposto.
[2] Atti dell' Assemblea, tom. iv., pp. 648-651.

in thought or idea. "That which is united" (he writes) "is no longer called two, but one. Divide them only in your mind and contemplate each apart, and you dissolve this unity. For it is impossible to preserve the unity and to contemplate both apart. For that which is united is made indissolubly one, and is no longer two. But you say, 'I only divide them in mind.' By this very mental act you dissolve their unity. . . . Deserting, therefore, the arguments of mere reason, receive the faith, and confess the one Lord Jesus Christ both God and man, neither divided by sense or word or reasoning."

The argument of Cardinal Manning[1] in defence of Cardiolatry, involves such inevitable Nestorianism that it divides the two natures not only in mind, but in substance, treating the human nature of Christ as separated from the Divine, and even dividing that again by treating the heart of Christ as a distinct Personality to be addressed and worshipped as such—an idolatrous worship which the censors of the Sorbonne would have denounced as even more gross and indefensible than the theses of Berruyer.

The Pelagianism of Modern Romanism.

From the day when the Jesuit Lainez entered the Council of Trent, and by his fatal influence involved it in the errors of Pelagius, that heresy, against which the whole of the Augustinian theology of the middle-ages was a continual protest, has reigned in the Church of Rome through the subtle influence of the unscrupulous Order of which Lainez was the second General. He did not, however, succeed in corrupting the ancient doctrine without encountering a vigorous opposition from the advocates of the older faith. Cardinals Pole and Contarini had at an earlier period, and Cardinal Seripandi to the very latest, resisted the new theology on the doctrines of grace.

The Legates of the Council (both of them afterwards Popes) reminded the Fathers, in their opening admonition on the doctrine of Justification, of the danger of their being drawn into Pelagianism through their indiscreet opposition to the truths, as well as errors, which they found in the writings of Luther. Albertus Pighius they alleged as an instance, who, "endeavouring to refute all the teaching of Luther on Original Sin, had fallen very near to the Pelagian error."[2]

Cardinal Seripandi, the noble vindicator of the ancient doctrines of grace, who died in the Council, and to the last protested against the Pelagianism which he saw threatening it, made an eloquent address on the subject in the General

[1] "Glories of the Sacred Heart" (London, 1877).
[2] Le Plat Mon. Conc. Trid., tom. iii., p. 481.

Congregation of October 8th, 1546. He contended that the Fathers ought to be most vigilant against the danger of condemning the Catholic divines in their eagerness to condemn Luther and his followers, and among them Cardinals Contarini and Ægidius of Viterbo, who seemed to be condemned by the Article on Justification, and with them Pighius and many more. The testimony of Seripandi was sufficient proof that a departure was being entered upon from the older doctrine of the Church, and we shall see presently that this parting of the ways has led the Roman Church into the most pronounced Pelagianism.

The Council in its final decrees and chapters on Justification appears in some degree to halt between two opinions, or at least to betray the conflicting influences of the two parties it sought to reconcile. Let us compare the statement in chap. xvi. with Canon XXXII.:

"So great is the goodness of God towards mankind that He wishes those things which are His own gifts to be their merits" (chap. xvi.).

"If anyone say that without the grace of the Holy Spirit preventing him and aiding him man can believe, hope, love, or repent as he ought to obtain the grace of justification, let him be anathema" (Can. III.).

"If anyone say that the good works of a justified man are so the gifts of God as not to be also the good merits of the justified person . . . and do not deserve the increase of grace and eternal life . . . let him be anathema" (Can. XXXII.).

We cannot be surprised to find that in the face of inconsistent statements like these, which might be readily multiplied, the doctrines of grace remain still without clear definition in the Roman Church, and that the numerous meetings of the Congregations *de Auxiliis Gratiæ* have never yet come to a satisfactory result either to Jesuits or Dominicans. The latter cling tenaciously to the doctrine of Aquinas, which is directly opposed to that of the Jesuits, as the learned historian of the Congregations, Serry, has distinctly proved, and consequently to the teaching of Loyola himself, who made Aquinas his infallible guide. Unfortunately for the better cause, Clement XI., in his ill-omened Bull "Unigenitus," completed the fatal triumph of Jesuit theology, and from 1713 until now that theology has crushed out the Augustinian doctrine, which was the rule of mediæval divinity, and substituted for it a pure and uncompromising Pelagianism. In that too famous Bull the Pontiff condemns as heretical the following propositions, hitherto considered the first principles of the doctrines of grace:

I. The grace of Jesus Christ is the effectual principle of every good thing.
II. It is necessary for the performance of every good action.
III. Without it we can do nothing.

These, with a number of their consequences and corollaries, given in the very words of St. Augustine and Prosper Aquitaine, are condemned by the Pope as heretical, the contrary doctrines being inferred as orthodox, which represent the teaching of Pelagius and of the modern Jesuits. The older doctrine rests upon the infallible words of Christ: "Without Me ye can do nothing"; and those of St. Paul: "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me"; and has thus been beautifully expounded by St. Augustine: "The first man was created good, but did not good. He wished to desert Him by whom he was made. God permitted him, as though He said, 'Let him desert Me, and he will discover himself, and prove his misery; for he can do nothing without Me.'"

In the doctrine of the Jesuits, interpreted by their advocate Lessius, "Grace is like an instrument which the free-will can use or not, as it likes. The whole influx of grace in working, and all its efficiency, is in the power of free-will, and depends on its application and co-operation."[1] Free-will is here supposed to be absolutely independent of grace, and to use it as an instrument. This involves an absolute denial of prevenient grace enabling the will, and is a direct reproduction of the doctrine of Pelagius, who held that grace only assisted, but did not precede, free-will. St. Augustine affirms, therefore: "Spiritum sanctum non solum esse adjutorem (quod Pelagiani dogmati suo sufficere existimant) verum etiam largitorem dicimus virtutis, quod isti negant."[2] It is difficult to reconcile these words even with the ambiguous language of the Council of Trent, but absolutely impossible to reconcile them with the more modern doctrine of Rome, as illustrated in the Bull "Unigenitus."

The Donatism of the Papacy.

The schism of the Donatists, which severed into two violent and irreconcilable parties the purest of the Churches of Christendom, and survived until the fatal hour when both the schismatic Church and the great Church of Tertullian, Arnobius, St. Cyprian, and St. Augustine fell together during the terrible irruptions of the Vandals, arose out of an incident of a most trifling nature, but one which too clearly indicates

[1] De Gratiâ et Libero Arbitrio.
[2] Contra duas Pelag. Epist., l. iii., c. 4.

the evils which a superstitious usage may bring upon the Christian Church. A wealthy Carthaginian woman, by name Lucilla, had introduced in the reception of the Sacrament the habit of kissing a bone of a martyr, to which she attached a superstitious value. This brought her into controversy, and finally into serious collision, with the Bishop of Carthage, Cæcilianus, and ripened into a schism, in which Bishop was set against Bishop and altar against altar. We are here sadly reminded of the fatal influence of women in the history of the Roman Pontificate, by whom Popes were elected and the episcopate degraded—of the lives of Theodora and Marozia, not to speak of the still nearer scandal of Donna Olimpia Maidalchini Pamfili in the days of Pope Innocent X.

Of the doctrines of Donatism we know but little, but of its cruelties and bitter intolerance in practice we gather much from the pages of Optatus of Milevis, the Catholic historian. It claimed as belonging to itself alone the name of Catholic, as the Roman Church does now. It persecuted all who refused to join it with a bitterness and cruelty which was worthy of the Roman Inquisition in the days of its greatest power. But the point in which it most closely resembled the modern Papacy is thus described by the historian we have already cited: "To such a degree was the heart of Donatus exalted, that he seemed to himself to be no longer a man, but a god. By the people he was rarely called a bishop, but Donatus of Carthage. And he well deserved to be called and denounced as Prince of Tyre —that is, of Carthage—because he was the chief of bishops, inasmuch as he had more power in him than the rest. And as he would have nothing human in him, he lifted up his heart, not as the heart of a man, but as the heart of God desiring to be something more than the rest of mankind, to whom God addresses the word, 'Thou saidst, I am a god.' And though he did not actually say this, nevertheless he suffered and allowed this word to be accomplished. He lifted up his heart so as to think no man to be compared with him, and in the swelling of his pride seemed to be almost loftier than himself; for whatever is beyond humanity is Divine. Finally, when the Bishops desired to converse with this deity, he exacted so great a reverence from them that they had no less fear of him than of God."[1]

We seem to see in these words a picture of an African Papacy bearing a painful and humiliating resemblance to the still more powerful and extended Papacy of Rome. The likeness at some points is almost startling. The secular title claimed by Donatus anticipates the heathen title of Pontifex

[1] Optat. de Schism. Donat., l. iii.

Maximus claimed by the Popes. The abject servitude of the Donatist Bishops reminds us of that of the Bishops of the Church of Rome. The claims to represent the Deity survive still in the "plenitudo potestatis" of the Papacy—its irreformability, its infallibility, its claim to a universal dominion; and though the Popes, like Donatus, "may not actually say this" of themselves, they suffer it to be said, and encourage and allow an adoration and adulation so gross and idolatrous as to prove their spiritual relationship to its earlier claimant.[1]

The Montanism of Modern Romanism.

None of the ancient heresies has bequeathed to the mediæval and modern Church of Rome so rich a heritage as Montanism, in which the otherwise illustrious Tertullian and a Bishop of Rome in his day were so strangely entangled. Montanus and his followers were the first to bring into the Church a new rule of faith and new doctrines founded on visions and revelations, forming a kind of supplement to the perfect and final revelation of God in the Scriptures. Asserting for himself the possession of the Holy Spirit in a manner so far exceeding the measure of that supreme gift bestowed on an ordinary Christian, as to make some believe that he actually claimed to be a second Paraclete, he associated himself with two fanatical claimants of prophetic powers, Priscilla and Maximilla, and on the ground of their visions and prophecies produced a succession of doctrines which stand in strange contrast to the simple truths of the Gospel. Ecstasies and prophetic visions and utterances, formed the characteristic features of this new faith of which Tertullian himself became the apostle. The extraordinary resemblance which subsists between Montanism and the worship of the "Sacred Heart" in its origin, its history, its spirit and aims, has been already pointed out by the writer of these lines in a special treatise,[2] but it bears a like similitude to the earlier revelations and rhapsodies of St. Bridget, St. Catherine of Siena, St. Mary Magdalen de Pazzi, St. Theresa, and a countless number of visionaries, upon whose revelations the entire fabric of Mariolatry is built up. In vain the great divines of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries endeavoured to stem this tide of new revelations and prophecies. The court of Rome invariably encouraged and at last authorized them, and the stream flows on still with an irresistible current. Though the prophecies have often contradicted one another, and still

[1] See (as a single instance) the horribly blasphemous addresses which Innocent X. received on his coronation without a word of protest.

[2] "The Doctrine and Devotion of the Sacred Heart" (London, R.T.S.).

oftener failed in their fulfilment, the faith or credulity of their devotees has never been shaken. Thus the revelation of St. Catherine of Siena opposed itself bodily to that of St. Bridget, while another of the prophecies of St. Catherine was so disastrous in its results that the Pope himself, who had acted upon it, bitterly regretted his credulity in his last moments.[1] But what limit is there to human credulity, or to resolute fanaticism? The whole of the relative and creature worship of Rome has grown up from such visionary disclosures, with which it disgraces and discredits the great historical religion of Christ.

To indicate a few of the doctrinal and ritual observances which have their origin from visions and dreams, we have these among many others:

I. The feast of the "Corpus Christi" arising out of the vision of the nun Juliana.

II. The devotion of the Sacred Heart arising out of the fanatical ecstasies of Margaret Mary Alacoque.

III. The Feast of St. Mary de Mercede, resting on a vision of Raymond de Pennafort.

IV. The Feast of St. Mary de Monte Carmelo, from the visions of Simon Stock.

V. The Praemonstratensian Order, founded on a vision of St. Norbert.

VI. The doctrine of the "Immaculate Conception," which had its chief confirmation from the revelation of St. Bridget; while those of St. Hildegarde and of the Abbot Joachim formed the spiritual food of the mediæval laity, by whom the Divine revelation of the Scriptures was too little known.

VII. The doctrine of Purgatory rests wholly upon visions, as may be proved from the Dialogues of Gregory the Great, from Bede, and from many other mediæval testimonies.

We might multiply this list from the inexhaustible store of legends and visions which the Church of Rome has either authorized or tacitly permitted, but this may suffice to show that she has incorporated in her very composite system the principal feature of Montanism, and mixed up "cunningly devised fables" with the eternal truths of the Gospel.

This fatal error was denounced by Cardinal Cajetan in the Council of Lateran under Leo X., who writes of the conflicting visions of St. Bridget and St. Catherine of Siena:

"New revelations contrary to so many saints and ancient doctors, would seem to the wise to bring into the Church an angel of Satan transformed into an angel of light—fancies and figments. These, then, with the so-called miracles which are

[1] Gerson de Exam. Doctr. Consid. III.

alleged in this cause, are rather for old women than for the holy Synod. Wherefore I do not think them worthy to be mentioned."[1]

In proof of the Montanistic tendency of Romanism it may be added that the Roman controversialists, and notably the Jesuit Gretser, derive arguments for many of their doctrines and observances from the Montanistic writings of Tertullian. This has been largely proved in the "*Arbor hæreticæ consanguinitatis*," of Dr. Daniel Cramer, of Stettin, published at Strasburg in 1623.

On the Collyridian Heresy as represented in Modern Romanism.

Among the heresies associated with the life of the Blessed Virgin, and arising out of errors connected with it, St. Epiphanius has described to us two forms of error—one, the denial of her perpetual virginity, the other, the ascription to her of worship. Against the latter heresy he inveighs with great force, even in his description of the former one. In this we may notice a remarkable suppression of the truth in Cardinal Newman's work "On Development." The true translation of the passage he quotes (p. 407), which is given by the learned Petavius, runs thus:

"Revera tamen à Maria Virgine vita ipsa est in mundum introducta ut *viventem pariat* et viventium Maria sit Mater. Quo circa viventium Mater adumbrata similitudine (δι αἰνίγματος) Maria dicitur"—which Newman translates: "From Mary was life itself brought into the world, that Mary *might bear things living*, and might become Mother of living things." The last sentence, which describes the *viventium Mater* as said metaphorically, he omits altogether, turning "a living one" (Christ) into "living things," suppressing also the reason of this expression, which is given a few sentences after, "Maria vitæ causam præbuit *per quam vita est nobis producta*"—which explains "*ut viventem pariat.*"—I ventured to remonstrate with him on this *suppressio veri* and on his turning *viventem pariat* into "might bear things living," which almost gave her a creative power. He strove to defend his position, but (with the greatest authority of his own or any other Church, on the meaning of Epiphanius, directly opposing him) explanation was difficult, if not impossible. It is in this treatise (Haer. 78) that the most signal denunciation in all antiquity of the worship of the Virgin occurs, which runs thus:

"We find that some have actually advanced to such a pitch

[1] De Concept. B. Virginis, c. v. (Opusc. Lugd., 1568, p. 141).

of madness in the things relating to the holy ever-Virgin, that they would obtrude her upon us as a Deity, and talk of her as though they were stupefied and maddened. For they say, that there are some silly women in Arabia, who came thither from Thrace, who have invented a new doctrine, offering a cake and having services in her name and honour." After much more to the same purpose, he adds: "It is a sin to honour the saints above measure; their Lord ought rather to be honoured. For Mary is not God, nor did she receive a body from heaven, but was born of the union of her father and mother, according to the dispensation of promise, as was Isaac." Here he gives an absolute denial to the figment of the Immaculate Conception, one of the popular grounds of the extravagant devotions of modern Mariolatry. But the most remarkable passage occurs in his description of the sect itself, which he names Collyridian, from the cake they offer to the Virgin (κολλυρὶς). He writes:

"The body of Mary, in truth, was holy, but she is not God. She remained a virgin, and is to be honoured, but is not proposed to us as an object of worship, but as worshipping Him who was born of her flesh, and descended from the bosom of the Father. Hence the Holy Gospel has cautioned us in the words of Christ Himself, saying, 'Woman, what have I to do with thee? Mine hour is not yet come.' Where He calls her 'woman,' lest anyone should think that she has a higher nature: as though he prophesied against the schisms and heresies which were coming upon the Church, in order that no one with too excessive admiration of the saint should fall into that heresy."

That these words condemn by an almost prophetic anticipation the idolatrous worship of the Virgin in our day, must appear to every ingenuous mind. An earlier prophet had already sufficiently condemned it. The words of Jeremiah, which denounce the worship of the Queen of Heaven (xliv. 25, 26), tell with irresistible force against the same worship under Christianity, and against the worship of the Mother of the Gods, which it superseded. Let the closing injunction of St. Epiphanius ever be the guide of our worship:

"Let Mary be honoured, but the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost worshipped. Let no one adore Mary, for to no man, not to say woman, is the mystery of worship to be rendered—for such an ascription of glory belongs not even to angels."

It appears strange that a worship which in the fifth century should have been deemed puerile and almost ridiculous, should flourish in the nineteenth, to the fatal diminution and dishonour of the one living and true God. It would seem to be a part

of the mystery of iniquity of the latter days, a presage of the "perilous times" which were foreseen in the earliest age of the Church.

Conclusion.

Many more might be added to these proofs of the survival of ancient heresies in that Church which brands with the mark of heresy every other Church in the world. Well might we say of her, in the words of our Lord, "With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you again." For we are able to cast back the charge of heresy upon herself, and to bring against her the more serious charge of the worship of saints and images, of relics and shrines, involving the most subtle and the most seductive forms of idolatry. It would be a false delicacy and unworthy of the sincerity of a Christian either to dissemble or to mitigate this serious charge. We are bound to follow St. Athanasius, and to confess that in all this relative and inferior worship the first principle of Arianism is clearly disclosed, while in the extreme practices of Mariolatry it has reached its greatest, though hardly its final, development. It remains to be seen what new doctrine of necessary belief the Papal autocracy will impose upon its subjects in order to draw them still farther from the lines of the earlier Church and the articles of her universal creed. That creed has already been superseded by the larger creed of Pius IV., whose additions neutralize and even destroy its most fundamental articles; while the creed of Pius has been in its turn supplanted by the creed of the Vatican Council and the illimitable code of the Bullarium Magnum. One result we may well foresee, for it is an obvious as well as a deplorable one, that the farther the Church of Christ recedes from her exclusive worship of God, the more impossible will it be for her to carry on her great work of conversion both among heathens and Mohammedans. For the religion of the Prophet had this great and distinctive merit, that it was the protest against the forms of idolatry he had witnessed, not only among his own people, but among the degenerate Christians of the East, in that season of darkness and spiritual death, when the introduction of image-worship had disgraced the name of Christianity, and given it the worst characteristic of the faiths it had in its better days supplanted. To the fatal divisions of worship in the darkness of the Middle Ages may be traced the divisions of Churches which render Christianity so unsuccessful in her work of evangelizing the world. Nor can this work be ever carried on without bitter conflicts and fruitless labours, until the day when on earth, as in heaven, "the Lord alone shall be exalted, and the idols He shall utterly abolish."

Robert C. Jenkins.

ART. II.—THE AUTHORSHIP OF PSALM CX.[1]

ALL who have travelled in the Hartz Mountains know how the spectre of the Brocken looms gigantic and alarming, while the top of the mountain is still far off. Yet, as the wayfarer draws nearer, it grows fainter, and by the time he has reached the spot where the spectre had seemed to stand, it has vanished entirely.

In a great degree, the same kind of result holds good of certain recent developments of the so-called "higher criticism." We do not speak, be it understood, of modern criticism generally, but of the extravagant lengths to which certain critics have gone. Doubtless most sober Christian scholars believe that Genesis is compacted by its editor of various earlier sets of documents; they are not, therefore, compelled to accept the view that we must put the final shaping and moulding of the Pentateuch as late as the time of Ezra. We may be willing to allow that our forefathers were wrong in believing that David was the author of the great mass of the Psalter; nay, we may even say sometimes that the ascription, "A Psalm of David," hardly seems borne out by the phenomena of the Psalm itself, and must be viewed with suspicion. It is a very different thing to say that David wrote hardly any of the Psalms, and that the great bulk of the Psalter is post-Exilic, or even Maccabæan.

Anyone who will take the trouble carefully to look into the arguments on which these theories rest, will be struck, I venture to say, at the outset, by finding that these arguments do not hinge (save in a very slight degree) on delicate points of Hebrew scholarship, but are matters which any clear-headed educated man, scholar or no, can fully appreciate. The linguistic argument enters in very slightly. Further, he will often find the arguments strangely subjective, often mere beggings of the question, and sometimes lacking, I cannot but feel, in argumentative fairness.

A very good example of my meaning may be found in Psalm cx. Are we to continue to believe that to be a Messianic Psalm from the pen of David? or shall we say that its author was the tyrant Alexander Jannæus? or shall we maintain that it is a composition of a court poet in honour of Simon Maccabæus—"a glorification of Simon," as it is called by a recent learned advocate of this view?

In Dr. Gifford's sermon and Dr. Sharpe's lectures we have

[1] 'The Authorship of the 110th Psalm,' by E. H. Gifford, D.D., a sermon preached before the University of Oxford. 'Psalm cx., Three Lectures, with Notes,' by J. Sharpe, D.D.

what is, to all intents and purposes, a careful dissection of this last-named view. This is, perhaps, not *formally* true, for Dr. Gifford begins, without assuming anything, by examining the phenomena of the Psalm, and shows that no one has been suggested "upon whom the various lines of internal evidence converge as upon David." Dr. Sharpe, too, begins by careful exposition of the details of the Psalm, and then proceeds to discuss the objections to the Davidic authorship, and finally takes in hand the Maccabæan theory. Still, the essence of each book is the same—the Psalm is Davidic and not Maccabæan; and both books are characterized by the most studied fairness to the other side.

Let us ask, then, first, What grounds have we for calling the Psalm Davidic and Messianic? And first the heading may be noted, "A Psalm of[1] David," where it may be mentioned that the word "Psalm," here and elsewhere in the Psalter, is not expressed. It may be allowed to be true that the headings may at times be viewed with distrust, but this is when they do not sufficiently harmonize with the phenomena of the Psalm. A few suspicious cases may lead us to scrutinize other headings all the more keenly, but to cast all the headings aside contemptuously is only to show how closely scepticism and credulity are at times allied.

But not only does the Psalm itself profess to be Davidic, but we find the Saviour Himself expressly laying it down: "David himself said by the Holy Ghost, The LORD said to my Lord . . ." (Mark xii. 36; cf. Matt. xxii. 43, Luke xx. 42). The words are David's, and they are given by direct inspiration. Are we to be told that our Lord is merely speaking on the basis of the current belief of the day, without expressing any belief in it? But this, surely, is to play fast and loose with all laws of language. Sometimes, indeed, we are told that our Lord did think that David was the author, but that in this He but followed the erroneous belief of the time. This is not an occasion to enter into a discussion of the doctrine of the *kenosis*,[2] or voluntary self-limitation of Christ. I would, however, venture to say that, while we believe that His mind grew in wisdom as His body in stature, and therefore the mind, as being human, was finite; still, the Saviour, though *man*, was *perfect man*. We can, therefore, I think, readily

[1] It is impossible within our limits to discuss other possible meanings of the Hebrew preposition. I think it fair to say that in all probability it means "of," and marks authorship. This is of course quite irrespective of the value we assign to the heading.

[2] See Philippians ii. 7, where ἐκένωσεν ("made Himself of no reputation," A.V.) is literally what we find in the bald rendering of the R.V., "emptied Himself."

allow that He *might* be ignorant (for example) of many human languages, knowledge of which was no part of His mission: He would not speak of anything that concerned His mission, with a foundation of mistake beneath His teaching. If this theory we are combating be true, what finality have we got? If His arguments are to be accepted only so far as we accept His premises, is the same to be said also of His denunciations and His promises?

Further evidence, too, is furnished from the New Testament as to the authorship and reference of the Psalm. St. Peter, speaking on the Day of Pentecost—when there is the directest Scriptural statement that the Apostles were filled with the Holy Ghost—asserts both that David composed the Psalm, and that, being a prophet, he spoke his words prophetically of the Christ to be. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews again sees plainly that the words "Sit thou on My right hand" must be spoken of someone higher than the angels, One who "serenely waits for a sure and absolute victory, while they are busied in ministerial offices" (Bishop Westcott, *in loc.*).

And now what of the Jews? Clearly those to whom our Lord spoke were at one with Him in His view of the authorship and reference of the Psalm. They raise no demur at the outset; they acquiesce in our Lord's premises, and are silenced by His conclusions.

The same belief is frequently found in Jewish writings since our Lord's time. We will take as one example a passage from the so-called "Midrash Tillim," an exposition of the Psalms of uncertain dates, but all anterior to the eleventh century. Although it is often cited, it is worth giving it at length here, both as definitely bringing out the point at issue, and from its quaintness: "Rabbi Joden, in the name of Rabbi Chama, said: 'In the time to come, the Holy One—blessed be He!—makes King Messiah to sit at His right hand (as it is said, The Oracle of Jehovah to My Lord, sit at My right hand) and Abraham at His left. And his (*i.e.*, Abraham's) face turns pale, and he says, The Son of my son sits at the right hand, and I on the left. But the Holy One—blessed be He!—appeases him, and says, The Son of thy son is at My right hand, but I am at thy right hand,'" etc. ("Midrash Tillim" on Ps. xviii. 36). Other Jewish authorities, it is true, take other views, such as that Abraham or Hezekiah is the subject of the Psalm, which our space forbids us to discuss, but which we believe to have very little to recommend them. We shall, therefore, confine ourselves here to the question of David or not David; and if not David, what is to be said for a Maccabæan date.

We shall now try briefly to sketch the evidence on which it may be believed that the phenomena of the Psalm give the fullest support to the Davidic view; but before doing this, it may be well to meet a definite objection which has been brought forward. It is said here we have a Psalm occurring in the fifth and latest book of the Psalter among Psalms which are admittedly of much later day. The case is thus put by a recent advocate of the Maccabæan view: "By some strange accident, comparable to that by which the Moabite stone was only discovered twenty years ago, this Davidic poem waited (it would seem) for a public recognition till, probably, after the return from exile" (Cheyne's "Bampton Lectures," p. 20). We may, with Dr. Sharpe, begin by protesting against the exaggeration in the number of years involved—from David to the return measures roughly five hundred years, from the days when the Moabite stone was inscribed by the order of Mesha to its discovery was more than two thousand seven hundred years. Dr. Sharpe's remarks in continuation are exceedingly just.

He reminds us that there are no fewer than sixteen psalms in the fifth book inscribed "To David." Doubtless the compilation of the fifth book is much later than that of the first; yet this is in no sense conclusive of the date of individual Psalms. "Every new edition of a hymn-book, an anthology, a 'Golden Treasury,' contains writings omitted in earlier editions." The new conditions of life after the Exile "invested with new importance each utterance of a happier time."

Whatever special causes may have been at work in othee cases, it seems to us that Dr. Sharpe's suggestion as tr Psalm cx. is one of very high probability. The central figuro of Psalm cx. (be he who he may) is spoken of as both king and priest. Now, after the disruption of the kingdom, we find Jeroboam assuming priestly functions, in spite of the Mosaic ordinance, by offering sacrifice (1 Kings xiv. 1). Thus, a Psalm like this might seem at first sight to justify this ideal of kingship. In the southern kingdom, too, we find Uzziah offering incense (2 Chron. xxvi. 16), as though it were part of his kingly prerogative, and visited with sudden judgment. We may perhaps, then, suppose that a Psalm which might seem to countenance this association of ideas would be at first misunderstood, and so remained unused. After the return from exile, Zachariah was inspired to prophesy of the Branch who should be both King and Priest (Zach. vi. 12, *sqq.*); and then the true inner meaning of the Psalm being understood, it was joyfully incorporated in the collection.

Let us ask next how far the phenomena of the Psalm harmonize with the Davidic view—the view, that is, that the

Psalm is *by* David, not merely *about* David; "no mere glorification of David" by a "court-poet," but the words of the royal poet himself. Confining ourselves on this occasion to the case as between David and Simon, I trust it may appear that, apart from the *a priori* evidence of the heading, and apart from all external support to that view, the Psalm itself shows a far stronger—an infinitely stronger—case for David than for Simon.

We may now wisely follow the plan adopted by Dr. Gifford —that is, we may begin by simply letting the Psalm speak for itself, and then endeavour to see whither these phenomena lead us.

The writer, be he who he may, claims direct inspiration for what he says. This comes out more clearly when we translate the first clause more literally than is done in the E.V., "The oracle of Jehovah to my lord." The word here rendered "oracle" constantly occurs in the Bible in the sense of a solemn Divine utterance. It is very commonly found in the prophets, but, curiously enough, only occurs once again in the Psalms.[1] This oracle is addressed to "My lord"—to one whom the Psalmist accepts as his superior, one who "is invited by Jehovah to share the honour of His throne." The oracle uttered, the Psalmist proceeds to set forth the thought to him who is to be so honoured: Jehovah will be his help; his people will gladly devote themselves to his cause. And so in the day when their chieftain gathers his array, there shall be a multitude of willing followers, clad in "the beauties of holiness"—an army whose soldiers have had a priest-like consecration. But in verse 4, the Psalmist again appeals to the authority underlying his utterance in words as weighty and solemn as any words of Scripture can be, "Jehovah hath sworn"; and, as if to prevent even these words from being minimized, he adds, "and will not repent." And then follows a second promise: "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek." Thus, whereas the first oracle was a promise of kingship, the second is that of an eternal priesthood to the same person. The three remaining verses of the Psalm regard the warrior, fighting, pursuing, with Jehovah, as the source of his strength, at his right hand. Complete victory is his, yet he knows the exhaustion that comes from the conflict, and is glad to seek the refreshment of "the brook in the way."

---

[1] Psalm xxxvi. 1 (E.V.). Here the rather exceptional use of the word is to be explained by supposing Transgression to be personified as a quasi-divinity.

Dr. Gifford draws out very strikingly a parallel between this Psalm and the second, in both of which Zion is expressly pointed at. In both Psalms the Lord's anointed is newly made King in Zion; in both he is assailed by a combination of foes; in both God gives them utterly into his hands. All this points to a time when men believed fully in the reality of inspiration, and when the words of a prophet were held to convey God's will. How emphatically the speaker puts it we have already seen. The style, too, of the Hebrew, in its simple strength and beauty, may well be held to point to such an age as David's. And let it be remembered that this last statement is not one uttered merely by "unreasoning conservatives"; it is also the opinion of the most brilliant of the other school, one whom no one will accuse of lingering in the old paths. Ewald includes Psalm cx. among "Songs of David and of his time," though not assuming it to be by David himself. He speaks of the "genuine lyric brevity and compression of the Psalm"; it is "in the age of the greatest lyric poet of Israel, and as if after his example," we read of "a few grand briefly-sketched pictures," of the "very powerful beginning" ("Commentary on Psalms," i. 109, Eng. trans.). But we may go a step further, and argue that the Psalm is not merely one of David's age, and one which definitely refers to him, but that there are one or two touches which connect it with David personally. Thus the word "oracle," in verse 1, which, as we have said, only occurs in one other place in the Psalms, Davidic or otherwise, yet occurs twice in an undoubted Davidic hymn, "The last words of David," enshrined in 2 Sam. xxiii.

There is much force in a citation by Dr. Gifford from Dr. Driver, who does not accept the view of the Davidic authorship, and yet goes so far as to declare that we must believe the Psalm to have been written "by a prophet with reference to the theocratic king," and that it "depicts the glory of the theocratic king." Surely David's hopes were fixed on a "theocratic king"—one of his own seed, whose throne should be established for ever (2 Sam. vii. 12).

If it be asked whether there is any event in the life of David with which this Psalm can reasonably be connected, we may answer with some confidence that there are very fair grounds for connecting it with the time when the Ark of God was brought to its final resting-place on Mount Zion. That event happened, it will be remembered, shortly after David had won Jerusalem from the Jebusites, and had transferred his seat of government thither from Hebron. It was because the Philistines learnt that David was no longer a petty chieftain, ruling over a small part of the land, but was king of all

Israel, with a united people at his back, that they put forth effort after effort to overthrow him, to no purpose.

The transference of the Ark, therefore, was effected under circumstances of possible danger from Israel's foes, and we learn that on the first occasion, when the removal of the Ark was checked by the death of Uzzah, an escort was called together of not less than thirty thousand men. But on the second occasion, after the three months' sojourn in the house of Obed-edom, we are told that David gathered all Israel together, special mention being made of the priests and Levites —about nine hundred in number—who are present under their chiefs (1 Chron. xv. 3, *sqq.*). Such a scene as this—a king, newly seated on his throne, attacked by powerful and resolute foes, yet able to believe that his Lord should have them in derision: an army of warriors giving themselves as a free-will offering to their king, ready to be led forth against the foes of the Lord—all this surely is a close parallel to the Psalm. But David himself, we are told, executes priestly functions. He wears an ephod, he offers sacrifice, and at the last he utters the benediction.

Yet there is one point more. Granted, it may be said, that all of this is suggestive of an assumption of a certain priestly character, yet why of the order of Melchizedek? Clearly, we may say that there is implied a combination of kingly and priestly offices, and that a priesthood is brought before us different from, and therefore greater (seeing what the line of thought is) than, the Aaronic priesthood. Probably, also, the meaning of the name "king of righteousness" is not to be lost sight of. How far we may identify the Salem of Melchizedek with the seat of David's kingdom, it is, perhaps, impossible to say with certainty. Last of all, we may call attention to a possible curious parallel between Melchizedek and David. The former brought out bread and wine for Abraham; David, after the offerings to God, and after he had blessed the people, gives to each one "a cake of bread and a good piece" (R.V. "portion") "of flesh"—where it will be observed that in the English Bible the last two words are in italics, answering to nothing in the Hebrew. The word rendered "a good piece" only occurs in the account of this incident (2 Sam vi. 19; 1 Chron. xvi. 3), and its meaning must be considered very doubtful. Yet no less a Hebraist than Gesenius explains the word as meaning "a definite portion of wine or drink, a cup" ["certam *mensuram* vini potusve, *calicem*"]; and this view is embodied in the margin of the Revised Version, where we have "*of wine*" as an alternative for the "*of flesh*" of the text. If this interpretation be correct, then the parallelism becomes strikingly close; after the lapse of well-nigh a

thousand years again this solemn act is performed, both foreshadowing the day when the Saviour should give to His disciples the typical bread and wine.

The only other detail to which we shall refer is the expression in the last verse, "He shall drink of the brook by the way." The warrior, while pursuing a flying foe, faints from heat and weariness till refreshed from the brook which flows by his path. This brings strikingly before us the occasion in David's war with the Philistines, which Ewald cites by way of comparison, when he longed to drink of the well of Bethlehem, and three of his warriors, at their own imminent risk, brought it to him, though he would not drink it.

Thus, do we believe, David portrays his own conflicts and his triumphs in this poem; but, with "thoughts beyond his thoughts," he sees, too, the glory of the future King, his Son, in far-off days yet to be. It is well pointed out by Dr. Gifford that it was just at this juncture in David's life, when, the Philistines overthrown, the Ark brought safely to Mount Zion, the rites of sacrifice and benediction accomplished, the promise comes of the Son who should establish His kingdom for ever. It thus becomes clear that a very strong case exists for the traditional view, and this case is stated with admirable clearness in both the works now before us. It is surely not too much to ask that whatever view is offered to us in its stead should come with a strong array of evidence sufficient to establish it as a real substantial rival to the Davidic one, and not be one which its advocates seek to force upon their hearers by sweeping declarations scantily supported by evidence.

The newest theory, set forth with unhesitating confidence, is that Psalm cx. is "a glorification of Simon Maccabæus," who, though not a king, "lacked nothing of the dignity but the name. Syria claimed no authority over him." This is very strong language, and, if it could be justified, it would set the theory, not, indeed, on higher ground than the traditional view, but would give it a very reasonable degree of probability.

Let us briefly examine this theory. It is of the essence of it that Simon was practically, though not formally, a king. Now, be it remembered, the words of the Psalm are very strong—the subject of it is bidden by God to sit at His right hand, and, therefore, his kingship is directly and distinctly due to God. Simon, we learn, on the death of his brother Jonathan, was chosen by the Jews their leader (ἡγούμενος, 1 Macc. xiii. 8), and thereupon he sends to Demetrius, King of Syria, presents of a golden crown and scarlet robe, begging that he would give the land "immunity," that is, of course, from tribute. The presents are graciously received, and the request granted

but the wording of the permission is most suggestive: "As for any oversight or fault committed unto this day, we forgive it, and the crown tax also, which ye owe us: and if there were any other tribute paid in Jerusalem it shall no more be paid" (verse 39). Demetrius, it is clear, was glad of the alliance of stout warriors like Simon and his men, and so makes these concessions, but no words could show more clearly that the relation between the two was that of suzerain and vassal. Or, again, take another point, on which much stress has been laid—the fact, namely, that Simon coined money with his "own stamp." Antiochus Sidetes, the successor of Demetrius, writes to Simon: "I give thee leave also to coin money for thy country with thine own stamp" (1 Macc. xv. 6). This is hardly the language which would be addressed to one who "lacked nothing of the dignity [of king] but the name." Obviously he was a vassal, though a powerful one, and one whose alliance was valuable; but, none the less, it is impossible to view him as one who wielded a God-given sceptre.

But the same kind of results are got if we consider the nature of the priesthood. The reference to the priesthood of the subject of the Psalm is even more emphatic than that to his kingship—"The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent." Surely the force of language will hardly go further. The priesthood, too, is dissociated from the Levitical priesthood—something new, something specially sacred, is brought forward. But what of the high-priesthood of Simon? The first allusion to it is in the letter of King Demetrius, in which he calls him "the high priest and friend of kings" (1 Macc. xiii. 36); and whether or no Simon owed the high-priesthood to Demetrius, anyhow the appointment was confirmed by him (xiv. 38). Nay, if we notice what happened in the case of the high-priesthood of Jonathan, the brother of Simon, to whom King Alexander could say (x. 20): "Now this day we ordain thee to be the high priest of thy nation," it seems by no means improbable that Demetrius had not merely confirmed, but actually bestowed, the dignity on Simon.

Surely the parallel somewhat breaks down. The Psalm brings before us a priest appointed to an exceptional priesthood in terms of special solemnity; the history shows us Simon probably appointed by a heathen king, and certainly accepting confirmation at his hands. Surely, unless the Psalm is an absolute mockery of language, the idea of such a parallel must be driven out of court.

Another point remains. The Jews and priests were pleased, we are told, that Simon should be "their governor and high priest for ever, *until there should arise a faithful prophet.*" To say nothing further of the source whence he derived his

authority, that authority was, in a certain sense, temporary; a higher authority might in due time arise, and then this inferior authority was to come to an end. Thus, viewing the matter, as we have done, in a broad general way, it becomes plain that in no point will the recorded history of Simon satisfy the conditions laid down in the Psalm.

The Simonian theory is discussed with great fulness and clearness by Dr. Sharpe in his second lecture. To enter into full details is impossible here, but we may conclude with one striking point: The subject of the Psalm, priest and king, is distinctly and essentially a warrior, fighting and pursuing. But Simon's period of rule was one of peace, when "every man sat under his vine and his fig tree, and there was none to fray them." This is rather an awkward contradiction. A recent work, to which we have already referred, remarks on it: "It appears to be certain, from many prophetic passages, that inspiration was not incompatible with harmless illusion." A good many of us will have our opinion as to the good taste of such a remark in such a connection; but, after all, the question is simply one of fact. The Psalm, we are told, refers to Simon; but part of the Psalm is absolutely incapable of being so explained. An ordinary plain man would say, Then the theory has broken down. By no means, say our critics; the theory is all right, the Psalm itself is in fault. This is almost as illogical as the case of the Roman priest, who, on being told some passage in the Vulgate was certainly incorrect, because it could in no way be reconciled with the Hebrew, cheerfully answered: "So much the worse for the Hebrew."

Has any case, then, been shown why—so far, at any rate, as this Psalm is concerned—we should cut loose from the old moorings? Surely no. And be it once again remarked, that the present phase of criticism is having less and less to do with critical scholarship. In an increasing degree, the arguments contained in books of destructive criticism can in the main be comprehended by any educated person. It is not so much scholarship as keen logical common-sense that is wanted, which shall rigorously refuse to treat assertion and demonstration as the same; which will demand, when the treasures assailed are so priceless, that no outpost, even the tiniest, be given up, unless and until it is shown to be untenable. Of absolute truth, whatever it be, we have, and need have no fear; of theories put forward with loud assertion, and sometimes with reckless treating of the evidence, we may have much fear, yet often they are but shadowy and unsubstantial after all.

R. SINKER.

ART. III.—SAYINGS OF JESUS:

"PARTY FEELING."

IN the following lines I desire to say a few words about "parties" and "party feeling" in the Church and in the world, and to see, if it may be, something of what is said concerning them in the Bible, and to ask what light is shed upon them by our Lord and Master Jesus Christ.

Without even mentioning them by name I do not spend any time in showing that there are "parties" in the Church. They exist, inevitably differ, and often dispute. And we all know that "government by party" is the present fashion in the State. As politicians, most men adopt a distinctive name, range themselves under a special flag, follow a leader. And as professing Christians (though many resent being classed under titles which suggest division), they either claim openly to belong to some sect or are stubbornly reckoned by others as representing this or that party in the Church.

I do not for a moment assume that there is no good reason for these divisions. Many men, many minds. But, at the same time, not a few join, or remain in, them without being able to explain, with individual intelligence, why they do so. The accident of birth, marriage, education, society, circumstance, fixes their profession and place. Or some half-realized motive (perhaps an unworthy one) leads them in the choice of their opinions. And, these once chosen, they generally shut their eyes and stick to them without any further question or inquiry.

If men are asked to co-operate with anyone it is generally enough to be told that he belongs to such or such a party, is known by this or that name. That settles the question. We decline or accept the proposal to associate ourselves with him. That is the usual way in the world and in the Church. And there is much to be said for it. There are distinct principles of authority or rule in both—feudal and popular; priestly and personal. We can generally tell the nature of a man's mind by his surroundings, and, however we may respect him, can hardly help using them to measure the prospect of cordiality between us.

Where there is no common sentiment, common action is difficult, and thus "party feeling" is an accepted guide, and saves us a world of trouble. What are his colours? That is the point.

But convenient as this measure of humanity is, widely as it has been accepted, strongly as it is held and used, nothing is more notable than the light which is shed upon it in the New

Testament. I say New, because the Old is intensely penetrated with party feeling—at least, that chief portion of it which records the history of the Jews. I need bring no proof of this to anyone who reads the Bible with even the least intelligence. Why, the very utterance "Shibboleth," which is the familiar newspaper, and even almost household, word to indicate a "party test," has been provided for us in our English Bibles by the Hebrew. The Hebrew has ever been scrupulously exclusive. I will not quote instances in Old Testament history to show this—they abound in the Holy Scriptures. But there is one in the New which illustrates, better than any other, the way in which "party spirit" was regarded by our Lord Jesus Christ, and through which we may see the light shed upon it by Him.

I refer to the bitterness with which the Samaritan was looked upon by every Jew. Some have reckoned this to be impiously intolerant. Nevertheless, there was a special reason for it (2 Kings xvii. 6, etc.). When, in the reign of Hosea, the King of Assyria took Samaria, and carried Israel away into Assyria, he "brought men from Babylon, and from Cuthah, and from Ava, and from Hamath, and from Sepharvaim, and placed them in the cities of Samaria instead of the children of Israel, and they possessed Samaria and dwelt in the cities thereof." And so it was (we read) at the beginning of their dwelling there, that they (this mixed imported race) feared not the Lord; therefore the Lord sent lions among them, which slew some of them. Wherefore they spake to the King of Assyria, saying, "The nations which thou hast placed in the cities of Samaria know not the manner of the God of the land: therefore He hath sent lions among them. Then the King of Assyria commanded, saying, Carry thither one of the priests whom ye brought from thence, and let him teach them the manner of the God of the land. Then one of the priests whom they had carried away from Samaria came and dwelt in Bethel, and taught them how they should fear the Lord." Then comes the original offence which separated the Jews from the Samaritans, and it is thus recorded. "Howbeit every nation made gods of their own, and put them in the houses of the high places. . . . So they feared the Lord," *i.e.*, in such a mixed fashion. They observed the Hebrew ordinance and Jewish ritual taught them by one of the banished priests who had been sent back from Babylon to Bethel. And also "served their graven images, both their children and their children's children . . . unto this day."

Thus the religion, the ritual and ordinances of the Samaritan were polluted reproductions of the Jewish, and we must not wonder at the hatred with which the Jew abhorred him.

The Passover of the Samaritan was to him a blasphemous fraud, a base coin, an insulting counterfeit of holy worship. If any believer had good reason for showing religious intolerance towards a neighbour, it was the Jew, insulted by an offensive travesty or pollution of what he held most dear.

And yet they were the Samaritans of whom our Lord repeatedly and signally spoke with toleration and tenderness. This is most remarkable. Think of the occasions on which He so carried Himself towards these heretics, or brought in their name to illustrate some doctrine which He taught.

It was not as if they showed a better mind than the Jews, and desired a recognition which was denied to them. On one occasion, when He entered into a certain village of the Samaritans, they would not receive Him because His face was set towards Jerusalem, and thus the angry disciples prayed Him to call down fire upon them, like Elias. They knew not (as yet) what manner of spirit was required in a follower of Jesus, as He told them. They could not understand His toleration of this affront. Take another case. When common misery had driven a Samaritan to consort with some leper Jews, and Jesus had healed them all, He drew marked notice to the gratitude of "this stranger." We may recall other indications of the feeling shown by the Jews to these people. If the Scribes and Pharisees desired to bring the worst charge they could think of against Jesus they had only to remark, "Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil?" And yet, when He would illustrate genuine humanity, He draws the picture of a good Samaritan. The accusation of the Scribes which I have quoted would seem to indicate other examples of His tolerance of Samaritans beside those which are recorded. He was known to be their friend, deep as was the wound inflicted on the Jewish faith by their ancestors, and defective, or rather heretical, as was their worship in His (our Lord's) time.

The instances of His tolerance are, probably, not all recorded. Not the least of those we know of is seen in the surprise of the woman of Samaria, who asked, "How is it that Thou, being a Jew, askest drink of me?" She had not for a moment forgotten the ancient feud between the two nations, which barred the interchange of even the barest courtesies between them. The disciples marvelled that He even talked with her. But, heretic though she was, Jesus admits her fitness to hear some of the most precious among His recorded words. It was not He who first referred to the enmity between the Jew and the Samaritan. He assumes Himself to be the common Saviour of them both. "If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee, Give Me to drink, thou wouldest have

asked of Him, and" (here is one point) "He would have given to thee living water." This is specially notable. The mission of the Christ covered and ignored the dividing feud between these hostile races, though it was so deep and grave, as I have pointed out by reference to its origin.

That, in itself, displays the catholicity of Christian tolerance, and shows how Jesus was willing to treat the representatives of the most divergent religious animosity. Though, as the woman began by saying, the Jews had no dealings with the Samaritans, He (so to speak) waived this aside at once, without then entering upon its merits or nature, and was prepared to offer her blessings of salvation in words which are to this day prized as full of comfort: "He would have given thee living water."

But this is by no means all that we learn about the tolerance of Christ from His conversation with this bigoted woman. She insisted on dragging into it one chief point of dispute between the divided worshippers. "Our fathers worshipped in this mountain, but ye say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship."

And then it was that Jesus brought forward the profound eternal reason why an end should be put to all the bitterness of religious differences. He lifted the whole question of any such disputes into another level. There was one divine atmosphere which should be breathed by those who should thereafter understand and follow Him. It was not a question of local boundaries or external distinctions, or even deep traditional division. Jesus saith unto her, "Woman, believe Me, the hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father." For the present time, He would say, the Samaritan was wrong and the Jew was right (and this adds to the force and value of His forecast); but in the time to come this would be superseded and left behind in the fuller relationship between any true worshippers, at all. "God is a Spirit," He said, "and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." This cannot mean (the context forbids it) merely that all worship should be spiritually sincere, whatever its form. That is obvious. It goes (so to speak) without saying. It was no new thing to be affirmed. We do not need revelation to be assured of such a truth. To restrict the teaching of Jesus on this critical, this pointed occasion, to the announcement of so evident a fact is to rob His words of their significance. What, then, can they mean?

They really contain the Divine eternal principle that sincerity and the love of truth must override what we understand by "party feeling" in all our relations with one another.

There must, I need hardly say, be parties. There must be

variety in views. I do not like this word "views," but I am at a loss to find another which expresses what I mean. There must be differences in our aspect of facts. Minds, circumstances, abilities, intelligences, and tastes vary. What is one man's meat is another man's poison. This cannot be helped. There are diversities of operations by the same Spirit of God. But among things needful, that we may be Christians indeed, in whom is no guile, the knowledge and use of this law is not merely desirable, but prominent, essential, inevitable. We must honestly follow after truth ourselves, and be ready to believe that those from whom we differ may be equally sincere. The Father seeketh such in all the relationships of life.

Then divisions, or parties, if we like to term them so, lose their sting, their taint, their bad nature, and yet retain all their force. As each seeks truth rather than victory or sectional triumph, so, and so alone, the cause of righteousness advances in the Church and in the State. We must not be silenced by the reply that this is Utopian. It is simply true. And only as it prevails can there be true national and individual life. This is the salt of the earth which alone saves the people and the man from corruption, disappointment, and shame. The Father seeketh such to worship Him, or to serve Him, in any way. It is this which marks the "Christian" way of life and work, as distinguished from the ancient Jewish or the modern worldly.

ART. IV. — FASTING COMMUNION NEITHER PRIMITIVE, NOR APOSTOLIC, NOR DIVINE.

PART II.

PASSING onwards down the stream of history, we find no support for the practice of fasting before Communion, notwithstanding the efforts made by some to discern such support where none exists, until we come to Tertullian, A.D. 192, who as a Montanist would regard fasting as meritorious. We are not, therefore, surprised at his praise of the woman who received the Communion *secreto* and *ante omnem cibum*. But his evidence as to the practice of the Church goes quite in the opposite direction in another passage as follows: "Eucharistiæ Sacramentum omnibus mandatum a domino tempore victûs ETIAM in antelucanis cœtibus de presidentium manu sumimus" —"The Sacrament which was commanded by the Lord to all at the time of food, we partake of ALSO at our meetings before dawn at the hand of the presiders."

This is clear evidence that what our Lord commanded still

was observed in the practice of the Church, though Mr. Puller with inaccuracy translates *mandatum* "administered," and is also evidence that evening celebrations at meal-time still survived in Christian communities. And here, as an admirable comment on Tertullian's "Etiam in antelucanis cœtibus," it is well to add the late learned Bishop Jeune's words, taken from his charge in 1867, and so recently quoted by the Bishop of Exeter with approval:

> The hour of administration has varied greatly in the Christian Church. In Tertullian's time it was observed, not only in the evening at the Love-feast, but in assemblies before dawn. In the age of St. Augustine, the Christians of Egypt were in the habit of communicating on Saturday evening, but generally in the morning, certain days excepting, when the administration was in the afternoon. St. Augustine, too, observes that in some places in Africa, on the Thursday before Easter, the Communion was administered both morning and evening, and in other places only towards night. Our Church has not limited the celebration of the Holy Communion to any special hours of the day. The ordinary time of celebration is at the close of the first hour of evening. But warrant and example there surely is for evening Communion in the institution of His Supper by the Lord, and in the practice of Apostolic and after times.

The valuable note in Bingham is also to be read with care on this point: ("Fell. Not. in Cyprian Epist.," lxiii., p. 156). "Constat Eucharistiam licet horis antelucanis sumtam vespere etiam distribui solitam, cujus rei locuples testis Tertullianus" (Lib. de Cor., ciii.). 'Eucharistiæ sacramentum tempore victûs de presidentium manu sumimus,'" and "Consuetudo post cœnam communicandi diu duravit in ecclesiâ."

Now it will be noted that, notwithstanding the growing prevalence of exaggerated and metaphorical language as to the Lord's Supper, and the admitted and consequent increase of the practice of fasting before Communion, there was no appeal at this date to an Apostolic or Divine authority to justify the custom. Such a notion was never dreamt of till much farther on down the centuries.

The practice CREPT in, and centuries later it was necessary to imagine, even if it could not be produced, an Apostolic direction for a practice the very opposite to that of our blessed Lord. But the Saviour's example lived long in the early Church, for the practice of Communion on Saturdays after the daily meal was for centuries observed by such large and important Christian communities as those in the vicinity of Alexandria, the Thebaid, and others in Egypt itself (Socrates, quoted by Bingham, "Antiq.," vol. v., p. 292). Would such a widespread custom have been possible contrary to Apostolic practice and precept? If such precept, reversing the order of Christ, was appealed to by the Church of that age, let it eb

produced, or proof given that such an Apostolic precept was even THOUGHT of at this date.

In the article in "Biblical Antiquities" we find the following passage on this custom of some of the African Churches: "The practice then noticed was probably a relic of the primitive Church, both as to time and manner, when the Lord's Supper had been like other suppers, eaten in the evening; when an evening meeting on the first day of the week meant the evening of Saturday (Jewish mode); when the thought that fasting was a necessary condition of partaking of the Supper of the Lord was not merely not present to men's minds, but was absolutely excluded by the Apostle's rule that men who could not wait patiently when the members of the Church met, should satisfy their hunger beforehand in their own houses" (E. H. P.).

Advancing to Cyprian's time, A.D. 248, we still find evidence of the prevalence of the custom of after-supper Communion. Cyprian, contending with the Aquarians, does not contend with them (Bingham) about celebrating after supper, but only because they did not use wine on BOTH occasions. He would not have so easily passed over the evening celebration had not the custom been *largely prevalent;* all he contends for is that the general custom of the Church to celebrate only in the morning was not contrary to the rule of Christ: "Though He gave it in the evening after supper, because He had particular reason for what He did to signify the end of the world; but we offer in the morning to celebrate His resurrection" (Bingham, "Antiq.," vol. v., p. 294)—a statement unwarranted as a matter of fact and theologically unsound, inasmuch as the Lord's Supper is "for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ" (see Cor. xi. 26).

And he gives another reason why they did not celebrate in the evening—because the people could not so well come together in the evening as in the morning, an argument which nowadays makes as strongly in favour of evening Communion, as it possibly in Cyprian's day may have told against it. He (Cyprian) plainly implies the prevalence of non-fasting Communion when he says "that people who only offered water in the morning should not salve their consciences by offering the mixed chalice when they came together AD CŒNANDUM"; and his arguments as above are obviously and wholly unconvincing, as against Communion after supper.

Once more we ask, Where in the history of the Church up to this date is there any trace of any Apostolic tradition against post cœnal Communion, or in favour of fasting Communion, or even of any knowledge of or belief in the existence of such tradition? We can see nothing of the kind; but we

CAN see the rise of superstition, we can read the carnal, metaphorical, exaggerated language of many of the Fathers with regard to the Lord's Supper, and we know of the slanders and persecutions of the heathen. Then, as now, were banded together against the doctrine and custom of the primal Church the dragon, the false prophet, and the wild beast.

We may safely sum up the question to this date in the words found in Bingham's note: "Exhis patet totis tribus primis Christianismi seculis, tametsi sacramentum mane sumi soleret, apud ecclesiam usitatum fuisse ut id etiam a cenatis sumeretur" (Vid. Dall., "De objecto Cult. Relig.," lib. ii., chap. xiv.; Bingham, vol. v., p. 293).

We now come to the time of Augustine and the Council of Carthage, A.D. 397, of which he was a member, when it was attempted to stamp out the primitive custom by the decree: "Ut sacramenta altaris non nisi a jejunis hominibus celebrentur excepto uno die anniversario (quo cœna Domini celebratur)"—an unscriptural prohibition, which bears remarkable testimony to the nature of the Divine institution, and the time and hour of its original appointment, and, be it noted, to the prevalence of the custom in the Church of non-fasting Communion. About the same time is the letter of Augustine to Januarius ("Epist.," cxviii.): "Though it be apparent (*satisliquidum*) that when the disciples first received the body and blood of the Lord they did not receive fasting, yet does anyone blame the universal Church because all men receive fasting?" and he goes on to argue from the expression (1 Cor. xi.): "The rest will I set in order when I come"—that fasting Communion was then made the rule of the Church by the Apostle Paul (Bingham, vol. v., p. 289).

This bold assertion, the great name of Augustine, and the other influences already at work, undoubtedly immensely strengthened the practice of fasting Communion; and at last, A.D. 680, the Council of Trullo forbade even the Maundy Thursday celebration in the evening, authorized by the Council of Carthage, by which provincial Councils we are as much bound as by the decrees of the Council of Constance in 1414, which forbade the cup to the laity.

And now let us return to Augustine's letter, upon which, as the apex of the pyramid, the erroneous edifice is built.

Quoting St. Paul's words, τὰ λοίπα, in 1 Cor. xi. 34, "The rest will I set in order when I come," he deduces from them—he does not state a fact, he merely draws an inference from the words of St. Paul, by the flimsiest process of reasoning, that "fasting Communion" was the rule established by the Apostle when he came to Corinth.

And when we ask the evidence of this astounding assertion,

will it be believed that all we have is Augustine's words, "unde intelligi datur"?

We are told that St. Paul reversed his own solemn authoritative conclusion; we are told we may invert or read backwards the canon in Holy Writ, laid down by the Apostle, upon the feeble and utterly erroneous conclusion, "unde intelligi datur."

There is no pretence at bringing forward evidence as to matter of fact. The argument of Augustine is simply this. "The custom of fasting Communion is very general (universal it was not), THEREFORE this was one of the things altered by St. Paul," a conclusion which is to be met with an unhesitating negative.

If the *ipse dixit* of Augustine, or of the erratic Tertullian, be of sufficient weight to override the plain directions of Holy Scripture, there is an end of the Bible as a rule of faith or practice, and there is substituted for it the varying uses of the Church, not of the first century, but of the fourth or fifth or seventh century. The abuses in Corinth were most grave and serious, and they were brought to the formal notice of the Apostle. He blames them for indecent haste, he warns them of the judgment of God, and he solemnly lays down the remedy for their unseemly participation of the Lord's Supper.

"If any man hunger let him eat at home"; he does not recommend fasting Communion; he commands with all his Apostolic authority the very reverse.

But there were other matters, τὰ λοίπα, therefore not this. This question he had settled—he had spoken, "causa finita est," but there were "other" matters, *i.e.*, matters outside this, upon which he had not spoken, and, plainly and without doubt, those matters were "the rest" which he would "set in order" when he came.

The removal[1] of the abuses in Corinth was a crying and an *immediate* necessity—the judgment of God was abroad in death and sickness, and the inspired Apostle lays down the authoritative decision, and, the necessity being an imperative and pressing one, he meets it, not in the future, but at once with the rule, "If any man hunger let him eat at home."

We are asked to believe that the Apostle St: Paul contradicted his own written words, and reversed his own official and inspired decision, upon the strength of Augustine's "unde intelligi datur."

We must in this matter take our stand on the impregnable rock of Holy Scripture, and as from that elevation we survey the subsequent centuries, we are shut up to the conclusion, not

[1] See again the late Rev. C. H. Marriott's tract, to which I am again here indebted.

that early Communion is to be forbidden to the discretion of the Church, but that fasting Communion is neither so consonant to the institution of the rite by our blessed Lord, nor so agreeable to the practice of the primitive Church, whereby every meal was consecrated, and the solemn rite itself was made a part of and to follow the supper of the *Ἀγάπη*, of which Chrysostom says, "It was a custom most beautiful and most beneficial, for it was a supporter of love, a solace of poverty, a moderator of wealth, and a discipline of humility."

But it is sometimes said the "Church has power to decree rites or ceremonies." True, but we have shown *this* alteration was not made by Apostolic or primitive authority; and granting the AUTHORITY of the Church to decree rites, no such decree WAS made either by the Church or by General Council, and, even if it were, such decree may have been wrong or inadvisable.

The authority of a judge, a parent, or a teacher is not always wisely exercised, and Churches and General Councils "MAY err and HAVE erred, even in things pertaining to God," so that we cannot accept the practice of fasting Communion either as consistent with Holy Scripture, or as having been commanded by the primitive Church, or desirable on the ground that it was prescribed by some provincial Council of Carthage, or on the flimsy basis of "unde intelligi datur," or because it was enforced by King Edgar, A.D. 960, when our British Church was under the heel of Rome and transubstantiation was formulated, and this practice was used to impress the delusion.

Again, it is argued that because certain matters may have been legitimately changed, this change is also desirable. Without stopping to comment on the reasoning, it may be said that the change of the Sabbath was probably (*a*) of Apostolic origin, and answers to the (*b*) test, "Quod semper, ubique ab omnibus," but that fasting Communion is certainly not of Apostolic origin, and for four centuries did not comply with Vincentius Lirinensis' canon as above.

It is said that change has been made as regards posture, the upper room, the private house, the ordinary dress.

Passing over the fact that the surplice is a relic of the ordinary dress, and the argument that had we strictly followed our Lord's example many troubles would have been saved the Church, it is sufficient to say that changes consistent with the spirit of the sacred ordinance, and upon which there rests no suspicion that *the object of their introduction was to teach transubstantiation*, are very different things from the introduction of such a change as "fasting Communion," which is opposed to the very essence and soul of the ordinance, and against which there is in the prayer of consecration the ever-

lasting protest of the Church of England, "Likewise, after supper, He took the cup."

If fasting Communion is consistent with the mind of the Church, why perpetuate the condemnation of it thus contained in the services of the Church? The Church of England enjoins kneeling in the reception of Holy Communion, but until she gives as clear a direction as to fasting as she does with reference to kneeling reception, no arguments from the change in the latter direction are of any use as regards a practice against which the words just quoted in the Communion Service are a standing warning.

It will also be noticed that in the inspired accounts of the sacred ordinance it is not the dress, nor the posture of the recipients, nor the place of its institution which has been eternally stamped upon the forefront of the holy rite, but only the time of its celebration, and the fact of its reception "after supper."

It is this fact, destructive as it is, of fasting Communion which the Spirit of God has engraved upon the rite by the title of "The Lord's Supper."

There is no rule in the Church of England fixing the time of celebration. Dr. Hook says, "THERE IS NO DIRECTION about what time of the day it shall be used, only custom has determined that it shall be used in the forenoon" ("Church Dictionary").

And we may fairly suppose with the late Bishop of Lincoln that the possibility of evening—which of course would be non-fasting—Communion is contemplated in the rubric, which directs that "the table shall stand where morning and EVENING prayers are appointed to be said."

But another and grave objection to fasting Communion is derived from the object with which the practice is now pressed. Under the plea of greater reverence—greater reverence than that prescribed by the example of our most blessed Lord and His Apostles!—it is used to teach the doctrine that there is "a substantial presence of Christ's body" made to coalesce with or under the forms or veils of the elements by the act of consecration."

It is admitted that many, of course, have advocated fasting Communion who do not hold either this delusion or the almost identical one of transubstantiation.

But the general object of the leading spirits of those who NOW advocate fasting Communion is to teach thereby what is erroneously called "higher," or "Church" doctrine, the presence, "after the manner of a spirit," of the body and blood of Christ in the elements. And it is to be noted here that inasmuch as ANY presence of body and blood must be a corporal

presence, the addition of the word "spiritually," by which is meant "after the manner of a spirit," as Gardiner meant it, is simply a self-contradiction. With this great danger in view the Church of England will do well to discourage fasting Communion, and without refusing liberty in other directions, to maintain the evening and non-fasting celebration as most in accordance with our Lord's personal example.

It is said men should not receive after a heavy dinner and sumptuous fare. Neither should they receive at early fasting celebration after a wine-party or a card-party protracted to twelve or one the night before. I have known this done, but, as a matter of fact, the other error is PRACTICALLY UNKNOWN, and both of these classes are most unlikely to come to the Lord's Supper at all. Thus in both cases the very improbable abuse should not be pushed as an argument. The reasons advanced in favour of fasting Communion are of the following nature: That as Christ's body was put into the "new tomb wherein never yet man was laid," so it should be with the sacred elements ("Ritual Reason Why," p. 161).

This argument the late Bishop of Oxford is said to have called "foolish and disgusting"; "foolish" because the purpose in view is defeated by eating a breakfast to follow the Holy Communion as completely as if it preceded participation, and "disgusting" to introduce the question of digestion at all. And it is clear that an argument of this kind reveals the real object with which fasting Communion is pressed, *i.e.*, the restoration of the Mass into the English Church, and the teaching of a carnal or corporal reception of Christ's body "after a spiritual manner," the expression in inverted commas being a contradiction and not an explanation of the doctrine, although it is quite sufficient to throw dust into the eyes of thousands.

Again, the practice of fasting Communion is advocated on the ground of there being more self-denial and reverence in a fasting and early reception than in an evening and non-fasting Communion.

But this is a direct condemnation of the action of our blessed Lord; and, besides, it cannot be too clearly stated that acts of self-denial of mere human selection are not at all honourable, and are really pieces of "voluntary humility," and to "the satisfying of the flesh."

There is no merit and no reverence and no cultivation of the true spirit of self-denial in choosing the most inconvenient and uncomfortable time for Holy Communion or in fasting reception.

If we desire to cultivate the habit of godly self-denial, let us take the list of "mortifications" which St. Paul suggests to us in Col. iii., and not those created by our own carnal imaginations.

God imposes upon us mortifications which humble us to the dust, while those of our own selection puff up the fleshly mind.

Arguments against the practice may be multiplied:

(*a*) Fasting Communion, which practically must be a very early reception, would of course condemn and put an end to evening or any non-fasting Communion as an "act of gross irreverence," and would therefore be tantamount to an excommunication of the greater number of the wives and mothers of the working classes.

(*b*) The hurry of getting up, the bustle, the rush to be in time, which are no imaginary evils, but would in many cases certainly exist, unfit the mind for the sacred rite.

(*c*) There is the danger of a sense of merit stealing into the mind from the inconvenience thus incurred and SOUGHT AFTER, and of a laxity of life being indulged in for the rest of the day. There ARE cases where on Sundays early and fasting celebrations, followed by French novels and lawn-tennis, are, I regret to say, the order of the day.

(*d*) Evening, which naturally would be non-fasting, reception is a quiet, reposeful time, calculated to rouse within us the sacred memories of that upper room furnished, of the moonlit Kedron, of Mount Olivet and Gethsemane. Evening and post-cœnal reception was the custom of the early Church, and was the example set for the Church of all ages by the Lord Jesus Christ our Sacrifice and our Pattern.

Chrysostom, in a passage deliberately mutilated we cannot doubt by the "Ritual Reason Why," recalls this solemn fact to our mind amidst much protestation against the accusation of having administered the Communion to those who had broken their fast; he says, "If I have done this, let my name be wiped out of the catalogue of bishops," and he goes on to say that even if he *had* done so, and if they still object, "I have done nothing unreasonable," *οὐδὲν ἀκαιρον τῶν πραγμάτων ἐποίησα*, "let them degrade Paul, who baptized a whole house after supper. Yea, I will dare to say (*τολμῶ λέγειν*) a bolder thing, LET THEM DEPOSE CHRIST HIMSELF, WHO GAVE THE COMMUNION TO HIS DISCIPLES AFTER SUPPER" (Chrys., "Sermo ante Exil.").

I conclude with the famous reply of Bishop Jeune in Convocation to Bishop Wilberforce so recently brought forward by Canon Fleming in the columns of the *Record*: "When Bishop Wilberforce was contending that the institution of the Lord's Supper at night was an exception, and could not be quoted as a rule, Bishop Jeune replied: 'Then let my Lord's exception be my rule.'"

Appended are the utterances of some of the bishops of our Church:

I. The Archbishop of York (Dr. Magee).

I have never been able to agree with those who regard evening Communion as in itself a sin, or even as a practice forbidden by our Church. I cannot set aside the plain, and to my mind conclusive fact, that the first Communion was celebrated at eventide, by Him who assuredly would not have done so had the certainty of His example being followed involved the certainty of sin! I cannot but see, moreover, that if the evils which arose from evening Communion in the Church of Corinth warn us of the danger the custom involves, it is clear, first, that it was a custom in Apostolic times, and secondly, that the inspired Apostles did not believe that the best way of preventing these evils was absolutely to prohibit the custom.

("Primary Charge to the Clergy of Peterborough Diocese," 1872, p. 18.)

II. The Bishop of Winchester (Dr. Thorold).

(*A*) On evening Communions I must not be silent, for in 100 churches in the diocese the returns show them to be celebrated, while, in the Metropolis, generally they appear to have increased from 65 in 1869, to 267 in 1880, a circumstance which would not readily be accepted as significant of a corresponding augmentation in the clergy of the Evangelical School. Four years cannot make me forget that at St. Giles' I instituted the practice, and at St. Pancras continued it, with an entire conviction both of its suitableness and necessity. But this shall not diminish my anxiety, if possible, to get behind the grave prejudice that clearly exists against it in the minds of brethren whom I deeply respect; and while vindicating the liberty wherewith I believe we may suitably claim to be free in this matter, to appreciate and consider their difficulties.

Is it illegal? I take it to be in this respect precisely on a footing with early Communion, neither more nor less. Perhaps the Prayer-book contemplates neither.

Is it un-Catholic and inconsistent with antiquity? The blessed Lord instituted it in the evening. For the three first centuries, until it became abused, it was certainly celebrated occasionally at that hour. But were this argument ten times stronger than it is, it is not worth a feather's weight in the face of the undoubted liberty of the English Church to decree rites and ceremonies for herself, as to when she thinks proper. Nay, I would eagerly fling all the traditions and decrees of the mediæval time into the Dead Sea sooner than rob one humble soul for which Christ died of the Blessed Sacrament of His body.

Is it inconsistent with that clearness and devoutness of spirit, which the recent partaking of food might be supposed to endanger? Precisely as much as a mid-day Communion. The poor have no experience of late dinners.

Is it irreverent or slovenly? If it be, it is the clergyman's fault. I have never found it so.

But is it necessary? From an experience of twenty-four years, emphatically I say *it is*, and while fully appreciating the important experience of those who think otherwise, I claim hearing and respect for my own. The mother of a young family, the busy household servant (especially where there is only one), the working man often late marketing on Saturday night, and who needs his Sabbath rest for body as well as soul, the medical man, and, where she is wanted at home, even the Sunday-school teacher, these value and require evening Communion, since not only is it often the only time possible, but it is the time when the day's labour is over and the evening rest is come. If in some cases it might be an exaggeration to say that any other hour is *always* impossible—yet those who know the selfishness of ungodly employers,

will confess that occasionally it may be—an evening Communion will often make the difference between an ordinance received once a month and once a year. While I would never press evening Communion, nor even hastily introduce it without cause, God forbid that I should discourage it where the people value it, and the attendance is sufficient. At St. Pancras I was careful always to have an early celebration on the same day, so as to disappoint none who valued the ordinance weekly. This avoided a stumbling-block. Let us give freedom and take it, protecting ourselves, and considering our brethren.

("Primary Charge to the Clergy of Rochester Diocese," 1881.)

Again, in his Second Charge (1885), he speaks to the same effect, on page 94:

(*B*) Twenty-eight years ago, when the question had not been even stirred, I was called, when quite a young man, to succeed Bishop Bickersteth at St. Giles'-in-the-Fields. It was a charge of 25,000 souls. To my great concern, both early and mid-day Communions were scantily attended by the poor, and it occurred to me that the quiet evening hour might suit them better. Before taking any action, I consulted the Bishop. His answer was indecisive. I felt sure he meant me to use my own discretion. Had he forbidden me then, I should instantly have obeyed him. Later on, after my fuller experience of its necessity, had he, or his wise successor, forbidden it, I could not have disobeyed him. But I might have declined to become responsible for fatally diminishing the people's highest privileges, and I think I should have respectfully placed my resignation in his hands. I quite admit that the early hour is no difficulty for working men. They are used to it; but I am quite sure it is impossible for their wives, and for many medical men. Also I concur with those who, for their own edification, prefer the morning hour. To the objection, however, that it (evening Communion) encourages indolence, I can only say, so far as the clergy are concerned, that the most self-denying service we ever took at St. Pancras was at the monthly evening Communion, when, after a heavy day's labour, we administered the holy rite often to over two hundred communicants; sometimes in the end so exhausted, that I, for one, hardly knew how to walk home. Any who have even the faintest suspicion that an evening Communion necessarily implies slovenliness or irreverence, I invite for fairness' sake to visit, if they have the opportunity, the church I have already named in the evening of the last Sunday in the month, and I am mistaken if they will not be impressed with the pathetic reasonableness and the blessed solemnity of that quiet holy service, as they have seldom been impressed before. The letter below reached me with one of the Visitation Returns. Is our brother to be forbidden?

"After a long-lived prejudice against evening Communions, I have come firmly to the conviction that without them the Church is practically excommunicating the great body of the wives and mothers of the poorer working classes. They can attend church at no other time. No morning hour would suit them; nor would their husbands permit them to attend at any but an evening hour."

III. The (late) Bishop of Manchester (Dr. Fraser), in his Primary Charge, delivered himself as follows:

I found evening Communions, I may say, *established* in the diocese when I became bishop. I have not hitherto thought it necessary to express an opinion either in their favour or against the practice. On three occasions I have taken actual part in them. On one of these occasions—on a Thursday in Holy Week, the "Dies Mandati,"—I do not know that I ever took part in a Communion on which there seemed

to rest a more solemn awe, or which seemed to bring more comfort and joy to my own soul. It is said, I am aware, that "Evening Communions are of questionable legality in English Church law, and have been repudiated by the whole Church Catholic for twelve hundred years, and by all save one tiny and crotchety communion for three hundred years more." The innovation is asserted to be "almost invariably found where the most rationalising teaching on the sacramental mystery prevails." "It means Zwinglianism, and nothing less." "It is the most self-indulgent mode of celebrating the memorial of the Passion, and therefore unsuitable." There are some remarkable admissions among these strongly-worded objections. It is admitted that four centuries of Christian history passed before evening Communions were formally repudiated. Not only was the first Communion celebrated in the evening, but so was the Communion at Troas, where Paul "continued his speech until midnight"; so too, no doubt, were the Communions at Corinth, to which men came in disorder, not because they were held in the evening, but because they had not been taught or did not realise the solemn and mystical character of the act. The "tiny and crotchety communion" which departed from the asserted custom of the universal Church was the great Church of Carthage—the see of the metropolitan of the province of Africa, and the seat of at least seven General Councils —which, in a council at which Augustine was present, held in A.D. 397, passed a canon that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper should be celebrated by none but such as are fasting, except on one day in the year, the Thursday before Easter, when it was the custom of African Churches, in imitation of our Lord's example, to celebrate the Eucharist after supper. But the African was not the only Church that adopted evening Communion. Socrates tells us, though he notes it as a singularity, that the Churches of Egypt and the Thebais were used to administer the Lord's Supper on Saturdays, after eating, in the evening; and Cyprian gives a reason why in his time they did not celebrate in the evening generally as in the morning, because the people could not so well all come together in the evening as in the morning; from which Bingham rightly infers that "it is plain in Cyprian's time there was no absolute rule to forbid communicating after supper, though the practice began generally to be disused, and the common custom was to receive fasting and at morning service." And Cyprian's principle could entirely justify the occasional use of evening Communions in such populations as ours, his declared object being that "all the brotherhood might be present."

There appears to me to be gathering round the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper a mass of semi-superstitious rather than Catholic and rational practices, which make me resent any attempt to abridge the liberty of a national Church or even of an individual priest, in matters of this kind. I must leave the question, brethren, to your own sense of expediency, to your experience of what you find best to promote the devotion of your own people, only asking you to remember that you must justify your departure from usual practice by a strong conviction that the change ministers to edification.

("Primary Charge," 1872, p. 104.)

And again, in his Charge for 1884:

I did not ask for a return of the number of parishes in which there are evening Communions; but it must be considerable, chiefly in the towns. I delivered myself of my mind on this subject in my Primary Charge; and I have seen no reason to change it. I found, as I then said, the custom established in the diocese when I became bishop; and I have never felt that I ought to prohibit it, even if I had the power, or

even desire, to restrain it. It can be justified by the necessity of the case; and those who saw the reverent demeanour of the 135 communicants, almost entirely of the working class, to whom I assisted in administering the holy rite in the Church of St. Matthias, Salford, last Sunday evening but one, would not raise any objection to the practice on that score. Indeed, except on the somewhat vague ground that it is an "un-Catholic" usage, I am at a loss to understand the objections that are made. Paul certainly had no scruple about "breaking bread" at Troas at an evening Communion, and if the institution of Christ were to be pressed, as it sometimes unduly is in every particular, it would certainly point in this direction. But the practice does not seem to me to need such justifications. As long as the same deep spirit of reverence is maintained, it cannot matter at what hour this sacramental and memorial act is done. We justify ourselves on the plea that there are many of our parishioners, and those the very poorest, to whom it would be a serious difficulty, amounting in some cases to almost a hindrance, to communicate earlier in the day, and for them we provide more suitable opportunities. I do not deny that evening Communions have their special dangers, and I most earnestly beseech all the clergy to use them carefully, to see that there is no relaxation of reverence either in the administration or the reception of this most holy Sacrament. As I said in my first Charge, the departure from usual practice can only be justified when "the change ministers to edification."

IV. The Bishop of Exeter (Dr. Bickersteth)

not only gives his own testimony, but quotes that of other eminent authorities also.

There is another question upon which some of the most laborious parish priests in the diocese have asked my judgment, I mean the celebration of the Holy Communion in the evening. They have introduced the practice from a deep conviction that only an evening—in addition to an earlier—administration of the Lord's Supper met the needs of all the members of their flocks; and the numbers who avail themselves of it have, they think, abundantly justified this return to a primitive and Apostolic use; but they have been pained by the severe criticism and condemnation which other Churchmen have not scrupled to pass upon this practice.

Now, in the first place, we must remember that there is just as much authority in our Prayer-book for an evening celebration, as for an early celebration before Morning Prayer. Our Church has not fixed any limits of hours for the administration of the Lord's Supper, or affixed or prefixed that administration to any service.

Let me adduce the following testimonies to this. Bishop Phillpotts, my predecessor in this see, writing to Mr. Croker (1840), says:

"I apprehend that you are quite right in your supposition that the Communion Service is a distinct office altogether, and was wont to be performed at a separate time from either Morning or Evening Prayer. I apprehend, too, that there is no rule and no principle which connects it more with Morning than with Evening Prayer."[1]

The late learned Bishop Jeune, in his Charge for 1867, says on this subject:

"The hour of administration of the Lord's Supper has greatly varied in the Christian Church. . . . In Tertullian's time it was observed not only in the evening at the Love-feast, but in assemblies before dawn. In the ages of St. Augustine, the Christians of Egypt were in the habit

[1] "The Croker Papers." Murray, 1884.

of communicating on Saturday evening; but generally in the morning, certain days excepted, when the administration was in the afternoon. St. Augustine, too, observes that in some places in Africa, on the Thursday before Easter, the Communion was administered both morning and evening, and in other places only towards night. Our Church has not limited the celebration of the Holy Communion to any special hours of the day. The ordinary time of celebration is at the close of the first hour of evening . . . . but ample warrant there surely is for evening Communion in the institution of His Supper by the Lord, and in the practice of Apostolic and after times."[1]

And the late Bishop Wordsworth, of Lincoln, in speaking of Fasting Communion, says:

"Christ never intended, the Ancient Church never dreamt, that in matters ritual and ceremonial one fixed and rigid rule should be enforced everywhere and at all times. On the contrary, it is desirable that they be not the same everywhere and always, but should vary in different places and seasons. It cannot be doubted that, at the close of the fourth century, it was the practice of the Church to receive the Communion before any other food, and it would be presumptuous and irreverent to say that the Church did not act wisely and well. If we had lived in those days, our duty would have been to conform to this rule. But then it is no less certain that it would be also irreverent and presumptuous to take upon ourselves now to impose customs of the fourth century in opposition to the usages of the particular Church in which our own lot is cast by the good providence of God. If, however, it be right to impose an early fasting Communion from the fourth century, why not an evening Communion from the first century, and to impose that as a matter of necessity?"

"The following facts," the Bishop continues, "are plain and certain:

"(1) Our Blessed Lord did not institute the Holy Communion fasting.

"(2) The Primitive Church hallowed its daily food by receiving the Holy Communion after it.

"(3) The office of the administration of the Lord's Supper in our Liturgy points to evening as well as morning: 'The Table shall stand where Morning *and Evening* Prayers are appointed to be said.'

"WE NEED NOT SCRUPLE TO SAY THAT ANY MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND WHO, ON THE PLEA OF REVERENCE FOR THE AUTHORITY OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH, VENTURE TO REQUIRE FASTING AS A CONDITION OF ADMINISTERING AND RECEIVING THE HOLY COMMUNION, NOT ONLY SET THEMSELVES UP AGAINST THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, WHICH, FOR THE MOST PART, ADMINISTERS THE COMMUNION AT MID-DAY, OR EVEN LATER, BUT EVEN AGAINST THAT ANCIENT CHURCH TO WHICH THEY APPEAL."

THOMAS STANLEY TREANOR, M.A.

ART. V.—THE SANTAL MISSION.

PART II.

IN a former paper we spoke more particularly of the past and present. We now turn to the future. The question is, Do the Santals believe in a future state? Most assuredly they do; but, at the same time, there is a general indistinct-

[1] Charge of the late Dr. Jeune, Bishop of Peterborough, 1867.

ness about their belief. Some believe that after death they at once enter into another world; others imagine that the spirit hovers about near the place where it left the body; and others, that the spirit is born again in another person.

The Santals also believe that our spirits frequently change their abode, entering at will into the bodies of men or of animals. A favourite resort of the departed spirit is in the body of the large red lizard. Cows and buffaloes, dogs and pigs also become the abodes of spirits. Very quarrelsome people are said to be possessed with the spirit of a dog. It is supposed by some that the spirit leaves the body in the form of a lizard. In proof of this the following story is told: One day a man fell asleep, and becoming very thirsty, his spirit left the body in the form of a lizard in order to obtain water from a pitcher close by. It so happened that just as the lizard entered the pitcher the owner of the water-pot covered it, not knowing what had happened; consequently the spirit could not return to the man's body. So he died. While his sorrowing friends and relations were making preparations for burning the corpse someone uncovered the pitcher to get water. The lizard immediately escaped, and returned to his abode in the body of the dead man, entering at his nostrils. At once the man arose, to the great astonishment of the bystanders, and asked them why they were weeping. "We thought you were dead," said they, "and we were preparing to burn your body." The man told them that he had been down a well to get some water to drink, but had found it difficult to get up again, and that he had only just returned. The truth now dawned upon their minds that the well was the pitcher of water, and that on account of its having been covered the man could not escape, but that as soon as the hindrance was removed the man recovered.

The people say that if they use the feet to push wood into a fire they will have to suffer the penalty of having their feet burned in the next world; and if they see a piece of grass or straw on a man's head they immediately remove it, otherwise they will have to carry large bundles of grass on their heads hereafter.

In the next world there will be nothing but hard work, their principal occupation being to grind dead men's bones day and night in a mortar, using the stalk of the castor-oil plant as a pestle; this, from its softness, makes their task an endless one. They will have but one chance of getting a little rest—that is, the men—if they can chew tobacco, can sometimes beg for a few minutes' respite, under the excuse of preparing it. When the taskmaster calls them to return to their work they say, "Wait a moment, sir; I have not quite

finished preparing my tobacco." Then they make a pretence of rubbing it to a powder in the palm of their hand, mixing a pinch of lime with it to give it pungency as vigorously as possible; but as soon as the taskmaster turns his back they again prepare it very slowly. In this way they manage to prolong their rest. But woe to those who cannot chew tobacco or smoke the hookah! For this reason every Santal makes a point of learning the practice in this world. Women who have children can obtain a little rest under the plea of feeding them. When told to return to work they say, "Oh, wait a few minutes longer, sir; my child is very hungry," while really the child is but nestling in her bosom. Sad is the lot of poor women who have no family.

When a Santal dies all his possessions are placed by his bed, and some money, too, as it is supposed he will have to buy everything in the next world. He must also take his weapons with him, as he has to provide himself with all kinds of necessaries, so his bow and arrows are carefully laid beside the bier.

If anyone should enter the next world in a human form the inhabitants of that place would devour him. A child was in great trouble at losing his mother. Every day he visited the place where her body had been burnt. The Sun (the supreme being of the Santals), seeing the boy's grief, asked him whether he would like to see his mother again. The boy answered in the affirmative; so the Sun took him up, telling him not to speak or show himself, else he would be devoured. He was placed in a cave, which was so covered that the boy could see without being seen. Presently his mother passed by, and began to sniff, saying to her companion, "I smell a man. Where is he?" The Sun said to her, "You must be mistaken. How can there possibly be a man here?" The woman having left the place, the Sun asked the boy if he had seen his mother, to which he replied, "Take me away. I have seen quite enough." From that time he never again longed for his mother.

All the dead whose bodies are properly burnt and whose collar-bones have been consigned to the Damuda (the sacred river of the Santals) become good spirits; others become demons. The funeral pyre, which is always placed near water, consists of a large heap of wood, upon which the body is placed; then the eldest son or the nearest relative sets light to the wood, having first placed the torch near the dead man's mouth. If the hand or the foot should move during the burning it is a sure sign that others of the family will soon be called away. To propitiate the king of death live frogs are thrown on to the burning pile, and sometimes small images of clay in the shape of a man are placed beside the corpse. If a

body is not consumed quickly it is pierced with a spear or chopped in pieces with an axe. It is said that misers burn very slowly and generous men are quickly consumed, so to avoid such a disgrace the body of a rich man is smeared over with melted butter and oil to expedite its combustion. After the body is consumed search is made for the collar-bones. These are washed in turmeric water and deposited in a new earthen jar, and then taken to the Damuda. When the ceremony of throwing the bones into the river is completed, all the relatives assemble at the village of the deceased to offer sacrifices to his memory. Goats and sheep are killed and a feast is prepared. Several questions are then asked of the departed spirit, such as: "Are you angry with any of us? if so, please forget it. Did anyone injure you in your lifetime? if so, accept these sacrifices, and forgive the offender." Then the sacrificer addresses the other spirits in these terms: "We consign the departed to your care; make him one of yourselves. We have now done our part; let us go in peace."

The Santals are fond of music, and say that the art of playing the flute and a general knowledge of singing and dancing was imparted to them by our first parents. The flutes are made of bamboos, and are about two feet in length, and have a mellow tone. Their scale does not correspond to ours. The people delight in dancing, and often keep up the dance through the hours of the night. The maidens are decked with flowers and ornamented with tinkling bracelets, and the young men with peacock's feathers and garlands of flowers, all the dancers keeping time to the drumming of the tom-toms and the clanging of cymbals. Though dancing is prohibited amongst the Christians because of its tendency to licentiousness, yet the missionaries make much use of this love of music as a means of attracting the people. Many Christian hymns have been composed by the natives and set to their own native airs, and the catechist, if able to play the native violin and sing, has no difficulty in finding an attentive audience.

The following is the first verse of a very favourite hymn at our harvest festivals. It was composed by the Rev. W. Sido, one of the native pastors, with a special view to its being used on those occasions. Appended is a translation of the same:

Nes gota bochor Baba, dayakatem jarikeda,
Dayakatem sāwäepurauket';
Ama' daya dularte bochor bochor jonomkhon,
Nonkagile ńamet', sanama'tem purunakat'le.'

This year, all the year long, Father, by Thy mercy Thou hast caused it to rain.
By Thy mercy Thou hast given us a plentiful harvest;
By Thy mercy and Thy love, year by year, from our birth
Thus we have received; Thou hast given us a full supply of all things.

The languages of the more civilized nations of India belong to the same family as our own—the Indo-European, as it is called. That of the Santals belongs to another class of languages. One amongst its many peculiarities is that both the governing and governed cases of nouns are twice repeated, once in close connection with the verb, once in a more ordinary position. For instance, where we should say, "The tiger killed a man, a Santal would say, "The tiger—a man—he killed him;" and very often the "he" is also joined into the same word with "killed." Again, they have a curious class of semi-consonants at the middle and end of words, which are sometimes considered akin to the click-sounds of Africa. These are written with a certain diacritical mark at the end of the consonant, which has the nearest sound to them in our alphabet. The language has also a dual number, which has to be constantly used when we are speaking to two persons.

When the missionaries first went to work amongst these interesting people they found that the Santals had no character or written language. Thus it has been a great difficulty to acquire the language, and although great progress has been made in translations, etc., yet many points of grammar are still considered open questions. Then the dialects are so different on account of the vast distances which separate the Santals of Orissa from those of the Church Missionary Society's missions in the Santal Pergunnahs, that it has been found impossible to use the same set of books. The honour of reducing the spoken language to writing must be accorded to the Rev. Dr. Phillips, a Baptist missionary of Orissa, who laboured most successfully for many years amongst the Santals in Midnapur. He used the letters of the Bengali character for writing down Santali.

The pioneer in writing Santali in the Roman character was the Rev. E. L. Puxley. He was the first missionary that actually went and lived among the people, though several others, amongst whom were the Revs. E. Droese and H. Hallett, of Bhagulpur, made several tours among the Santals. Mr. Puxley was a cavalry officer who gave up his commission and was sent out by the C.M.S. to work in India. Mr. Puxley in a letter to the writer of this account says: "I was appointed by the committee to Lucknow, but a Major Ainslie, a godly man, who was on board the ship that the Rev. John Barton and I went out in, and who had been engaged in putting down the Santal rebellion of 1854, spoke to me about the Santals, to whom he had taken a great liking. One or two other soldiers on board our ship, with whom I was familiar, spoke to me in the same terms; so on arriving

at Calcutta I asked the committee to send me there. Hence my going amongst them."

A mere accidental meeting with a godly Christian officer was the turning-point of the real commencement of the Santal Mission. How often do small things turn into great futures! An overruling Providence caused the word to be spoken, which has grown to be such a blessing to thousands, and which has potencies still to be developed.

Mr. Puxley fixed upon Hiranpur as the best centre for work. He thought that by living amongst the people he should be better able to influence them than if he lived at Bhagulpur, and only paid occasional visits to them. An old Government rest-house was acquired, and here he gathered together youths from different parts of the Santal country, and also brought from Bhagulpur the Santals who had been gathered there by Dr. Droese. In 1863 Mr. Puxley removed to Talihari, the present headquarters of the Santal Mission, having bought some houses of the railway company, which had been erected for the engineers during the construction of the line. These he presented to the society. He also translated St. Matthew's Gospel and the Psalms into Santali. The Rev. W. Storrs, who succeeded him, built the large church at Talihari, which, with its recently-finished tower, is a conspicuous object in the district, standing, as it does, on the top of a hill. To him was given the privilege of reaping a bountiful harvest of souls. The sowers of the precious seed, who had been driven from their work by fever and sickness, had left the scene of their labours, feeling in their own minds that their toil had been in vain; but we have the promise that in the great harvest home both he that soweth and he that reapeth shall rejoice together.

It may be well to mention here that all the Gospels have been translated, and have passed through several revisions; the Epistles have also been printed, so that the Santals have now the whole of the New Testament complete in their hands. Many parts of the Old Testament have also been translated and printed as a continuous Bible history, so that the substance of the whole of the Old Testament also is in their hands. A hymn-book containing between two and three hundred hymns is published, also the Prayer-Book, "Pilgrim's Progress," and a number of school books.

As we have said before, schools have been an important feature in the history of the Santal Mission. The Rev. E. Droese, who was specially interested in the Malers, did not neglect the Santals. Before the Santal rebellion of 1854, when the people rose against the Hindu money-lenders and their oppression, he established several schools in the Santal country.

Government was only just waking up to find that they had a tribe under their care called the Santals. It is very interesting to read the accounts in the *Illustrated London News* of that year, and the descriptions of these barbarians! Their bravery, however, in resisting the unjust demands of their oppressors, and how they withstood the forces of the English sent to suppress the insurrection, led to an inquiry being instituted, which has proved them to be entirely in the right. It has been turned by God's blessing into a victory of the vanquished. Though they were subjugated, yet Government, having inquired into their case, freely redressed their wrongs; and to make up for the past neglect offered to spend large sums in the free education of those so-called savages, if the C.M.S. would undertake to train teachers and superintend their work.

Mr. Droese, writing in 1856, says: "Missionaries labouring among the Santals might have served to help the people to a more extensive knowledge, and to a juster appreciation of the character of their rulers; might also have helped them to have their grievances taken notice of. The rising of the Santals would not then have been attended by the perpetration of such atrocious cruelties as were practised on most of the victims that fell into their hands."

The Governor-General of India sanctioned the scheme of educating the Santals through the labours of the missionaries, but when the court of directors of the East India Company in London heard of it, they sent out a despatch that no schools should be established in which religion was taught.

The despatch was met in India by a strong remonstrance on the part of the Commissioner of the Santal District, Sir George Yule, and the Director of Public Instruction. The former official characterized the plan that the C.M.S. was prepared to carry out as "the noblest scheme of education ever set on foot in India." He goes on to say: "Among other changes which late events will produce, I earnestly hope and firmly trust to see swept away that mistaken policy which has hitherto made us appear traitors to our God and cowards before men." Truly noble words by a noble man at a time when missions were more or less looked upon as chimerical.

In the Report of 1859 we read that a new missionary, Mr. Hallett, was appointed to take up the work of the Santal training school. There were then thirty-two Santal youths in training, and 422 in the village schools. His report is full of interest; he says: "My heart yearns towards these simple people, and my earnest and constant prayer is that God may see fit to gather them into His fold. I feel convinced that they will do honour to the name of Christians, whenever it may please the Great Disposer of all things to bless the means used to

lead them out of darkness into the glorious light of the Gospel."

Truly prophetic words uttered at a time when there was not a single Santal Christian in the district; uttered of some who were then in his charge, who are now honoured pastors of the Santal Church, for two of the present clergy, the Revs. Ram Choron and Bhim Hasda, were scholars in that training school. The seed was then sown which has since sprung up so plentifully, for nearly 5,000 Santals have been baptized since 1864, when some of these very young men came boldly out on the Lord's side; and the writer of this account has been intimately connected with them during the past twenty-one years, and he joyfully places it on record that these men have led consistent earnest Christian lives, and that Mr. Hallett's prediction has been eminently fulfilled. To God be all the praise!

Mr. Hallett's health broke down completely owing to the hardships he had endured during the Mutiny; for, in order to save his life, he had to hide himself in a lake for twenty-nine hours, till the mutineers left the neighbourhood. He had been a Government officer, but gave up that to become a missionary to the heathen. His was a short course; he died very soon after.

The climate of the Santal country at that time was most deadly. Captain Sherwill, the Government surveyor, wrote in his Report of 1854: "To the natives of the plains the climate is most fatal, jungle fever carrying them off in a few hours. The bad season commences with the westerly winds in March. The suddenness of the attack is most appalling. September and October are deadly."

Mr. Puxley, writing in 1861, says: "From this extract from the report of the Government surveyor, it is evident that if our work here is to be permanent we must train the natives themselves to be the future teachers and pastors of their countrymen. All our resources for the future must be drawn from themselves, for it is almost vain to hope that the honour of bearing the glad tidings and publishing peace on these mountains will be reserved for European messengers. Each missionary, in the words of one who has lately gone to his rest (referring to Mr. Hallett), must be the ear of corn which falls to the ground, dies and brings forth fruit."

Mr. Puxley, knowing the deadliness of the climate, and the risks he would run, yet bravely determined to go and live in the midst of the people he loved. One had fallen—another soldier was ready to take his place; it was not to act on the defensive, but to go forward into the enemy's country.

F. T. COLE.

(To be continued.)

Short Notices.

In the Footsteps of the Poets. Pp. 381. Price 3s. 6d. Isbister and Co.

This charming volume gives local information of the various haunts of Milton, Herbert, Cowper, Thomson, Wordsworth, Scott, Mrs. Browning, Robert Browning, and Tennyson. The writers are Professor Masson, Dr. John Brown, Canon Benham, Hugh Haliburton, Henry Ewart, John Dennis, the Bishop of Ripon, R. S. Hutton, and William Canton. It is well worth while to be acquainted with such detailed information, as it throws a great deal of light upon the various poems.

Christianity in the Home. T. L. Cuyler, D.D. Pp. 264. Price 3s. 6d. Hodder and Stoughton.

It is sometimes thought that domestic religion in the present day is not so much cultivated as in the generation of our fathers. The present work consists of thirty-six very wholesome chapters which would make admirable reading at family prayers, and which might greatly help in re-establishing the old tone of quiet and genuine Christian piety.

The Boys' and Girls' Companion. Volume for 1893. Pp. 192. Church of England Sunday-school Institute.

This illustrated magazine for boys and girls makes a charming gift-book for young folks, its contents being both varied and interesting. There are short, simple, and instructive papers on Bible, biographical, and natural history subjects, and a number of miscellaneous papers and stories well calculated to delight the readers for whom they are intended. The volume is tastefully illustrated and bound.

Weather Lore. Richard Inwards, F.R.A.S. Pp. 191. Elliot Stock.

This fascinating book is a collection of proverbs, sayings, and rules concerning the weather, arranged from various handbooks and traditions all over the world. These wise saws refer to weather in general, times and seasons, movable feasts, the months generally, days of the week, sun, moon, and stars, wind, clouds, mists, dew, fog, sky, air, sound, tide, rain, and other natural phenomena. There is also an interesting list of common plants, with the dates at which they ought to be in full flower, and a calendar of birds, and when they ought to be in the South of England, and another for winter birds. Never, probably, has such a flood of light been thrown on the homely, natural philosophy of the country side ; and for persons living in the country especially the volume would be an amusing and instructive daily companion.

The Clergy List for 1894. Kelly and Co., Limited.

This publication cannot be spoken of too highly. Indeed, we should imagine that a copy of it is in the hands of every clergyman. It certainly ought to be, for it is simply invaluable, containing, as it does, a mass of information respecting the Church and her clergy, well-arranged, comprehensive, and authoritative.

Nye's Illustrated Church Annual, 1894. Price 1s. Pp. 128. Griffith, Farran and Co.

This is the second year in which Mr. Nye's "Annual" has appeared ; and to say that No. 2 is even better than No. 1 is high praise indeed. There are valuable and interesting papers by Archdeacon Emery, Mr. J. G. Talbot, M.P., the Earl of Selborne, and a number of other writers, whose names are a sufficient guarantee of the excellence of their contributions.

Light for Little Footsteps. Pp. 64. Price 2s. 6d. Partridge and Co.

This is a large volume of simple Bible stories in large print, with engravings by various artists. The selection is well made, and the book is a pleasing variety for the Sunday resources of the nursery.

The January number of the *Revue Internationale de Theologie* is in many ways an interesting one. Bishop Herzog has a learned article on Priscillian, and the latest discoveries in relation to him. The well-known ecclesiastical historian, Professor Langen, concludes his sketch of the "School of Hierotheus." Professor Beyschlag treats of our Lord's words to St. Peter in Matt. xvi. 17-19. Professor Friedrich sends a contribution on the inscription on the statue of Hippolytus at Rome. Canon Meyrick replies to General Kiréeff's explanation of the attitude of the orthodox Church to the old Catholics, accepting the General's disclaimer of any wish on the part of the former to "absorb" the latter. The editor comments on Canon Meyrick's letter, not, as it seems to us, in too friendly a spirit. And yet it is difficult to see altogether what offends him in Canon Meyrick's letter. Bishop Holly, of Haiti, sends an article in French, in which he explains he is not accustomed to write. There are reviews, as usual, by Mr. Allen and Mr. Lias, and these are the only English contributions except that of Canon Meyrick already referred to. The ecclesiastical news contains some most interesting information concerning the Protestant Churches of France and Switzerland, and of the movement in progress for the restoration of the Apostles' Creed as a recognised symbol of belief in these Churches. Professor Kyriakos, of Athens, gives some details of the publications of a union formed in Asia Minor to forward the interests of the Orthodox Church. But the article which will most interest the readers of the CHURCHMAN is that by the editor on St. Augustine's teaching in regard to the Eucharist. This consists of simple extracts from his works (translated, however, into French) with a brief summary of their purport. These extracts not only show that St. Augustine did not hold the doctrine of transubstantiation, but that he used the expressions "sign" and "figure" of Christ's body and blood, so strongly repudiated as Zwinglian by modern "advanced" High Churchmen.

The editor of this most valuable periodical asks for an increase of subscriptions in England, and especially that the *Revue Internationale* may be introduced as soon as possible into our various public libraries. It will be a great advantage to us if this be done, because one feature of the publication is the valuable summary of contents of a large quantity of publications of various nationalities which the editor gives in each number.

Hazell's Annual for 1894 contains 676 pages of valuable information, clearly arranged and well indexed. The articles are all-embracing, the subjects treated of being historical, political, social and biographical. It is, indeed, "a cyclopædic record of men and topics of the day," and no busy man of letters can afford to be without it.

MAGAZINES.

We have received the following (January) magazines:

The Thinker, The Critical Review, The Religious Review of Reviews, The Newbery House Magazine, The Anglican Church Magazine, The Church Missionary Intelligencer, The Evangelical Churchman, The Church Sunday-School Magazine, Church Bells, Blackwood, The Cornhill, Sunday Magazine, The Fireside, The Quiver, Cassell's Family Magazine, To-Day, Good Words, The Leisure Hour, Sunday at Home, The Girl's

Own Paper, The Boy's Own Paper, Light and Truth, The Church Worker, The Church Monthly, The Church Missionary Gleaner, Light in the Home, Awake, India's Women, Parish Magazine, New and Old, The Dawn of Day, The Bible Society's Gleanings for the Young, The Bible Society's Monthly Reporter, The Cottager and Artisan, Friendly Greetings, Little Folks, Our Little, Dots, The Child's Companion, Boy's and Girl's Companion, Daybreak, Day of Days, Home Words, Hand and Heart, Open Doors, The Opening Year, Garden Work, and *The Home Visitor.* Number 113 of the R.T.S. "Biographical Series" deals with Blaise Pascal.

THE MONTH.

THE Bishop of St. Asaph points out the following facts with regard to the use of the Welsh language in Wales :

"The census returns give the number of those speaking only Welsh as 508,036, and of those who speak English and Welsh as 402,253.

"Last October I said that the 508,036 included all who, although they know English, prefer speaking Welsh, and that in Merionethshire, Cardiganshire, and Anglesea, with a population of 185,328, the monoglot Welshmen were returned as 130,680, although considerably more than half the population of those counties must have passed through the elementary schools, where all their education was in English, and I pointed out that every kind of pressure, political and sectarian, was exercised to make people return themselves as monoglot Welshmen. For these statements I was so widely and severely censured in the Welsh Radical press that I may be permitted to quote the following words from the general report just issued as a Parliamentary paper . . . under the marginal heading 'Untrustworthiness of the Returns'—

So desirous do many householders appear to have been to add to the number of monoglot Welshmen that they not only returned themselves as speaking Welsh—that is, Welsh only—but made similar returns as to infants who were only a few months or even only a few days old. Two parishes, one in Carnarvonshire and one in Merionethshire, were selected by us for detailed examination. In these parishes there were 138 babies under one year of age, and fifty-nine of these were returned as speaking Welsh. There were also 147 infants between one and two years of age, and eighty-seven of these were entered as monoglot Welsh. Thus of 285 infants not yet two years of age, 146, or more than a half, were represented as being able to speak Welsh, and Welsh only. Children under two years of age have been excluded by us from the language tables; and, consequently, these strange statements as to their power of speech are not of much importance excepting that they furnish good grounds for regarding with much suspicion the trustworthiness of the statements as to persons of riper years. Thus, in these same two parishes there were 1,587 children of from five to fifteen years of age, children, therefore, who must have had a more or less lengthy period of school attendance. In the schools of both these parishes English had been taken as a class subject, not without success. Yet of these 1,587 children 1,490, or 94 per cent., were returned as unable to speak English.

After this official statement it cannot be questioned that 508,036 represents not monoglot Welshmen, but those who prefer Welsh to English.

"I ask your readers to compare 1,252,873 who, according to the report of Lord Aberdare's committee, 'habitually speak Welsh' with the 508,036 of the language census returns. I would also ask where the 1,083,000 Nonconformists, who use the Welsh language in worship in Wales and Monmouthshire are to be found."

Taking the central funds only of the Missions to Seamen, the receipts in 1893 have fallen off £272, as compared with the previous year, the central contributions within the year (less legacies) being £17,842. But

to the special London fund for erecting the Missions to Seamen Church and Institute for sailors of all nations frequenting the Port of London was generously given £4,549 within the same year, making the receipts together £22,391—being an increase over the previous year of £2,584 in the combined receipts at the head office, 11, Buckingham Street, Strand. To these central funds, however, have to be added the amounts contributed and expended locally at the sixty-three seaports at home and abroad, occupied by the Missions to Seamen, all the accounts for which have not yet reached the head office, and which may probably add another £10,000 to the above totals. Looking back over the three past decades, it appears that in 1863, when the Missions to Seamen was but seven years old, it had 13 chaplains and 18 readers, occupying 24 seaports for the Church. Ten years later, in 1873, there were 14 chaplains and 23 readers at 33 seaports, the annual income having increased about £550. In 1883 there were 25 chaplains and 47 readers, etc., besides two clerical superintendents, employed in 49 seaports, the total annual income, £18,665, being much more than double that of 1873. At the end of 1893 there were 34 chaplains and 59 readers, etc., besides two clerical superintendents and a clerical secretary, working in 63 seaports at home and abroad, the estimated total annual income being again double what it was ten years before. There are still a considerable number of large ports at home and frequented by British shipping abroad, in which there are no clerical ministrations afloat; whilst thousands of British ships and fishing vessels are never visited by a clergyman, so that there are still large spheres of spiritual work afloat awaiting the efforts of the Missions to Seamen. Besides which many large ports already occupied are greatly under-manned, especially the great Port of London, to which the Missions to Seamen has recently appointed but one chaplain and two readers to give their whole time and attention exclusively to looking after sailors of many nationalities when ashore. That the national Church is being aroused to its duties to the national seamen is shown by the increased number of parishes which give offertories to the Missions to Seamen. In 1863, only 209 churches did so; and in 1873 but 188 churches thus cared for sailors; whereas in 1883 nearly four times as many churches, viz., 727, gave offertories; and last year about 1,100 churches helped in this way.

St. Martin's-in-the-Fields and the Strand District Board of Works have combined to establish a labour exchange at St. Martin's Town Hall, Charing Cross Road. All residents of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, St. Mary-le-Strand, St. Paul, Covent Garden, St. Clement Danes, St. Anne, the Liberty of the Rolls, and the precincts of the Savoy, may register their names for any kind of work, and employers anywhere and everywhere may apply here if they are in need of either male or female assistance. There are no fees on either side.—*Daily News.*

The living of Holy Trinity, Cambridge, vacated by the Rev. John Barton, has been offered to the Rev. Charles James Proctor, Vicar of St. Peter's, Islington, and accepted by him. Mr. Proctor is a graduate of Cambridge. Before his present appointment he served under the Rev. G. Forrester at St. Paul's, Clapham, where he did a good, solid, and abiding work amongst young men. At Islington his parish is in a well-ordered state of efficiency, and he has succeeded in winning his way amongst all classes of people. The living of St. Laurence, Dartmouth Street, Birmingham, one of the most difficult parishes in the city, has been conferred by the Bishop of Worcester on the Rev. W. Kipling Cox, incumbent of Christ Church, Coventry, but better known as organizing secretary of the C.E.T.S. for the diocese of Worcester, an office he has held for sixteen years.—*Record.*

Mr. E. J. Kennedy, who has been so long and so honourably associated with the work of the Y.M.C.A. at Exeter Hall, is about to seek orders in the Church of England. He will begin his ministry at a well-known church in South London.—*Record.*

The friends of the observance of Sunday have gained a decided victory in Bristol. It was proposed to open the city libraries and museum on the Lord's Day, and there was some fear lest the advanced tendencies of a certain section of the people might prevail. But the Sunday opening party found little support in the Town Council, who rejected the proposal by thirty-eight to nineteen.—*Record.*

It is announced that the total receipts of the Hospital Saturday Fund for last year, from all sources, amounted to £20,425, as against £20,567 for 1892. The expenses would seem, according to a corrected statement, to have amounted to £2,404, or £40 less than the year preceding.—*Guardian.*

The following clergy now compose the patrons of Church livings in the gift of what are known as "Simeon's Trustees": The Dean of Canterbury, Archdeacon Richardson, the Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge (the Rev. H. C. G. Moule), Prebendary Tate (Vicar of Kippington, Sevenoaks), and Canon Robert B. Girdlestone (incumbent of St. John's, Downshire Hill, Hampstead).—*Guardian.*

The new church of St. John the Evangelist, Littlewick, Berks, to which a district is about to be assigned, consisting of an outlying part of the extensive parish of White Waltham, was consecrated by the Bishop of the diocese on St. John's Day. It owes its erection to the generosity of Miss Ellis, of Waltham Place, Maidenhead, who, some time since, placed in the hands of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners £15,000, of which £10,000 was to be reserved as an endowment, and the remainder, with any interest accruing meanwhile, was to be expended in the building of the church and vicarage.—*Guardian.*

The committee of the Additional Curates' Society have received a donation of £2,500 to meet their present financial needs. The donor wishes his name not to be disclosed. This gift, together with £1,000 received a fortnight ago, reduces the estimate of the deficit for 1893 to £11,800.—*Guardian.*

It is stated that the Bishop of London's Fund has received a New Year's gift of £1,200.—*Guardian.*

Towards the more complete restoration of the parish church at Aslackby, South Lincolnshire, the Earl of Ancaster contributed £250; Mr. E. N. Conant, of Lyndon Hall, Rutland, £150; and Mr. Henry Smith, of Sudbrooke, £75.—*Guardian.*

The late Mr. C. R. Jacson, of Barton Hall, Preston, has bequeathed £200 to the Manchester Diocesan Church Building Society; £1,000 to the Barton Memorial Church Schools (but so long only as it continues to be a public elementary school of the Church of England); £2,500 to the vicar and churchwardens of St. Lawrence's, Barton, for rebuilding the church, and £500 for the augmentation of the living; and £1,000 for the church of St. John the Baptist, Broughton.—*Guardian.*

The late Mrs. Maria Foot, of Hanbury Vicarage, Burton-on-Trent, who left personalty amounting to over £53,000, has bequeathed £500 towards the endowment of almshouses for persons about seventy years of age of the parish of Hanbury, to be erected on the site of the old stables at Hanbury Vicarage, and to bear the inscription: "As a thank-offering for mercies received by J. R. F. and L. M. F. these almshouses are founded"; £50 each for the benefit of the churches at Compton Valence, Longbredy, Hanbury, Woolland, and Nice; £50 each to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, the Church Pastoral Aid Society, the Bible Department of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, the Church Missionary Society, and the Vaudois Church; a contingent legacy to the Dorset County Hospital; and other legacies, pecuniary and specific.—*Guardian.*

Obituary.

A GRAVE disaster has befallen the Niger Mission. Bishop Hill and Mrs. Hill, who only reached the West Coast some three or four weeks ago, have both succumbed to an attack of fever, and thus early in their work have laid down their lives for the people of Africa. Two other missionaries have since died on that fatal coast. Mr. Tugwell, an able and well-tried missionary in that district, has been summoned by the society in Salisbury Square, with the approval of the Archbishop of Canterbury, to be consecrated in place of Bishop Hill.

A distinguished public servant passed away on Sunday in the person of Lord Sandford, who was in his seventieth year. The son of the late Sir Daniel Keyte Sandford, M.P., professor of Greek at Glasgow, he was educated in his father's University and at Balliol College, Oxford, graduating in 1846 with a First in Classics. In 1848 he entered the Education Department as examiner, rising to be Secretary in 1870—the year of Mr. Forster's Act, which he had to put into administrative shape. In that difficult and delicate task it was generally allowed that he showed tact and resource, as well as an impartiality in denominational questions which had nothing to do with indifference. From 1872 till the creation of the Secretaryship for Scotland in 1885, he was equally responsible for Scotch educational business; he was then appointed first Under-Secretary for Scotland, and, indeed, organised the new office. In 1862 he had been secretary to the Commissioners for the International Exhibition of that year, receiving the honour of knighthood in the year following. In 1868 Sir Francis Sandford temporarily quitted the Education office to act as Assistant-Under-Secretary for the Colonies. On his final retirement from the public service in 1891 he was raised to the peerage. He was also a Privy Councillor and K.C.B. Lord Sandford leaves no issue, and the title, therefore, dies with him.—*Guardian.*

The death of Prebendary Gordon Calthrop, Vicar of St. Augustine's, Highbury, has deprived the Church of London of one of its leading lights. The deceased was a scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated in the First Class Classical Tripos in 1847. He was one of the chaplains of the college, having been ordained in 1851 by the Bishop of Oxford. In 1857 he was Select Preacher to the University, and again filled the position in 1874, and from 1858 to 1864 was perpetual curate at Holy Trinity, Cheltenham, since which time he has held the vicarage of St. Augustine's, Highbury. The prebend of Willesden in St. Paul's Cathedral was conferred on him in 1889. He was the author of the "Preacher's Commentary on St. John's Gospel." At Union Chapel, Islington, on the Sunday following Mr. Calthrop's death, the Rev. W. H. Harwood said they recalled, with many sacred associations, the friendship of the late Vicar of St. Augustine's with one whose name would always have the first place in Union Chapel—Dr. Allon. They remembered how Mr. Calthrop was associated with some of the chief events in the history of that chapel, and how, perhaps, in one or two cases his will went beyond his power. They recognised his splendid service to a truly Catholic conception of Christianity in that part of London, and they sincerely sympathized with those who were left—both with his own family, and with the church that had profited by his most faithful ministry.

The Rev. R. Waters, Master of Greatham Hospital, near West Hartlepool, has died after a few days' illness from influenza and pneumonia, arising from a severe cold caught at Stockton Christmas market. Mr. Waters, who was a Theological Associate of King's College, London, was ordained in 1859 to the curacy of St. John's, Burslem, and from 1861 to 1863 was curate of St. James's, Bristol. He was association secretary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society from 1863 till 1867, when he was appointed vicar of St. Silas', Hunslet, Leeds. In 1873 he removed to the vicarage of Rookhope, county Durham, and in 1877 was presented to the rectory of Sunderland. In 1885 Bishop Lightfoot appointed him Master of Greatham Hospital.

The Rev. G. B. Concanon, LL.D., Vicar of St. Paul's, West Brixton, has also been taken from his people. He had been in bad health for some time past, but preached on Christmas morning, and no dangerous symptoms were apparent until lately, when a complication of internal disorders gave anxiety to his friends. He was much beloved and esteemed (says the *Daily Chronicle*) by a large congregation, who deplore his loss after twenty-two years' ministry in Brixton. Dr. Concanon graduated at Trinity College, Dublin, in 1845, and was ordained two years later. He was Rector of Dromod from 1856 till 1865, chaplain to the Earl of Gainsborough from 1865 to 1870, and was appointed vicar of St. Paul's, Brixton, in 1881, being also chaplain to Viscount Valentia.

Under the head "A Modern Martyr," the *City Press* says "About three years ago the Rev. J. B. Mylius was presented to the vicarage of All Saints', Hatcham Park. Overpowered with the ever-growing neighbourhood, he consulted the Rev. W. H. Stone, of St. James's, Hatcham, as to the course he should adopt. 'I want,' he said, 'a second curate, if I am to overtake the work committed to my charge. I have no means. There is only one way out of the difficulty, and that is to accept the chaplaincy of the South-Eastern Fever Hospital, which will not materially interfere with my work as vicar of the parish.' 'Have you counted the cost?' asked Mr. Stone. 'I have,' replied Mr. Mylius. The chaplain he accordingly became, performing the duties that devolved upon him with the loving devotion he brought to bear upon everything he undertook. A few weeks ago he caught the fever, and last week he passed away, a martyr to duty, at the early age of thirty-two. His memory, however, will long be revered by those who were privileged to know him."

Miss Charlotte Maria Tucker, better known as "A.L.O.E." (A Lady of England), under which name she attained wide popularity as a writer, chiefly of books for children, died on the 2nd ult. at Batala, in the Punjaub, aged seventy-two. For the last eighteen years she had been working as an honorary missionary of the Church of England Zenana Missionary Society among the Mahomedan women of the Punjaub. That she did much good, and won the love of many, there can be no doubt, white and dark friends tending her with equal solicitude in her last illness. It should be added that to the objects of her Mission Miss Tucker devoted all the proceeds of her pen.

The loss of a sturdy Evangelical has befallen the diocese of Truro in the death of the Rev. George Taylor Braine-Hartnell, Vicar of Liskeard. Mr. Braine-Hartnell, who had a good record behind him, was appointed to Liskeard some ten years ago. Earnest in his defence of Protestant principles, his language and actions were not always understood, and frequently provoked rather bitter controversy. The living, a decidedly important one, is in the hands of the Simeon Trustees, who may be expected to make the appointment of a successor to the late vicar a matter of very careful consideration.—*Record.*

The Rev. H. W. Reynolds, M.A., Vicar of St. Thomas's, Agartown, St. Pancras, has succumbed to an attack of influenza after an illness of only five and a half days' duration. His widow is lying seriously ill, suffering from the same epidemic. Deceased, who was a late Hody Exhibitioner of Wadham College, Oxford, and Pusey and Ellerton Hebrew Scholar, graduated in 1870, and was ordained the same year to the curacy of St. Stephen's, Spitalfields. In 1878 he was appointed to the vicarage of St. Thomas's, Agartown. He was a son of Prebendary Joseph Reynolds, and brother of Prebendary Bernard Reynolds, both of St. Paul's Cathedral.