

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE
CHURCHMAN

JULY, 1894.

ART. I.—THE ELEMENT OF PERSONAL TESTIMONY
IN THE PREACHING OF THE WORD OF GOD.

A PAPER READ AT A MEETING OF THE IRISH CHURCH CLERICAL
SOCIETY, AT DUBLIN, APRIL 5, 1894, BY THE REV.
H. C. G. MOULE, B.D.

APPROACHING this important and sacred theme, I ask to distribute the offered remarks upon it somewhat thus: First, we will recall a few cautions on the threshold; then we will affirm to ourselves in a positive way the just and sacred place in our preaching due to the element of testimony; and we will close with a few words about the right method and manner of such testimony.

1. In two main directions we find occasion for some preliminary caution and reserve when the word "testimony" is uttered. The one relates to the nature of the Gospel, the other to the personal attitude of the witness. It belongs to the unique glory of the Gospel that it is a revelation indissolubly rooted into facts; into a Person who is supremely matter-of-fact; into the sufferings and doings of this Person, all matters of fact. "I delivered unto you first of all, that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures, and that He was buried, and that He rose again, according to the Scriptures." "He preached unto them Jesus, and the Resurrection." "I determined to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified." "Remember Jesus Christ raised from the dead."

This adamantine objectivity of the Gospel is to be recollected always. The grasp of the Christian's hand, the grapple of his foot, is to be always upon this Rock. We go to our preaching not to pursue a reverie, not to exhibit a speculation, but to present a fact, eternal from one side, historical from another; to re-affirm its certainty, altogether independent of our im-

pressions; to restate its significance, not as we have conjectured it or divined it, but as its original and historically ascertained expounders, authorized by their Master, have set it forth.

This anchorage upon supreme and immovable facts—facts of a Person—secures at once the absolute fixity and the boundless adaptability of the Gospel. It bids us rest at a sure centre, remembering on every occasion that “what we do not know can never destroy what we do know.” And it allows us to watch with unanxious wonder and hope the vast motion of the circumference, as the message of Christ is brought to bear on every human need, through all times and places; for that motion is secured and governed from a centre which is not the wisdom of man, but the power and the action of God.

So the messenger of the Gospel must never forget, in his longing to witness to its reality to *himself*, its reality in *itself*. If he would speak aright, he must continually remind his brethren that the facts of salvation stand *per se* outside him, and outside them; that the oracle of peace and life is not an echo of the pilgrim’s voice from the hills of the wilderness, but a voice, articulate and personal, from heaven; that he preaches not himself, even in his own best and noblest experience, but Christ Jesus the Lord. Let every witness be a liar; GOD is true!

Then we recall an obvious caution related to the personal attitude of the preacher. For his own soul’s sake, and for his brethren’s too, as they may be affected by him, he is to take care *how* he witnesses, not only because the Gospel is objective, but because he is a sinner. A subtle risk undoubtedly attends the work of spiritual testimony. Those of us who have experience of some noble characteristic Christian efforts of our time, evangelistic and for edification, know that what is called a testimony-meeting is sometimes a very anxious hour, and needs, for its wholesome working, stringent precautions. Not seldom voices then speak which would be the better for a little discipline of silence, while voices are silent which, if (but for three minutes) reserve could be forgotten for Christ’s sake, would probably say just what would glorify Him and not advertise the witness. And the risk of such occasions has its possible place in the pulpit also. For some men, though perhaps not at all for most men, yet for some, there lies an almost impalpable but serious temptation in the thought of saying in public what the Lord is to themselves; a temptation to set themselves to the front, to accentuate the depth of their own insight, the acuteness of their own repentance, the simplicity of their own faith, the persistency of their own prayers, the completeness of their own victories. “Take heed unto thyself.” “Search me, O God.” Better a reverent silence

than such utterance. "Set a watch, O Lord, before my mouth; keep the door of my lips."

2. I have thus indicated some obvious matters for caution in the use and handling of personal testimony in the preaching of the Word. May I now, with the more emphasis and confidence, affirm the just and sacred place which personal testimony assuredly should hold in our preaching, if that preaching is to concur in character with its subject-matter, and to be true to Apostolic models?

Need I at any length remind my brethren of the impressive degree to which personal testimony, quite definite and explicit, enters into Apostolic teaching, above all into that of St. Paul? If it be true, as a great preacher has said, that one inmost characteristic of a true sermon is that it is a deliverance of truth through personality, we may abundantly illustrate the dictum from those great written discourses, the Epistles, and from some of the originally unwritten discourses reported in the Acts, such as St. Paul's address at Miletus, that at the temple-stairs, and that spoken before Agrippa. "I count not my life dear to myself, so that I may accomplish the ministry I received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel of the grace of God." "I was zealous before God, as ye all are this day; and I persecuted this way unto the death: there shone from heaven a light around me, and I heard a voice saying unto me, Saul, Saul;" "I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision; having obtained help from God, I continue unto this day, testifying that Christ must suffer, and that He should be the first that should rise from the dead;" "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God, through Jesus Christ;" "By the grace of God I am what I am;" "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who comforteth us, that we may be able to comfort; our comfort aboundeth through Christ;" "God hath shined in our hearts;" "We bear about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus, that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our body;" "We believe, and therefore speak;" "He said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: wherefore I take pleasure in weaknesses, for Christ's sake; for when I am weak, then am I strong;" "He revealed His Son in me, that I might preach Him;" "I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me;" "To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain;" "What things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ;" "That I may know Him;" "I thank Christ Jesus our Lord, for that He counted me faithful, putting me into His ministry, who was before injurious;" "Of sinners I am chief; howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Christ Jesus might show forth His all-longsuffering, for a pattern to them which should

hereafter believe on Him to life everlasting;" "I know Him whom I have believed, and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him, against that day."

As St. Paul, so St. Peter and St. John, less persistently and abundantly, but as naturally, "put themselves in evidence" for their Lord: "I am a witness of the sufferings of Christ and a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed;" "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, that ye may have fellowship with us; and truly our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ."

May we with reverence cite, not the servants only, but their Master also, in proof of the essential fitness of personal testimony in the preacher's work? Is not the indication of His own most sacred personal experience no small element in the Lord's own teaching of eternal truth to man? "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me, and to finish His work." "He that hath sent Me is with Me; the Father hath not left Me alone." But I dare not press this beyond the most guarded limit; for He, unlike the very greatest of His servants, was essentially and necessarily His own message, His own Gospel. Let it be amply enough for us to remember, as we have done, how abundantly His servants, preaching and teaching His Word, pour into their affirmations and expositions this vivid element of personality, and, for His sake, say to us what to themselves the Gospel was.

And this is not an accidental tendency or characteristic; surely it is of the essence of the thing—of the essence of the message and its delivery. We remembered deliberately at the outset the immovable objectivity of the Gospel, and the consequent grave mistake of beclouding in our preaching its character as external historic fact; but we remember also that the fact was, and is, for the sake of the inmost life of the human spirit. Its absolute independence in itself of our meditations, of our imaginations, of our emotions, of those "frames and feelings" with which religious language is familiar—what is the significance of this to us? Surely this—that only by that which is in no sense of ourselves can ourselves be saved, transfigured, glorified. And this effect upon us it can have only by entrance into us, as we welcome to the heart, to the soul, to our whole being of thought and will, the Lord Christ Jesus in His Work, His Word, Himself. Nothing less than such a welcome and such an entrance satisfies the Scriptural account of the Gospel and its operation. With all else that is to be said about the scope and function of the Gospel (and that is vastly much indeed), *this* can be omitted only with a fatal loss to the whole—this personal contact, in man's inmost region, with the

eternal facts and forces of the revealed salvation. Nothing else, however great and true, in Christianity can be the substitute for this. The purest and most far-sighted programme of organization cannot take the place of this sacred individualism, deep as the relationship is, in a true view of things, between the individual spiritual life and that of the community. The most venerable and most splendid externals of religion are without this only a rich casket robbed of its inestimable jewel, or, if I may borrow an illustration from Irish literary antiquities, only a beautiful "shrine" from which the precious manuscript has been lost. The true Creed itself, so far from being a palladium, is but a formidable warning, a penetrating rebuke, if it is not the counterpart in its confessor to a true life, lived by faith in the Son of God.

Such is the message of Christ, that its own nature contradicts the idea of a messenger or expounder of it who is not also a witness. There are subjects innumerable of human thought on which it is quite legitimate to think and to discourse altogether, practically, from outside. But he who, being a commissioned servant of the Gospel, thinks of it and discourses of it merely *ab extra*, or even allows himself to seem to do so, cannot possibly do so and be in harmony with his theme; he cannot so do even mental justice to his theme. His action is a reproof to his position. And how, on such a subject, can he hope to reach the inmost life of other men?

3. Briefly, in closing, we are to think awhile about the right way and manner of personal testimony in preaching the Word of God. Here, if anywhere, let me speak with humility and diffidence; who can dare, in a matter of this moral and spiritual delicacy, to lay down crude rules, even had he an experience and an insight the greatest that has ever been?

Yet one rule must be recited which has no crudity in it, and no doubtfulness. It is the law of spiritual reality. He who in the pulpit would set to his seal that God is true must indeed, out of the pulpit as well as in it, "*know* the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent." A testimony which has not a walk with God behind it is an awful fallacy. An expression of personal peace and gladness in believing to which the chamber, the home, the heart give no real counterpart is the clatter of the sounding brass and the tinkle of the cymbal. A fatal facility for a testifying language which is only secondhand, or only caught by a superficial contagion, is a malady to be prayed against with all the heart. The witness *must* be the man who has seen, the man who personally knows.

Yet therefore (may I so far retrace our steps as to say this?)—therefore let us not put away the longing to witness per-

sonally to our Master because we dread the doing it amiss. That is to fold the napkin and to inter the gold. Let us rather, for His sake, so seek to deepen our inward converse with Him, so make reverent use every day for ourselves of our wealth in Him, that we cannot help the outcome of some loving witness, which will be delivered then so far aright that it will be indeed not to ourselves but Him. As pastors we cannot wholly divest even our most secret spiritual hours of a relation to the flock. The man conversing with Christ in his silent study, in his quiet garden, nay, in the solitude of the crowded streets, cannot gather up a deepening intimacy with Him, with "the power of His resurrection, the fellowship of His sufferings, and conformity to His death," in a daily surrender to the Cross, to the Crucified, without accumulating material for the truest personal witness to the eternal verity.

How shall that witness come out? Ah, there is a question which can only be answered by each true man in Christ for himself. And in the vast majority of cases the answer will be the *solvitur ambulando*; it will come as a holy instinct seizes occasion. Now and then, perhaps in most ministries, there will come hours when it will be nobly fit and natural for the man to pause, and to offer deliberately to his audience, simple or cultured, a quiet statement of his Master's past dealings with himself, in conviction, in manifestation, in peace, in power. If, being given aright, such utterance costs the man very dear, so much the better; it will be the less likely that he will deviate into a publication of himself.

But doubtless the occasion for witness will come far oftener in more passing and seemingly casual ways. A sentence here, half a sentence there, can often make all the difference between the mere discourse and the testimony to Christ. No argument will need to be dislocated, or even deferred. No true law of even literary fitness will need to be neglected. No faintest shadow of anything alien to the holy decorum of the Gospel shall fall on the words. Yet it shall be plain that the message comes not only from the Divine Word, but through the speaker's soul. It shall be plain that when he talks of sin, and grace, and righteousness; of new birth and new life; of propitiation, of justification; of holiness through the Spirit's power, making Christ the Inhabitant of the heart; of the peace of God in real life; of conversation with the Eternal Friend, he knows what he is talking about—he has a right to say, "*Come and see.*" To him (his brethren will be sure to find it out, soon or late) Christ is not only a topic, but the Lord; the Gospel is not only a study, but an immense reality.

Personal testimony—may we all have the holy privilege, as

our Master's messengers, of bearing it in our ministrations in this needful world! His last word to His Church assembled in her representatives was, "Ye shall be witnesses of Me." And time only intensifies the need and power of obedience to that royal order. How, in our preaching, under the blessing of the Holy Spirit, shall we best find out the soul, and win it for our beloved Lord, and build it up in Him? On the one hand, by an unwearied affirmation, thoughtful, loving, confident, of the eternal facts; on the other, by such a presentation of them as shall let all men see that they are *facts to us*.

ART. II.—FRA PAOLO SARPI.

THE Rev. Alexander Robertson has received a letter of thanks from the King of Italy, through the governor of the Royal Household, for his "Life of Paolo Sarpi," and he has also been honoured with the degree of Doctor bestowed upon him in Scotland for his literary labours. These acts of grace and courtesy are a strong testimony to the value of the work before us,¹ while the first witnesses also to the liberality of the Italian Court. It was high time that Sarpi's Life should be issued in a trustworthy form, drawn from original sources which have been too much overlooked. Sarpi had the honour of being regarded as a dangerous antagonist by that section of the Roman Church which, while it is specially represented by the Jesuits, is far from confined to the members of that society. Consequently his character has been blackened by a free use of the calumny which is regarded in some quarters as justifiable if a good end is to be obtained by its employment. Few men know that in the great Venetian antagonist of the Papacy is to be found the first mathematician, the first metaphysician, the first anatomist, as well as the first statesman and the most learned Churchman of his generation. In 1623 a statue was ordered by his country to be erected to his memory, but it was not till 1892 that it was erected. So long did the persistent enmity of his opponents prevent his merits from being publicly acknowledged. Two years ago this reproach to Venetian slackness was swept away, and Dr. Robertson's story serves as a good pendant to the memorial.

Dr. Robertson divides Sarpi's Life into sections, which

¹ "Fra Paolo Sarpi, the Greatest of the Venetians," by the Rev. Alexander Robertson, author of "Count Campello and Catholic Reform in Italy" (London: Sampson Low and Co., 1894, pp. 196).

he distinguishes not only by his hero's age, but also by a special characteristic. Thus, from the age of one to eighteen he is "the Scholar," from eighteen to twenty-six "the Professor," from twenty-seven to thirty-six "the Provincial and the Procurator," from thirty-seven to fifty-three "the Scientist and Philosopher," from fifty-four to fifty-five "the Theological Counsellor," at fifty-five "the Martyr," from fifty-six to seventy-one "the Statesman-Author;" in 1623 he died.

It is as theological counsellor of Venice in its struggle with the Papacy, and as the historian of the Council of Trent, that Sarpi has gained his world-wide reputation.

The dispute between the Republic of Venice and the Papal See, which was then held by Paul V., one of the Borghese family, began, like so many other quarrels in which earlier Popes had made themselves conspicuous, with the question of the exemption of ecclesiastics from secular rule and the claim of the Popes to nominate Bishops. With the latter claim Venice made short work. When the Patriarch of Venice died and Paul demanded to nominate his successor, the Senate ordered the immediate investiture of their own nominee. On the other hand, when ecclesiastics as well as the other citizens of Brescia were taxed for the restoration of the ramparts of the city, and when two ecclesiastics of bad life were imprisoned by the authority of the Republic, the Pope angrily remonstrated, and added to his remonstrance a demand that the mortmain laws in force in Venice should be repealed on pain of excommunication and interdict. Sarpi formulated the reply made to the Pope's briefs, which denied his right to interfere with the independence of the Venetian State, whether as to its laws dealing with property or the treatment of its subjects. Thereupon, on April 17, 1606, the Bull of Excommunication and Interdict was issued. By Sarpi's advice, the Republic met the aggression of the Pope by a decree that anyone observing the Bull should incur the penalty of high-treason, and a protest against Papal intrusion was affixed to church doors, signed with the name of Leonardo Donato, "by the grace of God Doge of Venice." All were loyal except the Jesuits, the Theatines and the Franciscans, of whom the first were banished and the others allowed to leave the country. The Pope summoned Sarpi to Rome. Sarpi, knowing that the result would be *la fune o il fuoco*, the rope or the stake, declared himself too much occupied with State affairs to leave Venice, on which the Pope publicly burnt his books, and placed on the Index all books printed or to be printed by his publishers. This was followed by the greater excommunication, to which Paolo Sarpi replied, "If I shall be, as an excommunicated one, separated from your communion, against every law, Divine and

human, I am prepared, by the help of God, to support it with tranquillity, certain that an iniquitous sentence is not able to damage anyone in the sight of God and of His Church." The Pope was defeated by the friar, and on April 18, 1607, he found it necessary unconditionally to remove the interdict. Paul V. was not a man to sit down quietly under such a rebuff. At first he attempted to lure Fra Paolo to Rome "that the Pope might show him honour." The Senate frustrated the Pope's design by forbidding him to leave Venice. The Pope sent two emissaries to hold private interviews with the Frate, in order to compromise him. At Fra Paolo's request the Senate desired that such interviews should be held only in their presence. The Pope could not wait any longer. In September he engaged Rotilio Orlandini and two other bravos, for the sum of eight thousand crowns and an absolution, to go to Venice and murder Fra Paolo. The Venetian Ambassador at Rome, through an informer, learnt the whole plot, and gave information to the Republic, by means of which the three murderers were arrested as soon as they put their foot on Venetian territory. A single failure did not discourage the Curia. There was another bravo in Rome named Ridolfo Poma, known to a worthless priest named Alessandro Franceschi. By Franceschi, Poma was introduced to Cardinal Borghese, and by him to the Pope. The Pope offered him wealth and an absolution if he would assassinate Sarpi. Poma undertook the task, choosing as companions Parasio, Giovanni, Pasquali and a priest named Viti. The Doge and the Senate, warned of impending danger, commanded that Fra Paolo should never pass through any but the widest streets, except he were followed by a body of attendants; but on October 5 there happened to be a fire, which drew away his escort, and the Frate returned to his monastery from the Senate House with one friend, Malipiero, and his servant, Fra Marino. The assassins saw their opportunity. As the three men were crossing the last bridge before their arrival at the monastery, the five bravos dashed upon them, overpowered Malipiero and Fra Marino, and left Fra Paolo for dead with fifteen stiletto stabs, one of which had entered his temple and broken his jawbone, the stiletto being so firmly fixed that it could not be withdrawn by the murderer. The assassins thought their work was done, and fled to the house of the Nuncio. By the Nuncio's help they got safely to the seaside, and were hurried on board a sloop which carried them safely to Ravenna, where they found carriages ready for them, which conveyed them to Ancona. At Ancona they were met by Franceschi, who "took them to the counting-house of Girolamo Scalamonti, the Pope's agent, who paid them to

the Pope's order the sum of a thousand ducats." After visiting the House of Loretto as holy pilgrims, they went on to Rome, and were lodged in the palace of Cardinal Colonna, receiving a pension from the Pope. But the unwelcome news came that, after all, Fra Paolo was not killed, so why should the Pope pay a pension to his murderers? At the end of a year he sent them off to Naples, but there the pension ordered by the Pope was not paid, so they returned to Rome, discontented and menacing, whereupon the Pope seized them and shut them up within the walls of the prison of Civita Vecchia, where they could tell no tales. There Poma lingered for some seven years, dying January 6, 1615.

It need hardly be said that the attempt to assassinate the foremost man in Venice caused first consternation and then fury through the city. The bravos had escaped, but the Nuncio had remained behind. The populace rushed to his palace, and would have burnt him alive in it had they not been controlled by the authorities. Four thousand ducats were offered by the Senate for the capture of Poma, dead or alive; two thousand for the others. The Pope, therefore, gave them special permission to go armed for their security. Fra Paolo himself did not lose his calmness or his charity. When the surgeon lamented over the *stravaganza*, or wide-spreading character of the wound inflicted on him, he playfully whispered with a half-smile, "*stylo Romanæ curiæ;*" *i.e.*, "such as might be expected from the style of the Roman Court," or "from the stiletto of the Roman Court." The severest word that he uttered was, "*Videat Dominus et requirat.*" His good constitution conquered, and the wounded man recovered. The Senate, resolved to take every precaution for the future, ordered that a house should be provided him close to the Doge's palace, in order that he might not have to pass through narrow streets to his monastery, and decreed that "if in future any person or persons be found, of any degree or condition whatsoever, who shall attack in any place or manner whatsoever, without exception, Father Paul, he or they who should kill such a person or persons shall receive the reward of two thousand ducats, and he or they who shall take them alive shall receive four thousand ducats, to be paid immediately, either out of the confiscated property of such persons or out of the public treasury. Further, that whosoever shall inform the Senate of any person or persons coming to Venice with intent to injure the said Father Paul, he shall receive the sum of two thousand ducats, and if the informer be an accomplice he shall receive a pardon" (p. 123). Fra Paolo gratefully declined the honour of a residence near the palace; he would be happier in the familiar monastery. The Senate consented, but only after

they had built him a special staircase and entrance, by which he could pass safely to his gondola. The stiletto which was left in his temple was hung up by him in the church of the monastery.

Once more Paul V. attempted to assassinate Fra Paolo, in the year following his recovery, in consequence of his publishing a book, the title of which was "A Treatise on the Interdict of Pope Paul V., by Fra Paolo Sarpi," in which he shows that it was not legally published, and that for many reasons it was not obligatory on the ecclesiastics to execute it, and that they could not observe it without sin. Fra Bernardo, Fra Francesco, and Fra Antonio were the three new conspirators. They were to receive five thousand scudi each and "Church preferment" if they would take off Fra Paolo by poison. Before the plot could be carried out, Francesco and Antonio were seized by the Venetian authorities and condemned to death, their punishment being changed to banishment, on Paolo's intercession. Fra Bernardo, not having left Papal territory, was safe, and was rewarded by his employer with a Cardinal's hat.

The "Treatise on the Interdict" was only one of a series of works which Sarpi now wrote. Another was on the "Validity of Excommunication." This was followed by a "Consideration of the Censure of Pope Paul V." and a "History of what passed between Pope Paul V. and the Serene Republic of Venice, or the War of Paul V. with the Venetians," and by a "Defence of the Right of Sovereigns against the Excommunications and Interdicts of the Popes." Then came a "History of Benefices" and "The Inquisition in Venice," and treatises on "Sanctuaries" and "Immunity of the Clergy" and "The Jesuits' System of Education;" and last, his great work, "The History of the Council of Trent," on which he had been employed for forty years. Strangely enough, an exact transcript of the author's manuscript of this great work has never yet been published, the book with which we are familiar having been printed from a slightly abridged copy made by Antonio de Dominis, Archbishop of Spalatro, and issued by him in London. The original has been lying in the Library of St. Mark, but as long as the Austrian dominion in Venice lasted it was not allowed to be consulted by editors. Its publication is now promised by Professor Teza.

In 1623 the great Venetian died at the age of seventy. He was buried in the church of his monastery, and a public monument was decreed him. But the hatred of Rome pursues the dead as it pursues the living. "We shall not permit that to one excommunicated should be raised a stone or an epitaph of honour in any spot whatever," wrote Urban VIII. "In no shape or form," said the Nuncio, "can our Lord tolerate this

work of impiety." We can well imagine how such arrogance would have been met had Fra Paolo been still *Consultore* to the Senate, but his mantle had fallen on no successor, and a "reconciliation" had been effected between the Papacy and the Republic. So the decree ordering a monument to be erected was allowed to become a dead letter. But this was not all. The Popes, one after another, were resolved on desecrating their antagonist's tomb and scattering his ashes to the winds. Ten times had his friends to move his remains in order to hide their whereabouts and save them from profanation. Built up in a wall, ensconced within an altar, concealed in a private house, deposited secretly in the Library of St. Mark, carried from place to place, at last they were interred by order of the Austrian Government in the Campo Santo of the Island of San Michele. Here they might have rested had not Gregory XVI. been accidentally informed that they were there some twenty years after the interment. Passionately throwing his handkerchief on the table, he cried out, "They have defiled my dear Island of San Michele with the bones of that heretic! He must be taken up and cast among the common bones, that his memory may perish eternally!" The Pope gave his orders to the Patriarch of Venice, the Patriarch to the monks of San Michele, and on All Saints' Day, 1846, when the Venetians went as usual to visit the grave of their friend in the cemetery, it was found that the stone marking the spot where Fra Paolo's remains lay was gone. Search was made with hot haste, and it was found that the remains themselves, protected by a strong stone coffin, were intact. The Austrian police traced the sacrilegious robbers, who were made to restore the slab that they had taken away, and on the night of November 19, 1846, it was replaced on the old spot. There what was mortal of the great Venetian still rests.

On September 20, 1892, his statue, the erection of which had been prevented by Papal intrigue for two hundred and seventy years, was unveiled in the presence of thousands, and handed over to the care of the Syndic of Venice. It stands in the Campo di Santa Fosca, between the Doge's palace and the monastery in which he lived.

It only remains to say that Dr. Robertson has done his work excellently. The book is well timed, well arranged, and well written; already a second edition has been called for.

F. MEYRICK.

ART. III.—THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.

PART II.

GESENIUS not only, in the first part of his dissertation, threw no light on the age and origin of the Samaritan Codex, but was conscious of the fact, and made no attempt to hide it. His serious work is the second part of the book, in which he examines the various readings of the Codex, with the object of showing that it was a recension inferior to the Jewish, and more recent, and useless in a critical point of view. By a minute investigation and classification of the variants, he satisfied himself that, according to critical rules, they were subsequent to, and less authoritative than, those of the present text, and that, judging by prevalent views of Hebrew literature, they were æsthetically inferior. All which might be true, whatever its age and origin. Only if, as he admits may have been the case—if Moses really wrote the Pentateuch, and the two codices date back to the division of the kingdom, what learned trifling to discuss the grammatical inaccuracy and literary inferiority of the Israelitish scribes of Jeroboam's day! In a literary point of view, he is considered by the writers in Smith and Herzog to have been triumphantly successful, but to have left the more important question of age and origin entirely unsolved.

And yet the supposed success of Gesenius in settling the questions of priority and taste has been transferred to the other question, which he is admitted on all hands to have left undecided, and respecting which he does not himself claim to have done anything more than make a guess. The great men who lived before the rise of the modern criticism, as represented by Kennicott, felt no uncertainty about the matter, as I shall show later on. But by this strange fallacy Gesenius is supposed to have disproved the traditional age and origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch, because successful in showing that it was a later revision than the Jewish (which no one who thinks it the Israelitish in contrast with the Jewish Torah can doubt), and that the variations were pedantically grammatical, or ungrammatical, or not in good taste. Yet such has been the case, and the result has been a surprising amount of ignorance as to the actual facts of the case.

We may use Professor Ryle's words to express the common state of mind and knowledge on this subject.

"The Canon of Scripture," he says, "recognised by the Samaritan community, even down to the present day, consists of the Pentateuch alone. It has been very generally and very naturally supposed that the Samaritan community received

their Torah, which, save in a certain number of comparatively unimportant readings, is identical with the Jewish Torah, from the renegade Jewish priest of the name, according to Josephus, of Manasseh, who instituted on Mount Gerizim a rival temple worship to that on Mount Moriah."¹

To the statement of Josephus as to the time of the institution of the Samaritan worship and of the expulsion of the renegade priest, Professor Ryle objects, preferring to identify these events with those a century before, recorded by Nehemiah, in whose time, therefore, he places the origination of the Samaritan Pentateuch. Then it was that, according to him, this Codex commenced. And the distinction between the two codices he states as consisting of "a certain number of comparatively unimportant readings." The actual number of various readings is 6,000.² Of the importance or unimportance of some of these I hope in a future paper to give the reader the opportunity of forming his own opinion, when we have finished examining the origin and date of the Codex, and come to consider the variants and the objections made to them by Gesenius.

The present popular supposition—Professor Ryle claims for it nothing more—is that the Samaritans obtained their Codex when they built their temple and instituted their worship, in the days of Alexander the Great according to Josephus, or in Nehemiah's day, which he thinks is more probable.

Assuming, which is the postulate required by all the critics of the modern school, that we have no external evidence as to the origin and age of the Codex, what are we to think of the probability of either of these two forms of the general supposition? In the Book of Nehemiah we read a good deal of those who subsequently became the Samaritan nation, but we do not find any mention of a temple on Mount Gerizim; and, on the other hand, we do find in the Book of Ezra that these adversaries of Judah were well acquainted with the history of Israel, most anxious to be looked upon as belonging to the same stock and to worship in the same temple. There is no great probability that at that time there was any other change among them than that of increased hostility to the Jewish people.

And on the other hand, if Josephus is correct—and the expulsion of a Jewish priest may very likely have happened more than once—it is evident enough, considering the state of feeling at that time between Jew and Samaritan, that nothing is less likely than that the Israelites would then for the first

¹ "Canon of the Old Testament," p. 91.

² Herzog, "Real-Encyclopädie," B. xiii., s. 349.

time receive their law from the Jews, or that they could have built their temple and instituted sacrifices in accordance with a law of which they knew nothing.

The historical evidence is wholly in favour of the Samaritan temple having been built in the time of Alexander the Great. Josephus must have had the Book of Nehemiah under his eye, and could hardly have made so great a mistake. It is evidently impossible that the Samaritans should have first received the Torah in Alexander's time; but if, contrary to the historical evidence, we suppose, with Professor Ryle, that the Samaritan Codex was merely that used by the Jews in Nehemiah's day, its variations, as we shall see more distinctly later on, are in the enormous majority of cases inexplicable; and the fact of the Pentateuch alone being received by them could, as Professor Ryle himself shows, be only accounted for on the wild imagination which he adopts, that "at the time when the Samaritan worship was instituted, or when it received its final shape from the accession of Jewish malcontents, the Canon of the Jews at Jerusalem consisted of the Torah only."¹

Either of these views is impossible. The writers in Smith and Herzog are right, in their point of view—that of the so-called higher criticism—in treating the question as insoluble; which it is, if these are the only suppositions, and if there is really no historical evidence available.

Kennicott, and the learned men who agreed with him, did not so think. The evidence exists. In this investigation we take for granted the truth of Holy Scripture as an historical record. On this assumption, the historical evidence as to the age and origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch is complete. If we reject this assumption the question is insoluble. It requires for its solution that assumption, which is in itself a strong proof of the correctness of the assumption. Nor is the general truth of the history contained in the Books of Kings denied by any of the critics, however much its evidence on this matter is ignored. But if Scripture history, and especially that contained in 2 Kings xvii., is true, the Samaritan Pentateuch has an antiquity far beyond that of the Samaritan nation. If the prophets of Israel knew the facts of their own day and the history of their own times, the ten tribes had God's written law; and the age when these prophets wrote is not questioned. The writings of the Israelitish prophets and the Books of Kings contain the evidence required. And if this be so, the unity and antiquity of the Samaritan Pentateuch, and *a fortiori* of the Jewish Pentateuch, rest on an impregnable basis of historical fact.

¹ "Canon of the Old Testament," p. 93.

According to writers such as Wellhausen, not only the Pentateuch did not exist among the ten tribes when in their own land, but it did not exist at that time among the two. Of three parts into which they decompose what they call the Hexateuch (that is, the Pentateuch and Joshua), the earliest part, to which they give the name of the "Jehovist," Wellhausen thinks to have been written shortly before the ten tribes were carried into captivity; the second part, Deuteronomy, he supposes to have been written just before Josiah's reign, or in it, and to have been presented to him as a newly-discovered work of Moses; the third and last part, or "Priests' Code," containing a large part of the ceremonial law, he assigns to about a hundred years after the Babylonian Captivity, veiled under the name of Moses in order to give it currency among the people.¹ Driver speaks very indefinitely as to the date of what he calls J E,² but none of these critics, any more than Gesenius, allow that the Pentateuch existed in the days of Jeroboam and Rehoboam either in Judah or Israel. Not only the view respecting the Samaritan Pentateuch held by Kennicott and a long list of learned men, but also the belief common to Christians and Jews in all ages, including that age in which our blessed Lord Himself lived, that there were five books written by Moses, and in existence from his day downward, is absolutely inconsistent with the alleged results of the criticism of the modern school. Those results, it must not be forgotten, are purely subjective. The facts are all against them. The monumental evidence is against them. And so also is this Samaritan Codex, which is consistent, as we shall see, with Hebrew history as recorded in our Bibles, and explained by it, but on the unproved hypotheses of modern critics avowedly an unsolved mystery.

The careful study of Kings and Chronicles makes it quite inconceivable that the knowledge of the Pentateuch should have been confined to the tribes of Judah and Benjamin. In David's days the sacred Scriptures must have consisted mainly of the Pentateuch and perhaps the Books of Joshua and Judges. The Book of Job was, I have no doubt, then part of the Divine Canon, but its nature and subject made it at that time, as is even now the case, the study of the few rather than of the many. The Books of Joshua and Judges have so much connection with each other that, in spite of the forcible separation the critics wish to make between them, we may

¹ "Prolegomena sur Geschichte Israels," s. 9, 51, 423, 424, where Wellhausen says that the "Priests' Code" "was published, and introduced B.C. 444 as the Mosaic law, a hundred years after the Exile."

² Driver, "Literature of the Old Testament," p. 117.

look upon them as closely united, and can hardly consider them as having come into existence before the time of the last of the Judges, Samuel. They must have stood on an entirely different footing in the estimation of their contemporaries from the five books of Moses. It was of these David spoke as "the law." The Pentateuch was at that time practically the Bible of the people, the Book of the Law.

When the ten tribes were severed from the two they had an equal right to the sacred literature of the nation. Probably they read all that existed. But there was a distinction. Samuel's connection with the Davidic dynasty was such that they could not regard his writings with satisfaction. The two books bearing his name were naturally hateful to the people who revolted from David's grandson. And if he wrote Joshua and Judges, they would not be likely to hold them in the same veneration in which they held the five books of Moses. These were as much to them as to Judah and Benjamin. It is the fact of their having the law and not observing it with which their prophets reproach them. In a prophecy to the ten tribes Hosea says (viii. 11, 12): "Because Ephraim hath made many altars to sin, altars shall be unto him to sin. I have written to him the great things of My law, but they were counted as a strange thing." In Ephraim as well as in Judah the written law existed. In the first verse of the same chapter it is against "the law" they are said to have transgressed. The references to the Pentateuch are continual (Hosea xi. 1; xii. 3, 4, 12, 13; xiii. 5). It is the same in Amos (iii. 1; v. 25, 26) and in Micah (vi. 4, 5; vii. 15, 20). Not only had the ten tribes the Pentateuch, the "law" which God had given them, in writing, but they were so well acquainted with it that their prophets could take for granted the fact that their many altars were inconsistent with it (Deut. xii. 13, 14), and assume their acquaintance with the histories of Jacob's birth, his prayer at Bethel, his wrestling with the angel (Hosea xii. 3, 4), the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah (Amos iv. 11), of the forty years in the wilderness (Amos v. 25), and of the coming up out of Egypt (Amos ii. 10; iii. 1), and the existence of the ceremonial law, with which their practices are compared (Amos iv. 4, 5) and contrasted.

In the history we find the same thing. It was evidently because of what was written in the Pentateuch that Jeroboam fixed on Bethel, "the house of God," as the centre of the idolatrous worship of Jehovah (1 Kings xii. 33). For the same reason he made Shechem, close to Gerizim, the capital of his new kingdom (1 Kings xii. 25). It was there that the law had been engraved on stones and the blessings pronounced on Israel. Both the resemblances in the ritual he instituted

to that in the temple at Jerusalem, and the differences were evidently consciously made in obedience to or violation of a known law, according to the dictates of political expediency (1 Kings xii. 26-33).

The complaint made in the history against Israel is the same as that made by the prophets—their forsaking the law, which if they had not possessed they could not have broken (2 Kings xvii. 12, 13): "For they served idols, whereof the Lord had said unto them, Ye shall not do this thing. Yet the Lord testified against Israel, and against Judah, by all the prophets, and by all the seers, saying, Turn ye from your evil ways, and keep My commandments and My statutes, according to all the law which I commanded your fathers, and which I sent to you by My servants the prophets. Notwithstanding, they would not hear." During this period, according to modern critics, up to the time when Israel was carried away captive, the Pentateuch did not exist, either in Israel or in Judah. Of the three layers of what Wellhausen calls the "Hexateuch," which he distinguishes as the "Priests' Code," "Deuteronomy," and the "Jehovist,"¹ he holds that the "Priests' Code" was written a hundred years after the exile,² with the purpose of representing itself as having been written during the wandering in the wilderness, and concealing under a veil the real truth as to its date and origin;³ concealing it, that is, from the Jewish laity. Wellhausen, of course, says nothing about the Samaritan Pentateuch. He could not have been more silent about it if there had been no Kennicott, no Gesenius, no Kohn. But it is in some part of these hundred years that all who do not with Kennicott believe in the Codex originating in Jeroboam's time—all who do not believe in the Mosaic origin of the Jewish Pentateuch—have to place the date and origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch. Is it possible to conceive that this book—this "Priests' Code," composed B.C. 444, should first have deceived the Jews, and then have been foisted by them on their hereditary enemies, the Samaritans, as the law revealed to Moses? The supposition is incredible. But the real fact is plain enough when we read the admonitions of the prophets and the statements of history respecting the ten tribes and their possession of the law. The law had been given to their fathers, and they broke it. "They rejected His statutes" (2 Kings xvii. 15). "They left all the commandments of the Lord their God" (verse 16). And for this reason "was Israel carried away out of their own land to Assyria unto this day" (verse 23).

¹ "Prolegomena sur Geschichte Israels," s. 12.

² *Ibid.*, s. 424.

³ *Ibid.*, ss. 9, 10.

In this seventeenth chapter of the Second Book of Kings we are told how, after the captivity of the ten tribes, the Samaritan history commences by the deportation of populations from other conquered nations to fill the vacant land. "The King of Assyria 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" (2 Kings xvii. 24). The Israelites were taken away, and instead of them large numbers from many heathen nations were removed by an arbitrary act of the Assyrian king from their own homes and put in possession of the lands and houses of the ten tribes, who were transported into other countries. This mingled population was subsequently called, from the country in which they live, "Samaritans," and, indeed, are so called in 2 Kings xvii. 29. They knew nothing of the worship of the Lord God of Israel. Each of these nations had its own gods, and they brought their gods with them.

The Lord, we are told, sent lions among them, which slew some of them, and they rightly attributed this calamity to its true source, though in expressing the fact to the King of Assyria they showed their ignorance of the God of all the earth by saying that it had happened to them "because they knew not the manner of the God of the land."

On this the King of Assyria gave a command to send them one of the priests who had been brought away captive from Samaria. "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."¹ And is it for a moment conceivable that the Israelitish priest should have gone to teach these heathen people how to serve the Lord, and not have taken with him the Book of the Law, which, as we have seen, the ten tribes possessed, and were reproved for breaking? It must be remembered that the Israelites before their captivity, apparently ever since Elijah's time, had worshipped the Lord (2 Kings vi. 10, 27, 33; viii. 19; x. 16, 31; xiii. 4, 5, 14; xvii. 2), although not rightly, for they persisted to the end in following the sin of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin, and using in the worship of the Lord the idolatrous symbol of the golden calf at Dan and Bethel, instead of joining in the appointed services at Jerusalem, thus not only breaking the second commandment, but consciously running counter to the twelfth chapter of

¹ 2 Kings xvii. 28.

Deuteronomy. It was true of Jehu's subjects as well as of Jehu himself, that they "took no heed to walk in the law of the Lord God of Israel" (2 Kings x. 31), which, as God said by Hosea, He had written unto them, and which forbade the worship of any graven image (Exod. xx. 4, 5) and the offering sacrifice except in the place which "the Lord should choose out of all their tribes to place His name there" (Deut. xii. 13, 14).

It is not likely that the priest whom the King of Assyria had taken from Samaria and sent back there was of the family of Aaron. In all probability he belonged to the priesthood which Jeroboam had consecrated out of his own heart. And it is equally unlikely that he would have taken back with him such a book as the Book of Job or such writings as the Books of Samuel or the prophecies of Hosea and Amos and Micah, which could not but be distasteful to an Israelitish priest of Bethel, and that he should not have taken back the Pentateuch, on which, however incorrectly, their ritual was based, and which contained all that had been distinctive of Israel as a nation.

What follows the passage already quoted from the seventeenth chapter of the Second Book of Kings, Wellhausen, though without mentioning the Samaritan Pentateuch, tries in part to get rid of. Verse 30 to verse 41 is by no means necessary to the proof of what has been already pointed out as so probable as to be almost certain, that the Samaritans received the Pentateuch from this priest whom the King of Assyria sent back; but it states it in express terms. Wellhausen attributes verse 34, beginning with the words "and after the law," to verse 41 to a different writer, and supposes him to forget, while inserting them, what he is writing about.¹ There is no reason for so doing, except to avoid the inconvenient admission that what the priest did was to bring them the Pentateuch. "So they feared the Lord, and made unto themselves of the lowest of them priests of the high places" (following in this the example of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, to which the priest who taught them could make no objection), "which sacrificed for them in the houses of the high places. They feared the Lord, and served their own gods, after the manner of the nations whom they carried away from them. Unto this day they do after the former manner; they fear not the Lord, neither do they after their statutes, or after their ordinances, or after the law and commandment which the Lord commanded the children of Jacob,

¹ "Die Composition des Hexateuch," s. 299.

whom He named Israel, with whom He made a covenant;" which is then recited, after which the passage concludes with the statement that though the same commandments and ordinances which had been given originally to Israel had been brought to them, they had not been obeyed. "Howbeit, they did not hearken, but they did after their former manner. So these nations feared the Lord, and served their graven images, both their children and their children's children: as did their fathers, so do they unto this day."

This is the history of the Samaritan Pentateuch. It is the book which the Israelites had always possessed, after as well as before the separation of the two kingdoms; and the Samaritans received it from the Israelitish priest whom the King of Assyria sent to teach the immigrants he had settled in Samaria how to serve the Lord.

Waiving all questions of inspiration, it only requires the acceptance of the Books of Kings as true history to explain perfectly what to the critics of the new school has been made by their own speculations an insoluble mystery, the age and origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch. It was plain enough to Kennicott, and is plain enough to anyone who considers it with a mind free from the unproved theories of modern criticism. It is clear enough when the Samaritans received the Pentateuch, and from whom, and clear enough, also, why they possessed the Pentateuch only. It is remarkable that they did not possess the Books of Joshua and Judges; but if Samuel had anything to do with those books, that would be a sufficient explanation, whereas that the Samaritans, if they received the Pentateuch when commencing the worship on Gerizim, should not have received the Book of Joshua, containing as it does the fulfilment of the command to bless the people from Mount Gerizim, would be unaccountable indeed.

The origin and age of the so-called Samaritan Pentateuch is thus plainly taught us in the historical books of Scripture. It was the Law which the ten tribes retained when they revolted from the house of David, and which one of their priests brought with him when sent back from Assyria to teach the Samaritans how to serve the Lord. This is the judgment arrived at by Kennicott, as will be shown subsequently, since whose time we know, from the admissions already quoted from Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible" and Herzog's "Real Encyclopædie," no new information on the subject has been obtained. The character and worth of the variants is quite a different question, and this will have to be considered in future papers. It is a much more interesting question than is sometimes supposed, and will well repay investigation. This is the object of

Gesenius's classification, which it will be necessary to examine carefully.

The term "Samaritan Pentateuch," which is also used for the Samaritan translation of the Pentateuch,¹ is a doubly misleading expression. For the future I shall venture generally to call it what it is proved from Scripture to be—the Israelitish Codex of the Five Books, in contradistinction to the Jewish Codex, which we possess in our Hebrew Bible as corrected and punctuated by the Masorites; but as the one has passed through the hands of the Masorites, and the other through that of the Samaritans, the terms Masoretic Codex and Samaritan Codex have also their use.

On the importance of this double transmission of the five Books of Moses from the time of Jeroboam it is hardly necessary to say a word. If we have a Codex which has been in continuous existence from the time of Jeroboam, whether better or worse than that in Jewish synagogues, more or less grammatical, improved or debased, unchanged from that time or altered here and there to suit the circumstances of different ages, matters comparatively little. If that is true—and I venture to say that Kennicott was quite justified in considering the proof complete—there is an end to all notion of one part of the Pentateuch having been written in Josiah's time, and another part near the time of the Exile, or later. Solomon had it before the division of the kingdom, and David had it, and his words about the law of the Lord refer to it; and no one who admits this much will doubt that it is still earlier in its origin, or, in words which ought by themselves to have been sufficient to carry conviction, "that the law was given by Moses."

SAMUEL GARRATT.



ART. IV.—THE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

PART II.

THEN (ii.) as to the language of Reformed theology. Its standing of this side of the separation being known and notorious, we may well bear with sayings which on the other side would certainly mean dangerous error. Accordingly, we need not be startled to find in the Directory of the West-

¹ Petermann's "Pentateuchus Samaritanus" is a reprint of the translation; "De Pentateucho Samaritano," by Kohn, is the monograph already referred to with respect to the Codex.

minster Assembly, as well as in Baxter's service, the minister instructed to deliver the bread with these words, "Take ye, eat ye; this is the body of Christ which is broken for you,"¹ nor to hear the martyr Bradford declare that he would rather the consecrated bread should be called the body of Christ than otherwise,² nor to read the saying of Brooks the Puritan, that he would rather give his life to a murderer than Christ's body to an unworthy receiver.³ And accordingly, although when the religious atmosphere is charged with false doctrine greater carefulness is required, we may err, when our standing on this side has been sufficiently proclaimed, in being over-cautious in avoiding all language which has been used to express the teaching of the other side. For we may be surrendering expressions which belong to our side not less than to the other, and virtually conceding that they can fairly mean only the doctrine for which our opponents would claim them as exclusively their own. In strange ignorance or forgetfulness of the need of this word of caution, how many quotations have been made from the writings of Reformed divines as if in support of errors—errors of the other side—but errors which it is certain these writers never meant to defend, but were ready to banish and drive away as earnest maintainers of the truth on our side!

(b) But now my remaining caution has to do with what may be called, not a matter of language, but a real and not unimportant point of doctrine pertaining to this controversy. Let me bespeak for it a very careful consideration. I will state my caution thus: WE ARE DILIGENTLY TO AVOID BEING MISUNDERSTOOD AND MISREPRESENTED AS MINIMIZERS IN RESPECT OF THE TRUE DOCTRINE AND THE REAL GRACE AND BLESSING OF THE EUCHARISTIC FEAST. In rejecting what used to be known as "the Corporal Presence," we lose nothing of that which is food for our spiritual hunger, for the strengthening and refreshing, not of our bodies, but of our souls. We claim, as Reformed theology has always claimed, that the real giving and taking and receiving of the *Res Sacramenti* belongs to the teaching of our side quite as truly as to that of the other side.

It is true, indeed, that in the earlier stages of the controversy the Swiss school of divines, in their desire to avoid ambiguities and to separate themselves altogether from anything that could sound like the Romish Real Presence, gave less prominence to this teaching, and, emphasizing chiefly the

¹ See "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 435, 436.

² See Bradford's "Sermons," P. S. edit., pp. 94, 95.

³ See Appendix to Memoir in Brooks's "Works," vol. i., pp. 49, 50, Nichol's edition.

significant aspect of the words of institution, gave cause for uneasiness—as tending to reduce the ordinance to bare signs and naked figures. “This,” says Hooker, “was it that some did exceedingly fear, lest Zuinglius and Ecolampadius would bring to pass that men should account of this Sacrament, but only as of a shadow, destitute, empty, and void of Christ.”¹ But, though the tendency may even afterwards have shown signs of revival, the *Consensus Tigurinus* of 1549 (many years after Zwingle’s death), and the influence of wiser theologians brought about a sound agreement as to the true giving, receiving, and eating which pertain to the faith of the Eucharist. “By opening the several opinions which have been held,” says Hooker again, “they are grown, for aught I can see, on all sides at the length, to a general agreement concerning that which alone is material, namely, the real participation of Christ and of life in His body and blood by means of this Sacrament.” Accordingly the later Helvetic Confession (of 1566) is clear and strong in the expression of the doctrine which, in the former Helvetic Confession of 1536, had been, not indeed omitted, but somewhat less strongly and distinctly enunciated, and which in the Confession of Basle of 1532 had hardly received a full recognition. I must not be taking up time by quotations, but it may be truly said that evidence abounds to the fact that the doctrine of the Reformed does fully meet all the requirements of the Scriptural teaching—of the faith once delivered to the Saints—as to the real partaking, the real giving and taking and eating, of the body and blood of Christ, and that verily and indeed, in the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper.² And this being so, it must surely be obvious that a great and serious mistake is made when our opponents seek to represent the chasm of cleavage as surrounding only a doctrine of merely significant and not effectual signs, and then desire to claim as all their own the witness to true giving and receiving which can be brought forward so abundantly from the writings of the Fathers, from the liturgies of antiquity, as well as from the works of our great English divines, and from our English Book of Common Prayer.

But then our contention is that this giving and receiving is only after a heavenly and spiritual manner—that the giver is not the presbyter who ministers to us the sign, but the true Lord of the Feast who gives to our souls the thing signified by the sign. We maintain that the thing signified and really

¹ See “Eccles. Pol.,” book v., chap. lxvii., § 2; “Works,” vol. ii., p. 349, edit. Keble.

² See “Papers on Eucharistic Presence,” pp. 388-410, 725-744.

given is not really *in* the sign. In strictness of speech it is a thing distant not in place only but in time. It is the Lord's body crucified and His blood outpoured for the sin of the world; it is the real beneficial possession of His very death and sacrifice; it is "remission of our sins and all the benefits of His passion" which is here made over to us. And our taking, receiving, and eating is all spiritual. For this is the "verily and indeed" of all our taking and receiving. The mean whereby the body and blood of Christ are received and eaten in the Supper is faith. Faith is the hand, and faith is the mouth of the soul. And the taking and receiving verily and indeed is the privilege of "the faithful." The expression "spiritually by faith," so often in the mouths of our Reforming divines,¹ is the key to the interpretation of all teaching concerning the reality of receiving and taking in the true doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. And it must not be forgotten that faith comes to Christ, to be satisfied with the spiritual food of His most precious body and blood, not only in the Ordinance of the Eucharist, but also (and not less really, as the Fathers testify²) in the learning and inwardly digesting of the Word of truth, the oracles of God, the doctrine of the Gospel, the promises of the New Covenant.

While, however, giving and receiving require (of necessity) no real presence at all—for (to use an illustration very familiar to Anglican divines) estates far away are constantly given and received by signing and sealing deeds of conveyance, and (to use the illustration of St. Bernard, for which he was blamed by Aquinas)³ abbacies were conferred by the delivery of a staff—it is obvious that eating and drinking do require a certain presence of that which is eaten and drunken. We cannot possibly feed upon, nor be nourished by, that which is really, and in every sense of the word, afar off. But here again we have to remember the word "spiritually by faith." As the eating and drinking is all by faith, so the only presence required is presence "to faith," or, as Bishop Jeremy Taylor expresses it, presence "to our spirits only."⁴ And what question can there be that the cross of the Redeemer, the death of the Son of God, the separated body and blood of Christ, are really present to faith? Dr. John Owen, the learned Independent divine, declared: "One of the greatest engines that ever the devil made use of to overthrow the faith of the Church was by forging such a presence of Christ

¹ See "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 722-725; also pp. 86, 93, 109, 128, 129, 147, 149, 151, 153, 194, 195, 201, 202, 215.

² See "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 330 *et seq.*

³ See "Romish Mass and English Church," pp. 49, 50.

⁴ Taylor's "Real Presence," sec. i., § 8.

as is not truly in this ordinance to drive us off from looking after that great presence which is true" ("Works," vol. ix., p. 572, edit. Goold). And Perkins, the celebrated Puritan, wrote: "There must be such a kind of Presence wherein Christ is really and truly present to the heart of him that receives the Sacrament in faith. And thus far we consent with the Romish Church touching Real Presence. We differ not touching the Presence itself, but only in the manner of the Presence" ("Works," vol. i., p. 590, edit. Cambridge, 1616). Faith in its exercise finds no impediment in distance. Or, rather, to faith distance is not absence.¹ When Cœcolampadius wrote "Per

¹ So Bishop Cosin: "Præsentia Corporis Christi in hoc mysterio, non distantia sed absentia opponitur; et quidem ista, non illa, usum et fruitionem objecti intercipit" ("Hist. Transubs.," cap. iv., § 4; "Works, A. C. L.," vol. iv., p. 48).

Let it be noted how, in the following extract, Turretin adopts the very words of Cosin: "Patet rerum Creatarum præsentiam non esse metiendam locorum vel propinquitate vel longinquitate, sed ex relatione illa æstimandam, quæ fit ut is cui res præsens est, eâ commode frui queat; nam presentia, non distantia, sed absentia opponitur; ista non illa usum et fruitionem objecti intercipit" ("Instit. Theol. Elencl.," iii., p. 567, Geneva, 1686).

So Bishop Reynolds says: "By the Sacrament we have the presence of things farthest distant and absent from us" ("Works," vol. iii., p. 68, edit. 1826).

And again: "A Real Presence of Christ we acknowledge, but not local or physical; for Presence Real (that being a metaphysical term) is not opposed unto a mere physical or local absence or distance, but is opposed to a false, imaginary, fantastic presence" ("Meditations on H. Sac.," "Works," vol. iii., p. 72, edit. 1826).

So Peter Martyr had taught in his "Confessio de Cœna Domini" appended to some editions of his "Locis Communes": "A multis non existimatur Corpus Christi vere posse communicari, nisi realiter et corporaliter . . . præsens fuerit. . . . Ti meo iudicio vim fidei non satis perceptam habent. Non auimadvertunt per eam præsentia nobis fieri quæ alioqui longissime distant" (quoted from Hebert's "Lord's Supper," vol. ii., p. 366).

"Locali intervallo non obstante ipse Christus intime et realiter præsens est dignis communicantibus; præsentia tamen non corporali, sed spirituali" (J. Forbes, of Corse, "Works," vol. ii., p. 502, b. Amst., 1702). See also Sadeel's "Works," pp. 236 *et seq.*, 378, 382, Off. Sanct., 1593.

Maresius, in his Commentary on the Belgic Confession, says: "Quidni Christus quamvis absens loco et corpore, præsens nobis fieret spiritu et fide, quando quidem hæc est fidei veræ indoles, haud absimilis tubis opticis, per quos remotissima objecta accedere et præsentia se nobis facere videntur, ut menti præsentia reddat quæ alias vel loco vel tempore absentia ac dissita sunt?" ("Exegesis," p. 531, Gronin., 1652).

"The believing apprehension and the assurance of faith make in some sense present to the believing mind the past transactions of our soul's redemption" (Wahrh. Bek. der D. de K. in Zurich, 1545. See Winer's "Confessions of Christendom," p. 272, Clark).

The teaching of Pareus on this point is specially worthy of attention. He allows the force of the argument, "Quod nullo modo præsens

fidem absentissimum Corpus Christi, animo præsentissimum est,"¹ he was attributing to faith nothing more than had been given to it not only by St. Augustin, but still more clearly by Pope Leo the Great, and after him scarcely less distinctly by Rupert of Duyts, who says that to faith "præsentia sunt omnia præterita." And we are not to suppose that this teach-

est in Eucharistia, nullo modo potest manducari. Præterea: panis dicitur *κοινωνία* Corporis Christi. At simpliciter absentis nulla datur *κοινωνία*." He concludes: "Dicendum igitur primo, quod . . . non omnis præsentia corporis et sanguinis Christi sit nobis neganda. . . . Nec rationes negantes in contrarium sunt validæ. Tantum enim valent contra præsentiam realem corporis in pane, vel in loco panis. . . . Sacramentalem vero et spiritualem præsentiam nihil lædunt, quia utraque ex verbis Domini, et Pauli, et Patrum haberi potest. . . . *Sensus animi* sunt vel naturales; ut meus, ratio cogitatio, voluntas, memoria: vel supernaturales; ut fides, spes. Secundum hos sane Corpus Christi, fidelibus dicitur præsentissimum. . . . *Hominem pie fidelem non est dubitandum cum Christo esse per fidem*, inquit Augustinus. *Κοινωνία* spiritualis fidelium cum Christi corpore et sanguine in sacra cœna non est neganda, sed firmiter credenda. At *κοινωνία* talis est vera præsentia spiritualis corporis et sanguinis Christi in cœna. Hæc præsentia igitur spiritualis recte asseritur et creditur. . . . A phrasi spiritualis præsentia nulli orthodoxi theologi nostri seculi abhorruerunt, sed . . . omnes confessi sunt. . . . Christum vere adesse, et præsentem esse in sua cœna fidelibus: adeo ut absque corpore et sanguine Christi nulla cœna Domini esse possit" (Comment. in 1 Cor. xi., "Op. Theol. Exeg.," par. iv., p. 140, Frankfort, 1647).

¹ See "D. D. Cœcolampadii et Zwinglii Epistolæ," fol. 129. Basil, 1536.

² "Respondent, Quomodo tenebo absentem? Quomodo in cœlum manum mittam, ut ibi sedentem teneam? Fidem mitte et tenuisti. . . . Tu tene Corde" (Augustin, in "Johan. Ev.," cap. xi., tract 1., § 4, Op., tom. iii., par. ii., c. 630, Paris, 1680).

"Secundum præsentiam majestatis semper habemus Christum: secundum præsentiam Carnis, recte dictum est discipulis, *Me autem non semper habebitis*. Habuit enim illum Ecclesia secundum præsentiam Carnis paucis diebus: modo fide tenet, oculis non videt" (*ibid.*, § 13, c. 634).

"Habet Christum . . . in præsentem per fidem, in præsentem per signum, in præsentem per baptismatis sacramentum, in præsentem per altaris cibum et potum" (*ibid.*, § 12, c. 633).

"Cœnam manibus suis consecratam discipulis dedit: sed nos in illo convivio non discubimus; et tamen ipsam cœnam fide quotidie manducamus. . . . Noli parare fauces, sed cor. Inde commendata est ista cœna, Ecce credimus in Christum, cum fide accipimus. . . . Modicum accipimus, et in corde saginamur. Non enim quod videtur, sed quod creditur, pascit" (*ibid.*, sermo cxii., § 4, 5, Op., tom. v., par. i., cc. 565, 566).

"Habet enim hanc potentiam fides vera, ut ab iis mente non desit, quibus corporalis præsentia interesse non potuit, et sive in præteritum redeat, sive in futurum se cor credentis extendat, nullas sentiat moras temporis cognitio veritatis" (D. Leonis Papæ, Sermo xix. in "Heptas Præsulum," p. 67, Paris, 1661).

"Totus adest, totus sancto incunbit altari, non ut iterum patiat, sed ut fidei, cui præsentia sunt omnia præterita, Ejus passio memoriter

ing of Presence to the soul by faith had been altogether lost in the ages of darkness. Even Innocent III., who himself set the crown of Papal authority (it was the work of the Pope rather than of the Council¹) on the new-born doctrine of Transubstantiation, would not allow the *Res Sacramenti* to go further than the mouth of the communicant. "Christus de ore," he taught, "transit ad cor."² It is true that his teach-

representetur" (Rupertus Tuitiensis, *De Trin.*, lib. xlii. ; in *Gen.*, lib. vi. cap. xxvii., *Op.*, tom. i., c. 431, edit. Migne).

So the teaching of Cyril of Jerusalem has been interpreted as making the presence and the sacrifice "due to the action of the Holy Ghost . . . making the past contemporary with the present in its application" (Ffoulkes, "Primitive Consecration," p. 75).

¹ See the assertion of the editor of his works (Colon., 1575), in tom. i., p. 460. The statement is disputed by Bellarmine, but is confirmed by the wording of chap. xxix. and chap. xxxiii. Du Pin declares: "Matthew Paris says that those canons seemed tolerable to some of the prelates, but grievous to others. . . . Let the case be how it will, 'tis certain that these canons were not made by the council, but by Innocent III., who presented them to the council ready drawn up, and ordered them to be read, and that the prelates did not enter into any debate upon them, but that their silence was taken for approbation" (vol. xi., p. 95, London, 1699). See also "Translator to Reader," p. 2 ; and Cosin's Works, "A. C. L.," vol. iv., pp. 222, 473, 477, 482. The subject is discussed in Greenwood's "Cathedra Petri," book xliii., c. ix., pp. 637-639. See also "Romish Mass and English Church," pp. 71, 72.

² These words of Innocent should be read in connection with their context :

"Si vero præsentia quæritur corporalis, in cælo quærat, ubi Christus est in dextrâ Die sedens. Ad tempus tamen præsentiam exhibuit corporalem, ut ad spirituales præsentiam invitaret. Cum sacramentum tenetur, comeditur et gustatur, Christus corporaliter adest in visu, in tactu, et in sapore. Quamdiu corporalis sensus officitur, corporalis præsentia non aufertur. Postquam autem in percipiendo sensus deficit corporalis, deinceps non est quærenda corporalis præsentia sed spiritualis est retinenda. Dispensatione completa, *Christus de ore transit ad cor. Melius est enim ut procedat in mentem, quam ut descendat in ventrem. Cibis est non carnis sed animæ. Venit ut comedatur, non ut consumatur: ut gustetur, non ut incorporetur. Ore comeditur, sed stomacho non digeritur. Reficit animum, sed non effluit in recessum*" ("Myst. Miss.," lib. iv., cap. xv., *Op.*, tom. i., p. 383, Colon., 1575).

It should be observed that while the whole of this quotation will be found (with certain varieties of expression) in Hugo de Santo Victore, lib. ii., par. viii., cap. xiii. (*Op.*, tom. iii., fol. 290, Ven., 1588), the part printed in italics is found almost verbatim in the "Expositio Canonis Missæ Secundum Petrum Damiani," as printed in Mai's "Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio," tom. vi., par. ii., p. 215. If this treatise is indeed the work of the writer whose name it bears, which Mai seems not to doubt (see "Pref.," p. xxxiii., and par. ii., note, p. 211), it is interesting to observe that we have here the earliest known instance of the use of the word "transubstantiatio" (see § 7, p. 215). [The claim of Stephanus Eduensis must give way if we accept the correction of Bellarmine's error as to his date (see "Bibliotheca Maxima," tom. xx., p. 1872 and p. 1879)]. And then the fact that Innocent made use of this treatise (see also cap. xvi. compared with "Damiani," § 6) will make it

ing herein was afterwards contradicted and virtually condemned by Pope Gregory XI. (towards the close of the following century), who insisted on the glorified body of Christ

probable that he derived from Damiani the term which he inserted in the Lateran Decree, though it may probably have become, to some extent, a recognised form of expression before this.

It is still more important to note that Damiani, when writing this work, appears to have had before him the writing of Florus Magister (see Mai's note, p. 219), and that Florus had strongly insisted on the truth (to which the earlier fathers had abundantly borne witness) that the *Res Sacramenti* is food *only for the soul* (see "Eucharistic Worship," app., note ii., p. 329). See his letter concerning the Council of Chiersy (A.D. 837) in "Mansi," tom. xiv. c. 743, 744, especially c. 744, where, following the teaching of St. Augustin, he says: "Qui manducat intus, non foris; qui manducat in corde, non qui premit dente. Credere enim in Eun, hoc est manducare panem vivum, qui credit manducat. . . . Manet ergo in mente fidelium incorrupta venerabilis mysterii virtus, et efficacissima potentia."

But the words of Damiani, as adopted by Innocent, will be found to be almost an echo of the following words of Florus: "Mentis ergo est cibus ille, non ventris; non corrumpitur, sed permanet in vitam æternam, quoniam pie sumentibus confert vitam æternam" ("Adv. Amalarium," cap. i., § 9, Op., edit. Migne, c. 73). Compare the following from the same Council of Chiersy: "Panis et vinum efficitur spiritualiter corpus Christi, etc. Mentis ergo est cibus iste, non ventris; nec corrumpitur, sed permanet in vitam æternam" (Synod Caris., "MS. apud N. Ranchinum, in senatu Tolesano regium Consiliarium," as quoted by Archbishop Ussher, "Works," vol. iii., p. 82).

Compare the following:

"Cibus ille cordis et animæ est" (Rufinus, Com. in Ps. xxi. (xxii.), 26, Op., tom. ii., fol. 48, Lugd., 1570).

"Meus cibus est qui non corpus impinguat, sed confirmat cor hominis" (Ambrose, in Ps. cxviii. (cxix), serm. xviii., § 26, Op., tom. i., p. 1202, edit. Bened., Paris, 1690).

"Non corporalis esca, sed spiritualis est. . . . Cor nostrum esca ista confirmat, et potus iste lætificat cor hominis" (Ambrose, "De Mysteriis," cap. ix., § 58, Op., tom. ii., p. 341, edit. Bened., Paris, 1690).

"Qui manducat intus, non foris, qui manducat in corde" (Augustine, tract xxvi. in "Evang. Joh.," c. vi.).

"Corporali ore corporaliter manducamus et bibimus, quotiens de altari Dominico Dominicum corpus per manum sacerdotis accipimus: spirituali vero ore cordis spiritualiter comeditur et hauritur, quando suaviter et utiliter, ut dicit beatus Augustinus, in memoriâ reconditur quod unigenitus Dei Filius pro salute mundi carnem accepit, in cruce pendit, resurrexit," etc. (Lanfranc, "L. de Corp. et Sang. Dom.," cap. xvii., Op., p. 179, Venice, 1745).

"Spiritualis refectio spiritualis omnino. . . . Veritatis insinuatio ut credatur quod sit tantum cibus animæ—communio spiritualis non corporalis" (Alexander de Hales, "Comment. in Sent.," par. ii., "De Off. Missæ," art. iii., § 1; quoted from Hebert's "Lord's Supper," vol. ii., p. 149).

"Ut significaretur quod iste cibus non est corporis sed animæ" (Albertus Magnus, Op., vol. xxi., dist. i. L. V., tract iii., c. xxiii., p. 134, Lugduni, 1602; quoted from Hebert's "Lord's Supper," vol. ii., p. 158).

"Corpus Christi non convertitur in corpus hominis, sed reficit

being conveyed as far as the stomach, requiring it (under pain of excommunication for the recalcitrant) to be followed by the faith of believers even into the belly of a mouse—"adeo ut" (to use the language of Bishop Cosin) "dubitare illis non liceat, quin res sit de fide, quæ a fide maxime abhorret" ("Works," A.C.L., vol. iv., p. 97).¹ But the concurrent *dictum* (which had been handed down from earlier ages), "Cibus est non carnis sed animæ," still held its own, and strongly influenced a current of teaching which flowed on and kept its course through the stream of pre-Tridentine doctrine.² I do not

mentem ejus" (T. Aquinas, "Sum.," par. iii., vol. ii.; Quæst., lxxvii., art. vi.).

Durandus teaches that the "Res sacramenti" passes immediately from the closed mouth to heaven.

"Sumptum a sacerdote et quolibet alio, ore clauso in cœlum rapitur" (Durandus, "Rationale," lib. iv., cap. xli., § 23, p. 258, Naples, 1859). But further on (§ 41, p. 262) Durandus adopts the language of Damiani and Innocent III.

The following is the judgment of Gerson: "Utrum in ventrem vadat? Dicitur secundum quosdam quod dum est in ore, adhuc præsens est sub illis speciebus, sed statim cum glutitur Corpus Christi, transit in mentem, et species illæ panis et vini in ventrem. Alii quibus magis credendum est, dicunt quod intrat in ventrem, et ibi tamdiu remanet, quamdiu species illæ sunt incorruptæ, et cum species desinent esse panis et vini, desinit etiam esse Caro et Sanguis Christi. . . . Nec obstat verbum Augustini quod videtur movere eos qui sunt in priore opinione, scilicet *quod quamdiu est in ore, tamdiu est in mente*" ("Compendium Theologiæ," tract iii.; "De Sac. Euch.," Op., tom. i., c. 275, Antwerp, 1706).

¹ In this the Pope was following the teaching of Aquinas and others among the scholastics, who regarded the matter as a crucial test of the true faith in the integrity of the Sacrament. Brentius and others of the stricter Lutherans favoured the same opinion. And we are assured that "the Lutherans in Ansbach disputed about the question whether the body of Christ were actually swallowed, like other food, and digested in the stomach." It is hard to believe the extent to which this superstition was carried in some parts of Lutheran Germany. The following may serve as an example: "When the Rev. John Musculus, in Frankfurt-on-the-Oder, inadvertently spilled a little wine at the Communion, he was summoned before a synod, and Elector John Joachim, of Brandenburg, declared that deposition, prison, and exile were too mild a punishment for such a crime, and that the offender, who had not spared the blood of Christ, must suffer bloody punishment, and have two or three fingers cut off" (Schaff, "Creeds of Ch.," pp. 284-5).

² See, e.g., the "Portalitium Fidei," lib. iii., Cõsid. vi., Imposs. xxiii., fol. lxxiv., Nuremberg, 1485, where the writer, quoting from Hugo de Santo Victore, says: "Corporalis præsentia querenda non est, sed spiritualis retinenda. Dispensatio completa est. Sacramentum intus manet. Christus de ore ad cor transit. Melius est tibi ut eat in mentem tuam quam in ventrem tuum. Cibus iste animæ non corporis est" (see Hugo de S. Vict., "De Sacramentis Fidei," lib. ii., par. viii., cap. xiii.; further evidence may be seen in "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 331-333).

See also Bonaventura, "In Sent.," lib. iv., dist. xii., par. i., dub. iii.;

mean that this current of doctrine was identical with the faith of the "Reformed." We may probably think that in consistency it should have been so. But there were few who were ready, like Wycliff in his old age, to follow their own teaching up to the point to which consistency might have led them. The voice of the Pope had been heard. The Pope had said "Yea." Who, then, should venture to say "Nay"?

Anyhow, our Reformers and subsequent divines were continually appealing to a catena of mediæval and later doctors who taught that, but for the authority which had defined the doctrine of Transubstantiation, the meaning of the words of the Institution, and therefore all that belonged to the faith of the Eucharistic Presence, could very well have been held without it. One of these, Fisher (Bishop of Rochester), declared there was not a word in the Institution by which the true Presence in the Mass could be established. And it is well known that Cardinal Cajetan, though an upholder of Transubstantiation, used words on this subject which, by order of Pope Pius V., were expunged from the Roman edition of his works.¹ Indeed, Bellarmine himself professes that the Real Presence in the elements is needless (though not useless) for purposes of Communion.² The Presence is necessary, in his view, for the purpose of the sacrifice, but for Communion (for Sacramental purposes) effectual signs ("*signa visibilia continentia virtualiter gratiam sanctificationis*") would avail—herein running, it would seem, in the very teeth of Pope Innocent III., whose famous decree which established the doctrine of Transubstantiation proclaimed it as for the purpose of Communion, "*ut ad proficiendum mysterium unitatis accipiamus ipsi de suo, quod accepit ipse de nostro*" (Op., tom. i., p. 461, Colon., 1575).³

also dist. xii., art. ii., quæst. i., concl. § 4 ("*tantum cibus mentis, non ventris*"). But this opinion could not make headway against the force of growing superstitions. "Dominicus Soto in 4 dist. 12 q. 1, art. iii. ait Hugonem Victorinum et Innocentium III. *stupenda de hæc re dixisse, et si quis eadem nunc diceret, ab ecclesia fore condemnandum*; sic nimirum error, instar fluvii, vires acquirit eundo." (Allix, Præf. historica in "Determ. Joannis Parisiensis," London, 1686.)

¹ See Edgar's "Variations of Popery," p. 362.

² See Bellarmine, "De Missa," lib. i., cap. xxii., c. 1021; and "De Sac. Euch.," lib. iii., cap. ix., fol. 705-708. See also "Romish Mass and English Church," p. 89.

³ It will be found also that Innocent III. was far from regarding the Real Presence of Christ's person, body, soul, and divinity, as a necessary consequence of transubstantiation. Thus he wrote: "*Porro quum panis transubstantietur in corpus, et utique rationali spiritu animatum, videtur quod panis transubstantietur in hominem: pari ratione in Christum transubstantiatur, et ita in Creatorem. Sic ergo creatura quotidie fit Creator. . . . Ego tamen sicut in aliis, ita pariter in hoc, divina*

Full well were Reformed divines, English and foreign, justified in contending that this presence to the faith of the soul is all that belongs to the essence of the Real Presence, and that all questions of its relation to the elements could therefore only be questions, not of faith but for the schools, not of the Presence but of the mode.¹ But mark the consequence. Writers, ignorant apparently of Reformation theology, have assumed that by "Real Presence" our divines could only mean Real Presence under the form of the elements, and that by the "mode" they meant only the manner of its existence there on the altar. Nor has this been all. The words of our Catechism, because they assume a Real Presence to the faith of the faithful receiver, have been appealed to in support of the doctrine of a Real Presence in the elements considered in themselves—a doctrine which by a curious mistake has been attributed to Bishop Overall, but which (as far as I know) no esteemed divine of the Church of England ever taught.² And what a record of misunderstanding and misrepresentations has followed this ignorance of the true teaching of Reformed theology!

To mention but a few examples. Ridley, I believe, has now

sacramenta magis veneranda, quam discutienda profiteor. Scriptum est enim: Non comedetis ex eo crudum quid, nec coctum aqua, sed assum igni. Etsi secundum vim inferentiæ non sequatur: Quod si panis transubstantiatur in corpus humanum, ideo panis transubstantiatur in hominem, quia non homo, sed hominis pars est corpus" ("Myst. Miss.," lib. iv., cap. xix., Op., tom. i., pp. 384, 385, Colon., 1575).

Yet it would be a mistake to infer that all idea of Christ's Personal Presence, or of concomitance, was either absent from his mind or rejected by his judgment. In chap. xvii. he had said: "Alii vero dicunt, et bene, quod licet ad prolationem præcedentium panis a natura mutetur in corpus, et ad prolationem sequentium vinum præterea mutetur in sanguinem, nunquam tamen est corpus sine sanguine, vel sanguis est sine corpore, sicut neutrum est sine anima, sed sub forma panis sanguis existat in corpore per mutationem panis in corpus, et converso. Non quod panis in sanguinem, vel vinum mutetur in corpus, sed quia neutrum potest existere sine reliquo. Est ergo sanguis sub speciebus panis, non ex vi sacramenti, sed ex naturali concomitantia" (pp. 383, 384).

It would appear that what subsequently took distinct shape, and became hardened into (at last) an article of faith, was in Innocent's time a floating opinion, which was commending itself as a probable outcome of the newly-developed doctrine.

Hagenbach must have overlooked this passage when he wrote that Aquinas was the first to make use of the term *concomitantia* (see his "Hist. of Doctrines," vol. ii., p. 106, Clark).

The opinion of concomitance has been attributed to Robert Pulleyn (see Hebert's "Lord Supper," vol. ii., p. 146). But in truth the *doctrine* will be found stated by Anselm, Epist., Lib. iv., Ep. cvii., Op., p. 453. Paris, 1721.

¹ See "Theology of Bishop Andrewes," pp. 12-17.

² See "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 295-305.

been given up, but Ridley used to be claimed as the teacher of a teaching which he was burnt for denying. Archbishop Parker was sometimes confidently claimed as the patron of a doctrine, for the more distinct exclusion of which he secured the insertion of our Twenty-ninth Article of religion. How many times has Bishop Andrewes been quoted in support of a doctrine of the Real Presence which quite certainly was none of his!¹ Bishop Cosin has been cited as teaching a mode of the Real Presence which, in terms most distinct, he clearly rejected. Bishop Morton has been appealed to in support of a doctrine of Real Presence which he was strongly opposing and effectually laying low. Bishop Jeremy Taylor has been quoted largely as teaching that which his doctrine of the Real Presence certainly condemned.

The "Real Presence" of Laud and Bramhall and other divines of that school (so, at least, I am fully persuaded) was not the "Real Presence" of the teaching which belongs to the other side of the doctrinal chasm.² The Real Presence of Church of England divines is presence only to faith.³ But then, it is surely a misrepresentation to stigmatize this Presence as having no truth or reality in any region outside, beyond, or

¹ See "The Theology of Bishop Andrewes" (Elliot Stock), reprinted from THE CHURCHMAN of July and August, 1889.

² In the "Real Presence of the Laudian Theology" (Macintosh) some crucial tests are applied to the teaching of these divines.

³ It will be found, however, I believe, that the term "Real Presence" followed after the doctrine of the Council of Constance, which made a material addition to the decree of the fourth Lateran Council.

Thus it has been truly said, that "The term 'Real Presence' was begotten of false doctrine, and is expressive of it" (Vogan, "True Doctrine," p. 165; see also p. 91).

Ridley objected to the "diversity and newness of the phrase" (Works, p. 195).

And if it be true that "new and unauthorized words imply new and unauthorized conceptions," the Romish conception of "Real Presence" must stand condemned with that of "transubstantiation" (see Vogan's "True Doctrine," p. 91).

It is a phrase which has not received the sanction of any of the authorized formularies of the Church of England.

Nevertheless, its common use by English and other reformed divines in a sense altogether divested of new and unauthorized conceptions may be regarded as illustrating the principles of reformed theology, which desired to make manifest that in throwing down the false teachings which had been built on a basis of truth, it was parting with nothing that belonged to the underlying foundation of scriptural teaching.

The materialistic notion of the Real Presence was rejected because, though Romanists would allow no Real Presence without it, some of them confessed that the aim and purpose of the Real Presence were independent of it; and the reformed saw clearly that the essence of the presence was *only* that which pertains to our feeding on Christ in our hearts by faith with thanksgiving—*i.e.*, presence to the soul, presence only to faith.

above the subjective. Indeed this Presence, though separated so widely from what is now called "the Real Objective Presence," may nevertheless be truly said to be an objective Presence. For what can a merely subjective Presence be? Faith is not imagination. And faith has no creative power. Faith believes only what is true—objectively true. Faith can only realize that which is objectively real. And faith can receive only what is given—truly and objectively given.¹ And the *Res Sacramenti* is equally offered with the sign to those who by unbelief reject and refuse—to their condemnation eating and drinking the sign or sacrament of so great a thing—and to those who by faith verily and indeed take and receive the Heavenly Gift to the strengthening and refreshing of their souls. This is nothing more than the theology of the "reformed" has consistently and strongly insisted on:²

Time will not allow me now to follow up this subject into the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice. Our modern teachers, like the Romish Doctors, make the Sacrifice of the Altar to rest for its basis on the Real Presence in the elements. As a consequence, the *ἀνάμνησις* in their teaching directs faith's view to the sacrificing or memorializing act of the priest in the

¹ "Dicimus hoc spiritualiter fieri, non ut efficaciam et veritatis loco imaginationem aut cogitationem supponamus" ("Conf. Gall.," art. 36).

Bishop Cosin says: "De reali (id est, verâ et non imaginariâ) præsentia Corporis et Sanguinis Christi in Eucharistia, Protestantium Ecclesiæ nullæ dubitant" ("Hist. Trans.," cap. ii., § 1, Works, A.C.L., vol. iv., p. 18).

Again: "Fides non facit res præsentem, quæ promittuntur; (fides enim, ut constat, magis proprie dicitur accipere et apprehendere, quam vel polliceri, vel præstare:) Sed Verbum Dei et promissio cui fides innititur (non vero fides hominum) præsentia reddit: quæ promittit: quemadmodum inter reformatos et pontificios aliquot consensus est in Collatione Sangermani habita. Male enim a multis Romanensibus nobis objicitur, quasi crederemus hanc Christi præsentiam et communicationem in sacramento, per nudam fidem tantum effici" ("Hist. Trans.," cap. ii., § viii., Works, A.C.L., vol. iv., pp. 30, 31; see Bishop Thirlwall, "Charge," 1869, p. 56; and "Real Presence of Laudian Theology," pp. 45, 46).

It should be well observed how strongly this is insisted on by our reformers. Witness the following: "I never denied nor taught, but that to faith whole Christ's body and blood was as present as bread and wine to the due receiver. . . . I believe Christ is present there to the faith of the due receiver. . . . The receiving maketh not the presence, as your lordship would affirm; but God's grace, truth, and power is the cause of the presence, the which the wicked that lacketh faith cannot receive" (Writings of Bradford, "Sermons," etc., P.S. edit., pp. 488, 489; see also "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 485-488).

² See "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 689-698; also pp. 268 *et seq.* See also "Real Presence of Laudian Theology," pp. 45, 46. See also Hall's "Harmony," p. 327 (note); Turretin, "Inst. Theol. Elencl.," iii., p. 380, edit. 1686; "Ursinus," Op., tom. ii., p. 1164, Heid., 1612; and Sadeel, Op., p. 290, Off. Sanct., 1593.

chancel, and only as behind that (though doubtless as the source of its efficacy) to the commemorated act of Christ upon the cross.

But consistently with our view of the Real Presence only in the heart and not in the hand, only in the heart and not on an altar, our Communion Service takes our faith back to the one oblation once offered, which then and there made a full and perfect satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. And with this sacrifice in the full view of our faith, with this as the object of our remembrance, we want no more. Nay, we can see that there is room for nothing more. Where remission of sins is, there is no more offering for sin. Christ's flesh is meat indeed, and His blood is drink indeed. It is meat and drink indeed, because it satisfies the true hunger and the true thirst of the soul. And it is this true hunger and thirst, awakened within us by the Holy Spirit of God, which, bringing us to the feast of the one perfect sacrifice, and there really but spiritually (I would rather say "really, because spiritually only") feeding by faith on the crucified body and the outpoured blood of Atonement, learns to render the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for the spiritual food and sustenance vouchsafed to us in this Holy Sacrament.

Oh! what a true *sursum corda* springs out from the true view of this holy ordinance seen in its subservient but consecrated relation to the living Word of the living God, to the truth and power of the Gospel of Christ! Here is rest from the strife of tongues, and the soul's hiding-place is stillness from the danger and din of controversy. Oh! the comfort and support which comes of the sure and certain evidence which this Sacrament affords to the hard facts which lie at the very centre of our Christian faith—to the life, and death, and resurrection of our Blessed Lord! What a witness is here to the present justification, the perfect redemption, the full salvation, freely given to sinners justly condemned to the outcasting of death! What a testimony to the blessed truth of the everlasting Gospel, when, in faith's true view of these holy mysteries, the Holy Spirit of truth takes of the things of Christ and shows them unto us! And, oh! the blessed assurance which comes of the true faith of the mercy and love which has made such provision for each hungering and thirsting soul to open its mouth wide and be filled with the meat which endureth unto everlasting life, and then to depart in peace, saying to itself, "Now all is mine. Christ is mine. Now Christ liveth in me. And the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me."

N. DIMOCK.

2 R 2

ART. V.—ORACLES IN THE OLDEN TIME.

IN the early days of Greek civilization, it was a universally received belief that the gods of heaven held conversation with certain individuals, who were endowed with extraordinary powers, and to whom the gods communicated their will and knowledge of the future. The means of this communication was by oracles, but they were very often obscure and ambiguous, for Horace tells us truly that

Prudens futuri temporis exitum
Caliginosa nocte premit deus,
Ridetque si mortalis ultra
Fas trepidat.

Od. III., xxix. 29.

On all important occasions, both in public and private life, it was considered necessary to consult the gods. By this act men showed that they wished to pay due obedience to the commands of heaven; and when favoured with an answer, they acted with greater spirit and energy, conscious that their undertaking met the pleasure and received the sanction of the gods: but it shows also that men wished to know the issue before the commencement of their undertaking.

The manner of delivering oracles was hardly alike in any two places. In some (*χρησμοὶ ἀυτοφῶνοί*) the gods were supposed to answer *vivā voce*, by lots or by dreams; in others (*χρησμοὶ ὑποφητικῶν*) the answers were revealed by means of interpreters, as at Delphi.

The principal god was Zeus, who was the cause and origin of all kinds of divination—hence his name *πανομφαίος*—and out of the rolls of fate he revealed to inferior gods only what he thought proper. Next below Zeus was Apollo, who, acting only in subordination to his father, was the seer of the most high Zeus and the mediator between him and man. From Apollo sprang the observation of lightning, of birds, the prophecy from victims slain at the altar, and the interpretation of the will of Zeus by the use of the lot.

On the principle of *Ex uno disce omnes*, we shall treat the one at Delphi as the representative of all, because it was the most celebrated, and claimed the first place on account of its antiquity, the magnificence of its buildings and structure, the veracity and trustworthiness of its answers, the quantity and quality of its treasures, and the numbers who repaired thither for counsel and advice.

The city of Delphi was supposed to be situate in the middle of the earth. Zeus, wishing to know where the centre of the earth lay, sent forth two eagles, one from either of its extremities. The two eagles pursued their flight in entirely opposite directions, one flying due east, the other due west.

They met at Delphi, which Zeus concluded to be the central spot.

Parnassus geminos fertur junxisse volatus :
Contulit alternas Pythius axis aves.

Claudii, Prol. in Theodor. Cons. 11.

Delphi was often called the *ὀμφαλός* (navel, or centre) of Greece, as well as of the whole earth, either as a development of the former idea, not unnatural to a Greek, or from the fact of there being in the centre of the temple itself a white hemispherical stone, with a ribbon hanging from it, which was adorned with two eagles, supposed to be the representatives of Zeus. (Cf. *οὐδ' εἰ θέλουσ', οἱ Ζητὸς ἀετοί*. Sophocles, "Antigone," 1040.)

Let us now see how the early Greeks supposed the oracle to have been discovered. On the rocks of Mount Parnassus some goats were straying, and when they approached a certain fissure in the earth that gave forth an intoxicating smoke, they were suddenly seized with unusual and convulsive motions. The shepherds and inhabitants of the neighbourhood came, but only to experience the same sensations on approaching this *χάσμα*, or rent in the earth, and in their delirium they uttered broken and unconnected phrases, which were taken for predictions or prophecies. Over the mouth of this fissure was placed a tripod, upon which sat a virgin, who was called Pythia, Pythonisia, or Melissa, and who delivered the answer of the god. The fumes rising from beneath the tripod so affected her brain that she sank into a state of delirious intoxication, and her utterances were considered as the revelation of Apollo. Some say the tripod was a large cauldron into which the Pythia flung herself when she expected to be inspired. The same tripod seems not to have been used continually, for we hear of three; the first was placed there by the surrounding inhabitants; the second was wrought of bronze by Hepceustus, and was an offering of Pelops on his marriage with Hippodamia; the third was of gold, and was dedicated to Apollo by some fishermen of Miletus.

The god himself chooses the medium of his revelation, and, to show that the divine will is not revealed by any human wisdom or art, Apollo employs the tongues of feeble girls and women. No extraordinary powers come in this state of inspiration, but the human being's own powers are nullified even to unconsciousness, to render the voice of the god more awful and audible. The seer herself is not capable of revelation; she understands her utterances about as much as her hearers do; so men require an interpretation, if they wish to avail themselves of her response.

Previous to the Pythia ascending the tripod, she fasted for a

certain time, washed her hair and bathed her body in the Castalian spring, and sometimes drank of its waters. As soon as she sat down upon the tripod she shook the sacred laurel tree, wreathed herself and the tripod with its leaves, and made her responses to those who, having bound their brows with laurel, entered the temple in silence. The altar, which was also crowned with laurel, stood before them at the entrance, and upon it all who were desirous of consulting Apollo must lay their tribute. "Here the priests took of their offering and burnt it upon the slab. If the day were one of consultation lots were then drawn for the precedence, and he whom Fortune favoured moved on, past the Omphalos where Apollo had reposed in early days, past the tomb of Neoptolemus, past the image of Pallas, to the steps of the shrine itself. At the foot he left his train of servants and mounted all alone, wondering at the marvels round—the open colonnades, the wondrous sculptures filling the noble tympana, each commemorating the life and labours of a god. His soul burned within him as he saw the battle of the dragon and the son of Zeus; he shuddered at the Gorgon shield of Minerva, the giants flung from heaven, the slaughtered hydra. And now the jubilant trumpets of the priests pealed out with notes that rang round the valley and up among the windings of the Hyampeian cliff. Awed into silence by the sound, he crossed the garlanded threshold: he sprinkled on his head the holy water from the fountains of gold, and entered the outer court. New statues, fresh fountains, craters and goblets, the gift of many an Eastern king, met his eye: walls emblazoned with dark sayings rose about him as he crossed towards the inner adytum. Then the music grew more loud; the interest deepened: his heart beat faster. With a sound as of many thunders, that penetrated to the crowd without, the subterranean door rolled back; the earth trembled, the laurels nodded, smoke and vapour broke commingled forth; and, railed below within a hollow of the rock, perchance he caught one glimpse of the marble effigies of Zeus and the dread sisters, one gleam of sacred arms; for one moment saw a steaming chasm, a shaking tripod—above all, a figure with fever on her cheek and foam upon her lips, who, fixing a wild eye upon space, tossed her arms aloft in the agony of her soul, and, with a shriek that never left his ear for days, chanted high and quick the dark utterances of the will of heaven."¹

But Apollo did not sell his advice and knowledge of the future to every impatient inquirer. The "pure and holy" god demanded and would have a pure and holy heart in every-

¹ Arnold Prize Essay, 1859.

one before he should be permitted to receive his counsel and advice. The ceremony of sprinkling the person with water from Castalia's spring was meant for a sign of inward purification. But the Pythia bade them not to deceive themselves; for the "pure and holy" one drop of the sacred spring is sufficient, but upon the wicked no quantity of water will wash away the taint of sin. Neither shall any man tempt the god in vain, for none but the "pure and holy" man is blessed by the god, whose replies the ungodly and sinful man cannot comprehend, for guile is in his soul, and his misconception of the oracle's meaning hastens him faster and faster to his ruin and downfall. In this particular respect of giving advice to private individuals Apollo was very serviceable, inasmuch as after a long and anxious time of doubt many were driven to a fixed resolve, which they cheerfully executed, trusting to the divine sanction.

Besides this great utility of giving advice, we must mention that the Delphic Apollo looked all over the world from its central position, and kept up a connection between itself and the older cities on the one hand, and the lately-founded settlements on the other. This world-wide influence of the oracle gave it a position of authority that was ever increasing. Now the feeling of a Hellenic communion was the mainspring of Delphi's independence and importance; and when this communion was dissolved, then Delphi's importance waned. On this account, if on no other, the Delphic priesthood did its utmost to keep up the idea of unity; and as it was connected with the Amphictyony, the oracle was expected to avert disputes between the tribes.

Hence we find an ancient law enacting that neither Hellene nor Hellenic state should consult the oracle when engaged in hostilities. If we accept the opinion of Curtius, we must believe that the agency of the oracle was not confined to preserving the communion between the existing sanctuaries, for there prevailed in the religion of Apollo an increasing desire to widen its circle. Accordingly, the fact that few colonies were sent out without the approval of the god is not to be accounted for merely by the reflection that the Hellenes never began an undertaking of importance without the sanction of the gods. But the whole matter of colonization was under Apollo's own peculiar guidance to such an extent that to found a colony beyond the sea without his advice and sanction involved grave impiety, and one so founded would never succeed. And Müller, followed by Curtius, explains this interest taken by Delphi in Greek colonization not only by its religious zeal, but also, and this pre-eminently, by the increase in power, glory, and profit which was added to it by

every step of colonization, it being one of its most important tasks to collect all possible information about countries; thus finding the means of showing the right courses to the colonizing impulse of the Hellenes, and by wise and timely guidance preventing a useless waste of power and an injurious tendency towards dissipating the vigour of the nation. If this be so, it was the greatest and most lasting service rendered by Delphi.

As everything relating to the gods and their worship came under the control of Delphi, so also the festivals were in some respects under its management, and, that a general harmony might prevail, it had the superintendence of the calendar also.

Further, the gods were the leading bankers, and their temples were the principal financial institutions; so the establishment of the temple served the purposes of mercantile societies and of public banks.

But this strength, importance and influence of Delphi was not to last for ever. Single states came to claim for themselves entire freedom from all sacerdotal guidance, and would have a full political sovereignty of their own. When states thus asserted their independence, Delphi had not the same command and authority as formerly, and it then began a course of wily and cautious policy; and that very priesthood which had originated and infused into its devotees the purest ideas of morality now wavered, leaning now to this side, now to that, and resorted to every kind of intrigue and disreputable means to keep its position. It was the opinion of the ancient writers that the more the gold of the East had its power acknowledged at Delphi, as elsewhere (and we cannot but notice the danger of such donations as those of Croesus), the more generally it became known (firstly through the Almæonidæ, and secondly through Cleomenes, who wished to employ the oracle to get quit of his colleague Demaratus) that the god's answers were purchasable, the lower Apollo's authority fell among the Greeks, the less became the respect for him from all sides, and the faster his glory waned.

Later on we find the oracle acting the part of an irresolute coward, even forbidding states to act with determination, as in the cases of the Cnidians, Cretans, and others.

After the thin end of the wedge had been inserted, faith and confidence in the oracle waned, and the world was soon filled with stories about the venality of the sacred chamber. It would interfere and meddle in disputes where common-sense forbade it. Even the Lacedæmonians said something about Apollo's frailty when he was tempted with Almæonid gold; but perhaps this gossip originated in the great interest which that

family took in the restoration of the temple. And sometimes Apollo issued such unjust and unreasonable commands, that even Athens did not shrink from refusing obedience.

Again, the opposite civilizing influences of the East and West had been long gathering strength, and began to calculate their forces for an engagement that appeared fatal to the Greek, as well as to the Persian. Under such circumstances what course must Delphi take? Was the god, or was he not, to animate the minds and raise the drooping spirits of his children? Must he, or must he not, fall with them if they fell, unconquered in spirit to the last? Surely yes! But Delphi pursued an utterly different and more ruinous course. We have many reasons to believe that the attention and care of the crafty Delphi had been attracted by the influential magnet of Persia, and the oracle must have been devoid of all heart, feeling and courage to have damped the struggling efforts of a city like Miletus—which was peculiarly devoted to Apollo, and which of all other cities looked up to him as its friend and patron, as we see from his title of Didymæus—by such a message as this :

καὶ τότε δὴ Μίλητε, κακῶν ἐπιμήχανε ἔργων
πολλοῖσι δειπνὸν τε καὶ ἀγλαὰ δῶρα γένησσι.
σοὶ δ' ἄλοχοι πολλοῖσι πόδας νύφουσι κομήταις
νηῦσ' ἡμετέρου Διδύμουσ' ἄλλοισι μελήσει.

which may be translated as follows: "And at that day, Miletus, thou worker of evil deeds, thou shalt be made a banquet and a rich booty for many people. Then shall thy brides within thee bathe the feet of many a long-haired master, and other priests shall tend this holy fane."

That infallible god who says, "Thou wilt not win liberty," smother hope and crushes action, just as much as if he said, "Thou shalt not win liberty"; and he whose words *per se* decide a contest ought not to let slip the least remark that may damp and dishearten the righteous cause.

Another point is, that nothing contributed more to the fall of the oracle than the appearance and increase of a class which traded in divination, and which used a feigned *divinus afflatus* for other than honest or honourable ends. The greater part of these religious quacks hailed from Elis and Acarnania. Wandering from place to place, they were ready at any time to hire themselves out to political factions or military expeditions. Several went from house to house abusing the hospitality of the sacred farmers; and so prevalent did this practice become that to be a prophet was synonymous with being an impostor, custom having named these mendicant seers with the applicable title of "door-knockers" (*θυρόκοποι*). We learn from Plato that they professed to absolve from sin, and about many

of them we might echo Chaucer's sentiments as expressed in these lines :

Full swetely herde he confession,
 And pleasant was his absolution.
 He was an esy man to give penaunce.
 He was the best beggar in all his hous,
 For tho' a widdow hadde but a shoo,
 Yet wold he have a farthing ere he goe.

It can hardly be said, however, that Delphi sanctioned this religious quackery, for every abuse of the mantic art wounded Delphi.

About the fourth century before the Christian era philosophy grew more controversial, and after the beginning of the next the scorn of the Cynic, the logic of the Peripatetic, and the mental tranquillity of the Epicurean, bore down upon such an illogical, dishonest, and ridiculous creed. Delphi had no longer to solve the difficulties which engrossed its attention of old. They had not to decide upon points of statesmanship, speculative religion, and casuistry. It was the winner of the coming race, success in marriage, and such points that Apollo had to foretell. He was no longer an utterer of oracles; he had become a fortune-teller. We may subscribe to the words of Plutarch, who said that when the inquiries degenerated, the morality of the answers degenerated in the same ratio.

To Philip, King of Macedon (one of whose ancestors had to prove that he came of other than Macedonian blood that he might contend in Hellenic games), the unpatriotic and cowed oracle gave the feeble support of its name, and the indignation of Hellas at its infidelity found expression in the sarcasm of Demosthenes: *ἡ Πυθία Φιλιππίζει* ("The Pythia leans to Philip"). When Delphi lost the respect of Greece it did not gain that of Macedonia. It is true that Philip did once go through the ceremony of asking its counsel and benediction. It soon discovered that the ostentation of external dependence was rather a dangerous farce to play in its dealings with the leader of a rough and intrepid soldiery. Alexander was once refused admission to the shrine, as the day was not one set apart for consultation; but he rushed in, broke through the attendants of the temple, and took the adytum by storm. The venerable Pythia merely accosted him with the words, *ὦ τέκνον ἄμαχος εἶ* ("My son, I cannot check thee").

There was none to rouse the drooping spirit, none to stand up for and uphold the dignity of Apollo. Its religion was no longer catholic, no longer worthy, and its glory had departed. Only once again did a spark of the ancient fire seem to light upon the altar. This was when the Delphians stood to arms and met a second Brennus front to front, who had led his

marauding hosts across the mountains. Victory was on the side of Delphi and the shrine was saved. When Rome extended her conquests, Delphi held its peace on all national subjects. She did entertain private inquiries, as we see from the shrewd counsel she gave to Cicero. She was obsequious in the time of the Emperors; in the reign of Domitian was silent.

Siluit postquam reges timuere futura
Et superos vetuere loqui.

Sacrilegious hands began to violate her holy place; her statues had gone, together with her articles of value and curiosity. Delphi was ransacked at the hands of Nero, and it had suffered the same fate nearly a dozen times before. The last blow inflicted on it was when its sacred tripod was taken to adorn the hippodrome of the new Eastern metropolis. Thenceforth Apollo spake no more.

The oracles are dumb;
No voice or hideous hum
Runs thro' the arched roof, in words deceiving:
Apollo from his shrine
Can no more divine
With hollow shriek the steep of Delphos leaving:
No nightly trance or breathèd spell
Inspires the pale-eyed priest from the prophetic cell.

MILTON, "Ode to the Nativity."

J. H. WHITEHEAD.



ART. VI.—JEWS AND CHRISTIANS.

WHAT a wonderful race it is which is called by the name of Jew! Scattered, yet united; dispersed from their own country, yet unalterable in their patriotism; speaking different languages in the divers lands which for centuries they have inhabited, and taking from each varying manners, customs, and complexions, yet united in principle and in faith. In Russia they have 3,000,000, in Austria 1,644,000, in Germany 562,000, in Roumania 263,000, in Turkey 105,000, in Holland 82,000, in France 63,000, in Great Britain 92,000, in Italy 40,000, in Switzerland 7,000, in Scandinavia 7,000, in Servia 3,500, in Greece 2,600, in Spain 2,000. Among the different peoples of Europe they count 5,400,000. Asia probably contains 300,000, Africa 350,000, America 250,000, Australia 15,000. At the present time it is probable that of the 1,479,000,000 who inhabit the world, their race comprises some 8,000,000—about $\frac{1}{187}$ part of the whole. Dis-

persed they are, disunited and fragmentary; yet there is no nation on the face of the earth which has had so great an effect upon the rest in politics, morals, and religion. In their own country, to which the eyes of all the civilized world turn with a reverent and affectionate interest, long as it has lain desolate and in the hands of the stranger, we learn with interest that their own people are once more becoming more at home; in the holy city Jerusalem there are said now to be 42,000 Hebrews, and 100,000 in Palestine.

How is it with them amongst ourselves? In London they are said to be 67,000; in other parts of Great Britain 25,000. Amongst our most honoured and most powerful citizens are men of their race and faith; so great is their influence that without their consent and approval no great national enterprise can be undertaken. They are examples to all the world of liberality, generosity, patriotism, hospitality, and many virtues. We speak of our difference in religion with all respect and sympathy; we share the same faith as themselves, with the additional teaching which a section of their people gave us nearly nineteen centuries ago.

We cordially regret that unjust and unchristian prejudice prevailed so long that it was only the other day, thirty-six years ago, that they received amongst us their full rights of citizenship. We lament with them that in Eastern Europe, Africa, and the East they still labour under many disabilities. One of the most enthusiastic meetings of modern times was that which met in the Guildhall to protest against the persecuting policy of the Russian Government. We heartily sympathize with the Israelite Alliance of Paris, with the Anglo-Jewish Association of London, and with kindred societies in Germany and Austria, which are working for the removal of those inequalities. Amongst ourselves we think that they are now welcome and happy. In London, for instance, they have their special Board of Guardians, which a year ago spent £18,700 in relief of their own indigent poor, dealing with 32,800 applications. They have a large orphan asylum of their own at West Norwood; they have many admirable charities; in several hospitals there are Jewish wards. Under the London School Board there are several schools attended almost entirely by Jewish children, with Jewish teachers and Jewish religious instruction. They have six large elementary schools of their own in London, the chief of which is the Jews' Free School, Bell Lane, Spitalfields, the largest and one of the most successful elementary schools in the world. Schools and charities of the same character are connected with the principal provincial congregations, of which Liverpool has two, Manchester five, Leeds two, Birmingham,

Newcastle, Hull, and Sheffield each one. We think that now at length they seem to be at home and comfortable amongst their English Christian fellow-citizens.

The provision for their spiritual wants we look upon with warm and friendly sympathy. They represent the religious worship in which He whom we believe to have been their Messiah Himself had His human religious life. In the East of London they have a number of Hebras, or lesser congregations, which have been united into the Federation of Minor Synagogues. Eleven of the larger assemblies are federated together in the United Synagogue. They have their college for ministers in the West, with its extensive library. They have in the East their rich and valuable library at the Beth Hamidrash, where are held the sittings of their Beth Din, their ecclesiastical tribunal, at which points of their law are decided. Like ourselves, they have their ecclesiastical divisions. The mandates of their Chief Rabbi are binding only on the orthodox Jews; the Reform Congregations, although approaching every year towards an understanding with the others, still have their own authorities. The 3,000 Sephardim, or Jews from Spain and Portugal, have a different pastorate and a slightly different ceremonial from the Ashkenazim, the more numerous Jews from Germany and Poland. The religious designation "Jew," in fact, covers as wide a variety of differences as the religious designation "Christian," from the strict and enthusiastic tenets of the Chassidim of Russia and Galicia to the advanced Agnosticism of the Society of Ethical Culture in New York. We hear with sympathy that their religion is to them a real life, and their worship a matter of living importance. Only the year before last the orthodox Jews under the Chief Rabbi, influenced by English ideas and customs, made improvements in their liturgy, such as the omission of redundant and superfluous petitions; the public reading of the Ten Commandments; the introduction of English prayers, and the organization of special religious services for children.

Notwithstanding all these steps towards taking root amongst us, the great mass of these people, who are neither well off nor highly educated, are greatly shut off from us by race, habit, and language. If their position and circumstances permitted them to mix more amongst us, the difficulties of mutual understanding would not be so great. They live also in that part of London where, through the prodigious rapidity of the growth of population, and the ignorance and unelevated habits of the people, Christianity as a life has little or no attractive power. Eighteen hundred years of bitter hostility and cruel persecution have ingrained in their very heart of hearts an entirely hateful view of the Christian faith. Any-

thing that comes from Christians presents itself to their minds in a suspicious and alien form. Could anything, again, be more fatal to any attentive study on their part of St. Paul and St. Peter and St. John, their fellow-countrymen of old, than the calamitous and disastrous division amongst ourselves? Think what must be the feeling of a faithful adherent of the spiritual principles of the Old Testament who comes, as most of them come, from Russia and Poland, towards a religion which seems in its outward form to consist chiefly of the idolatry of pictures and the worship of the Virgin?

We who believe that Jesus, the Son of David, that perfectly unique personality in the whole history of the world, was indeed worthy to be the Messiah of whom all the prophets had spoken, are supremely anxious that in spite of all these difficulties, ingrained through eighteen centuries of distrust, hatred, and misunderstanding, the Hebrew people should have the happiness of recognising Him as well. The final vision must be the work of the Holy Spirit; but how can we overcome the preliminary obstacles, which are at present like a thick veil drawn between us? In the daily Hebrew hymn there is this touching and beautiful verse:

In Thy mercy, have compassion upon Thy people, O our Rock,
And upon Zion the habitation of Thy glory,
And upon the dwelling of the house of our excellency;
The Son of David shall come and redeem us;
The breath of our nostrils is the Lord Messiah.

How shall we persuade them that the Son of David has already come and redeemed them?—that the Lord Messiah has indeed for eighteen centuries been the breath of the nostrils of all who know His truth and glory?

There is one difficulty which did not exist in so acute a form in the days of St. Paul, the Apostles, and the primitive Church. When the Gospel of Christ was first published it was preached by Jews to Jews. Now it seems to come to them from the hands of aliens and Gentiles. Then those who were converted remained Jews. They continued their old worship, they kept their usual feasts, they frequented the synagogue and the temple, they undertook and performed vows. It was not till the year 135 A.D., after the final revolt of Jerusalem under the Emperor Hadrian, that the Jewish Christians broke with their old customs. Up till then they had been Jews as well as Christians. That was to them a great help. After the revolt, in which 580,000 Jews were slaughtered in Palestine, the Christian Jews were allowed to return to Jerusalem on condition of giving up everything that was distinctive of the Hebrew faith. This they did, and the line of severance between Jew and Gentile became complete. It was only the little remnant

of Jewish Christians who remained at Pella who still continued Christians without renouncing the character and customs of Jews. And they gradually died out. Anything which would bridge over this chasm, and restore to Hebrew converts the natural liberty of primitive days, would greatly help to break down the almost insurmountable barrier which eighteen centuries of prejudice and separation have raised between Jew and Gentile.

What we need is more love, affection, brotherliness, kindness. We must make the transition easier for the Hebrew. He must no longer live in isolated and unassimilated masses in the midst of an unsympathetic Gentile population, but become one of us, in nation, heart, and association. Thirty-six years is but a short time for the Hebrew to have forgotten the disabilities and suspicions from which during long centuries he suffered. We must not treat each individual Hebrew as if he personally and of his own deliberate choice had rejected Him whom we believe to be the Messiah. Nineteen centuries of un-Christlike treatment and of national concentration have made it almost impossible for him to share our faith. He has been thrown back upon himself, and he has not thought of Christianity as even a possibility. By far the larger number of Hebrews in our country know absolutely nothing about Christianity, except that they pass their lives amongst large populations who bear the name of Christian, but who are no recommendation to any faith whatsoever.

We must try to persuade the Hebrews that it is worth their while to inquire about this strong, inalienable belief of ours that the Messiah did come nineteen hundred years ago. How is it, that whereas there are in the population of the world 8,000,000 Hebrews, there are no less than 393,000,000 of those who agree with the Hebrews in accepting the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament as the Word of God, but who also believe that the Messiah was that marvellous Person born of a Hebrew mother, Jesus of Nazareth? Ought they not as patriotic Hebrews to look, with an earnestness which they direct to no other subject, into the history of that character, so unique in His influence, who has added no less than 393,000,000 of believers to the adherents of the Old Testament Scriptures, and whom those 393,000,000 believe to have been Him of whom the Law and the Prophets continually spoke?

Thirdly, we ought, I think, as Christians, to take much more trouble than we have taken hitherto in supplying them with short, clear, and succinct statements in their own language of the reasons for our belief. These ought to be accessible to every one of the 92,000 Hebrews in this country, and part of their familiar literature. Our religion teaches us every item

and precept of theirs; and as they are living in the midst of us, who have so much and of such incalculable importance in common with themselves, it is not too much to ask that they also in their turn should try to understand our principles, our beliefs, our reasons, and our hopes. Is it really possible that Jesus of Nazareth could have been the narrow ascetic, the harsh enthusiast which He is sometimes represented to have been by those who reject alike both Old and New Testaments? If that had been the case, how could His character have riveted the love and loyalty of so many millions of the human race in all lands and in every century? How is it that the varied and manifold predictions of the prophets and seers foresaw in so unexpected and unexampled a way the different events of His humble earthly life? If He was, according to the view of those who rejected Him, an ignorant zealot, where was the consummate genius which constructed such a life and such a history? The life and the history were well known in the earliest times of His followers; we have their letters alluding to the facts, and quoting the prophets; the four independent biographies of Him which had passed from mouth to mouth were written down, we now see, at the early date at which it has always been said that they were written. If they do not represent a real character, who was the inventor and the forger? Produce to us, we say, such a sublime genius. Why were not the long list of facts detailed by the Gospels denied at the time? Opposed they were, but not controverted. And the great fact of all, the rising from the dead, which turned the man of sorrows, the suffering Messiah of Israel, into the triumphant King of glory, has not that a wonderful testimony? For what other fact will you find twelve men writing during a long course of years, in which they underwent every kind of humiliation and persecution, daily to face death rather than be silent? Is it possible that if they inquire closely and seriously they can come to the flippant conclusion of a recent unbelieving writer that St. Paul was an ambitious man who wanted to lead a new sect? Was it not exactly the other way? Was there not every possible reason why St. Paul should have remained with the Pharisees, and succeeded to the religious supremacy of his nation after his teacher Gamaliel? What had he to gain by thirty years of scorn and opprobrium as the scum of the earth? Who can study his genuine, noble, lofty, self-denying character and come to so ludicrous a conclusion? And if our Hebrew brothers say that their nation as a whole rejected Jesus of Nazareth at the time, and that this fact is enough for them, is that true? Did the nation reject Him as a whole? Were there not hundreds of thousands all over Palestine who followed Him about, and wished to make Him an earthly King? Was

it not merely the presumptuous and usurping Pharisees who stirred up the populace of Jerusalem to reject Him, because they saw in Him that which would upset that personal authority which they loved better than anything else? They understood His appeal to the true spirit of the Old Testament, and they saw that it meant annihilation to those favourite traditions by which they had overlaid the law of God, and that was the reason why they were determined to destroy Him who dared to set them right; that was why they made the people cry out, "Crucify Him! crucify Him!" And when we see Him rejected by the chief priests, and hanging on His cross, is not that just what we should have expected from Isaiah? "*He is despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief; and we hid as it were our faces from Him: He was despised, and we esteemed Him not. . . . He was taken from prison and from judgment, and who shall declare His generation? For He was cut off out of the land of the living: for the transgression of my people was He stricken.*" And after the mighty fact of His resurrection, it was seen that at last was fulfilled that other mysterious utterance of the same prophet: "*Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon His shoulder: and His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.*"

These are some of the things that we wish to lay before our Hebrew brothers: the oneness of the Old and New Testament, the fulfilment of prophecy, the investigation of the character and words and effects of our Messiah and of His followers. But we must show them something more. Hitherto one of their chief obstacles has been the ungodliness and unchristian conduct of multitudes of professing Christians. We must endeavour to set before them, each of us, the example of a truly Christian life. We ask them to look at the highest and best, not at those who are Christians merely in name. We ask them to examine the characters of those who have taken the Messiah to their very hearts, and in whose every word and action the Divine wisdom and goodness of the Messiah has shone forth. Let them look at such a genuine Christian as Charles Gordon, the hero of China and Khartûm. "If Christians were all like Gordon Pasha," said the Mahometan refugee, "all the world would be Christian." It is a terrible warning to ourselves if, by our own want of faith, and worldliness, and frivolities and sins, we and our fathers have been a hindrance to their belief. What the followers of the Messiah ought to be they will easily find in the New Testament: they are to be known by such graces as *love, joy,*

peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance. Many there are amongst us at the present day who are examples of these qualities, lights shining in the world. If they do not find them in us, they may blame us, reproach us, shame us, rebuke us; but they cannot deny the type and the ideal, and the pure and high realizations which it has produced in human life.

Above all, we must give them no cause to think we do not sympathize with them in the sorrows of their people and in their national aspirations. Some of our noblest poets have sung of them in strains which go to our very hearts:

Is this thy place, sad city, this thy throne?

Bishop Heber sang one about Jerusalem, which is our Holy Place as well as theirs,

Where the lone desert rears the craggy stone,
 Where suns unblest their angry lustre fling,
 And way-worn pilgrims seek the scanty spring.
 Where now thy pomp, which kings with envy viewed?
 Where now thy power, which all those kings subdued?
 No martial myriads muster in thy gates,
 No suppliant nation at thy temple waits;
 No prophet bard thy glittering courts among
 Wakes the full lyre, and swells the tide of song;
 But lawless force, and meagre want is there,
 And the quick-darting eye of restless fear;
 While cold oblivion, 'mid the ruin laid,
 Hides his dark wing beneath the ivy shade.

Have they ever individually considered with themselves why all this is come to pass?

O! weep for those that wept by Babel's stream,

wrote one of our most famous and popular singers:

Whose shrines are desolate, whose land a dream;
 Weep for the harp of Judah's broken shell;
 Mourn—where their God hath dwelt the godless dwell!
 And where shall Israel lave her bleeding feet?
 And where shall Zion's song again seem sweet?
 And Judah's melody once more rejoice
 The hearts that leaped before its heavenly voice?
 Tribes of the wandering foot and weary breast,
 How shall ye flee away and be at rest?
 The wild dove hath her nest, the fox his cave,
 Mankind their country—Israel but the grave!

We long for the day when they will be able to say with us, "*We have found the Messiah.*" Of all the glorious occasions in their history, we believe that such a time would be the most splendid and the most blessed. Then we believe would be fulfilled the ancient prediction: "*Violence shall no more be heard in thy land, wasting nor destruction within thy borders; but thou shalt call thy walls Salvation, and thy gates Praise.*"

The sun shall be no more thy light by day, neither for brightness shall the moon give light unto thee; but the Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory. Thy sun shall no more go down, neither shall thy moon withdraw herself; for the Lord shall be thine everlasting light, and the days of thy mourning shall be ended. Thy people also shall all be righteous; they shall inherit the land for ever; the branch of thy planting, the work of thy hands, that I may be glorified. A little one shall become a thousand, and a small one a strong nation: I the Lord will hasten it in his time."

Our interest in them can never cease. It was said by a brilliant lawyer (Lord Erskine) that their universal dispersion throughout the world, their unexampled sufferings and their invariably distinguished characteristics when compared with the histories of all other nations, and with the most ancient predictions of their own lawgivers and prophets concerning them, would be amply sufficient to support the truths of the Christian religion. If this be so in their present condition, how incalculably great will be the benefit to the world when these can see that they have given birth to the Messiah, the true hope of all mankind, the desire of all nations! *If the fall of them, wrote St. Paul, be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their fulness?*

Thrice happy nation! favourite of heaven!
 Selected from the kingdoms of the earth
 To be His chosen race, ordained to spread
 His glory through remotest realms and teach
 The Gentile world Jehovah's awful name.¹
 You, and you only, amongst all mankind,
 Received the transcript of the eternal mind;
 Were trusted with His own engraven laws,
 And constituted guardians of His cause;
 Yours were the prophets, yours the priestly call,
 And yours by birth the Saviour of us all!

May God in His own good time hasten that golden day when they and we shall be all one in Him who was to "*come out of Sion, the Deliverer, and should turn away ungodliness from Jacob!*"

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

¹ William Hodson.

Short Notices.

Bishop Lightfoot. Pp. 139. Macmillan and Co.

This handsome and interesting monograph is a reprint of a biographical article in the *Quarterly Review*, and has a prefatory note from his life-long friend Bishop Westcott. It is written by a mind at once discriminating and sympathetic, and gives a delightful picture of a great man, a great scholar, a great Christian, and a great bishop. An interesting note on the well-known article on "The Christian Ministry" is given in the appendix: "If the preceding investigation be substantially correct, the threefold ministry can be traced to Apostolic direction; and short of an express statement we can possess no better assurance of a Divine appointment, or at least a Divine sanction. If the facts do not allow us to unchurch other Christian communities differently organized, they may at least justify our jealous adhesion to a polity derived from this source."

The Gospel of Life. By Bishop WESTCOTT. Pp. 306. Macmillan and Co.

A philosophical treatise from the thoughtful mind of Dr. Westcott on the relation of Christianity to the mysteries of being has been widely recognised as a most valuable and welcome contribution to Christian evidence. It should have been noticed here before, but it was hoped that it might have had a longer review. The recommendation, however, of this volume to our readers must no longer be delayed. The writer assumes three final existences: self, the world, and God, and discusses their difficulties. An impressive chapter follows on the duty and necessity of dealing with the problems suggested by these three existences, instead of setting them aside as insoluble. After discussing the conditions for the solution of these problems, such as physical laws, historical facts, spiritual judgment, and the claims and limitations of the sciences, he describes the contributions of pre-Christian religions on this subject, especially those of China, India, and Persia. A chapter follows on the three great assumptions of the Bible: as to God the Creator, Man the Crown of His Creation, and the Fall of Man. Then comes the consideration of signs as a vehicle of revelation. The absoluteness of Christianity is then set forth, and its historical claims. In the last chapter the various threads of argument are summed up with great power, precision, and suggestiveness. The verification of Christianity is shown to be as complete as the case admits; it lies in its fitness to fulfil the destiny of man; Christ is Himself the Gospel.

Lombard Street in Lent. Pp. 206. Price 3s. 6d. Elliot Stock.

It was a happy thought of Canon Scott-Holland and the Christian Social Union to have a series of uncompromising Christian sermons in the very heart of the City during Lent. The sermons are very unequal in value, but each is a collection of earnest and stirring thoughts on contemporary questions related to social life. There is nothing in the sermons that has not been said before by earnest Christian thinkers; and no idea which is the property of the Christian Social Union. Such addresses, for instance, have been given in successive years at the Christian Conference at Dumfries, and at other gatherings of the kind; but the advantage here is that the subjects are brought into a conspectus and treated throughout with the same earnest, courageous, self-denying Christian spirit. Canon Scott-Holland speaks on the need of "National

Penitence"; Dean Kitchin on "Social Warnings from History"; the Head of Oxford House on "Wasted Lives"; Archdeacon Farrar on "Personal Responsibility"; Principal Ottley on "The Ethics of Property"; Mr. Carter, General Secretary of the Social Union, on "Commercial Morality"; Professor Cunningham on "Wages"; Canon Barnett on "The Unemployed"; Mr. Hoskyns, of Stepney, on "Women's Work"; Mr. Richmond on "Speculation"; Mr. Dolling on "Soldiers and Sailors"; Mr. Barrass on "Betting and Gambling"; Canon Scott-Holland on the "Marriage Law"; Principal Gent on "Religious Education"; Mr. Fry on "Vain Oblations"; Mr. Lyttelton, of Haileybury, on "Recreation"; Dean Stubbs on "The Imperial Christ and His Democratic Creed" (Town Problems, Village Problems); Archdeacon Wilson on "Common-Sense in Religion"; Prebendary Eytton on "Social Hope"; and Professor Shuttleworth on "The Social Outlook."

The language of the sermons is sometimes somewhat exaggerated, but the book ought to do great good in enabling Christian people, and especially the clergy, to realize their social responsibilities.

Holy Living. By JEREMY TAYLOR. Pp. 415. Prices 1s., 2s., 3s. 6d. and 6s. 6d. Bagster and Sons.

It is doubtful whether this memorable work is as much read as it should be in the present day. The doctrinal library of no Christian can be considered complete without it. Messrs. Bagsters' edition is beautifully printed, and at prices suitable to different persons. It is a volume in their excellent "Library of Christian Classics."

History of Haddlesey. By the Rev. J. N. WORSFOLD. Elliot Stock.

English history has become, from the minuteness with which it is studied, so vast a subject that it is beyond the reach of any single individual, in its full and complete extension. Its different branches must be followed up by those who are, for various reasons, specially interested in them. A patient and thorough investigation of different localities from the point of view of their relation to the history of the county will thus have a stimulating influence on a whole neighbourhood. Mr. Worsfold's work has been performed with loving care and accurate research. It is not a mere collection of facts and records, but, while giving all available antiquarian information, it connects the facts with the general stream of national life. Light is thrown, from these local sources, on the Knights Templars; on the vicissitudes of church life in the parish; on the reign of Edward II.; on the Pilgrimage of Grace; on the Reformation; and on the families of Stapleton, Darcy, Fitzwilliam, Ancaster, and Davison. It is to be hoped that the success of Mr. Worsfold's labours will stimulate other learned clergy to similar undertakings. The celebrated statistical account of Scotland, in thirty-seven volumes, in the last century, was compiled entirely from the writings of the whole body of the parish ministers of Scotland.

MAGAZINES.

We have received the following (June) magazines :

The Thinker, The Expository Times, The Religious Review of Reviews, The Review of the Churches, The Anglican Church Magazine, The Church Missionary Intelligencer, The Weekly Churchman, The Evangelical Churchman, The Church Sunday-School Magazine, Blackwood, The Cornhill, Sunday Magazine, The Fireside, The Quiver, Cassell's Family Magazine, 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, The Parish Helper, Parish Magazine,

The Philanthropist, New and Old, The Bible Society's Gleanings for the Young, The Bible Society's Monthly Reporter, The Zenana, The Cottager and Artisan, Friendly Greetings, Little Folks, Our Little Dots, The Child's Companion, Boy's and Girl's Companion, The Children's World, Daybreak, Day of Days, Home Words, Hand and Heart, The Home Visitor, and Summer Vols.

THE MONTH.

THE Clergy Pensions Institution held its eighth annual meeting at the Church House on the 22nd ult., Mr. E. P. Thesiger in the chair. It was announced that during 1893 £37,095 had been received from clergymen in purchase of deferred annuities, making a total of £92,987; while the sum received to augment those annuities to adequate retiring pensions, including £735 from the Ecclesiastical Buildings Fire-Office, Limited, was £4,427, making a total of £33,690. Seven beneficiaries had expressed their willingness to accept pensions of £30 each, inclusive of the annuity purchased. The self-help contributions of those beneficiaries amount in all to £355 10s., purchasing life annuities to a total of £40 15s.; while the seven pensions amount to £210 yearly, at a cost to the Augmentation Fund of a total capital sum of £1,538 9s. 6d. The institution has now become a capable instrument for securing to the clergy and the Church important benefits, formerly unattainable.

The Ecclesiastical Buildings Fire-Office, Limited, held its seventh annual meeting at the Church House on the 22nd ult., Mr. G. A. Spottiswoode in the chair. The income from premiums amounted to £17,287, an increase of £2,622; the investments were £47,737, showing an increase of £2,680 in the year, and being £22,737 more than the paid-up capital; while the total expenditure was again a moderate percentage of the income. In consequence of this general prosperity, £2,978 was added to the fire fund, bringing it up to £18,135, or more than a full year's premium income, and £2,500 was distributed as grants. Of this sum £1,250 was divided among the Clergy Pensions Institution, the National Society, and the Incorporated Church Building Society, and £1,250 was allotted to the dioceses. This makes a total of £8,000 allotted in grants from surplus profits. The directors, with the concurrence of the shareholders, have decided to extend the company's operations to other branches of the same business, such as, for example, insurance against burglary, personal accident, breakage of plate-glass, coloured windows, and other valuable glass otherwise than by fire, etc.

At the annual meeting of the Mission to Deep-Sea Fishermen in Exeter Hall (Mr. Frank A. Bevan presiding) the Duchess of Teck presented good-conduct stripes and the certificates of the St. John Ambulance Association to members of the crews of the Medical Mission vessels. Her Royal Highness also presented a family Bible and the Royal Humane Society's certificate to Mr. G. Brickwood, steward of the Mission ship *Cholmondeley*, for his bravery in saving the life of a shipmate. The report showed that during last year 11,670 patients had been treated, 8,472 missionary visits paid, 1,594 services held, 294 floating libraries sent out, 475,599 publications distributed, and 929 copies of the Scriptures sold or given away. Woollen articles valued at £375 were sold at nominal prices, and 2,272 cuffs distributed; while tobacco to the value of £2,530 was sold in the North Sea, for the purpose of abolishing the foreign "coper" traffic. The accounts showed an income of £22,972, including £100 profit on

tobacco, £4,094 from sales of fish, and a grant of £4,200 from the reserve fund. The expenditure, £23,529, included £11,258 for the maintenance of eleven Mission vessels and their crews, over £3,000 written off for depreciation, and £2,959 for salaries. On the motion of the Dean of Norwich, seconded by Dr. Newman Hall, a resolution was passed expressing gratitude for the results of the Mission in the last twelve years, and pledging the meeting to give increased support to the work.

The Bishop of Beverley has consecrated a new church, which has been erected at Hexthorpe, near Doncaster. The structure is built in the late Gothic style of architecture, from the designs of Lord Grimthorpe, at whose expense, jointly with his sister, Miss Beckett Denison, the cost of erection has been defrayed. The church will accommodate some 450 worshippers.

The Hon. Mrs. Meynell-Ingram has built and presented new Church schools to the village of Hoar Cross.

Holy Trinity Church, Oswestry, has been reopened by the Bishop of St. Asaph after extensive alterations and additions, costing nearly £4,000. One of the transepts is the gift of Miss Longueville, of Penylan, in memory of her father.

An anonymous gift of £2,000 has been received by the Additional Curates' Society. The list of special contributions to meet the Society's present needs now reaches £3,444.

Obituary.

LORD ARTHUR HERVEY, BISHOP OF BATH AND WELLS.

ARTHUR CHARLES HERVEY, fourth son of the first Marquis and fifth Earl of Bristol, was born in 1808. He was educated at Eton and Trinity College, Cambridge, where he was placed in the first class of the Classical Tripos in 1830. In 1832 he was ordained deacon and priest, and was presented by his father to the rectory of Horringer with Ickworth, in Suffolk, the parish in which the family seat is situated. There he remained for thirty-seven years, discharging diligently the duties of a country clergyman, and at the same time taking an active part in the public work of the neighbourhood and diocese. The adjacent town of Bury St. Edmunds often enjoyed the benefit of his literary and musical talents in the way of concerts and lectures at the Mechanics' Institute, of which he was the president. In 1862 he was made Archdeacon of Sudbury; and in 1869 he was recommended by Mr. Gladstone, his old friend and schoolfellow, to the see of Bath and Wells, then vacant by the resignation of Lord Auckland on the ground of failing health. Lord Auckland lived for six months longer, during which time he continued to inhabit the ancient and beautiful palace of Wells. This was in one respect an advantage to the new Bishop, since it induced him to take up his residence in Bath, which, lying in the corner of the diocese, and not in easy communication with Wells, had hitherto seen little of its Bishops, and had accordingly been accustomed to pay little regard to them. A residence of six months in the city made a great change in this respect; and when Lord Arthur Hervey transferred his home to Wells, he did not lose the affection and popularity which he had merited and won in the greatest city of his diocese. These feelings were indeed shared by all, as

was shown by the presentation of a pastoral staff, and subsequently, to mark his eightieth birthday, of an episcopal ring. This latter was presented to him in the name of the clergy by Archdeacon Denison in warm and affectionate language. Sharp differences between the Bishop and Archdeacon on public matters had never been allowed to interrupt their private friendship.

Lord Arthur Hervey was classed as a Low Church Bishop, but his sympathies were wide and his practice tolerant. All good work of every form, if restrained within legal limits, he not only suffered, but encouraged; and his own love of order and appreciation of beauty and music induced him to set a high value on reverent and well-conducted services. No Bishop ever carried out more fully the episcopal virtue of hospitality. The grand old palace and beautiful grounds at Wells were thrown open with the largest liberality to all comers. Sunday-school teachers, lay helpers, choral associations, diocesan societies, were always welcome in any numbers. Visitors on business, lay or clerical, were sure to be invited to a place at his table. On public occasions, such as diocesan conferences or archæological meetings, the palace was filled with guests to its utmost capacity. Wells itself will miss him greatly as a citizen, ready always to aid any useful project with purse and person. To him it owes a valuable cottage hospital and an admirable recreation-ground, which he succeeded through many difficulties in establishing as a memorial of the Queen's jubilee. He was indefatigable to the last in fulfilling all the duties of his office. No parish was too small or too remote, no occasion too insignificant to profit by his presence and assistance, if other engagements allowed. He was continually on the move, and a large part of his time was passed on the railway. Octogenarian Bishops have sometimes come in for some severe criticism, but nobody who saw much of Lord Arthur Hervey ever thought of him, until quite lately, as an old man. His light step, active movements, and youthful elasticity of mind banished all recollection of his years, while the courtly grace of his manner was a perpetual charm.

Without being a striking preacher, Lord Arthur Hervey was impressive by his fatherly style and aspect, by the clearness and sweetness of his voice, and by the sound sense, moderation, and variety of material which pervaded his sermons, as well as by a delicacy and appropriateness of diction which was peculiarly his own. For the Bishop was a cultivated man in many ways. We have already referred to his musical talent and to his facility in the composition of lectures, a gift which he was always ready to exercise, wherever he was asked, for any good work in his diocese. But he was also a considerable author. He contributed articles to Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, as well as to the Speaker's and other commentaries. These were chiefly historical. One particular topic, that of genealogy, he had made his own. His volume on the reconciliation of the two "Genealogies of Christ," in St. Matthew and St. Luke, published in 1853, is still the standard work on the subject; and four sermons on the "Inspiration of Holy Scripture," preached before the University of Cambridge in 1855, show that he had anticipated many thoughts which are now familiar, but which were then new and striking. Latterly, however, he appeared as a strong opponent of the newer Biblical criticism, which he attacked in several charges and addresses to the Diocesan Conference, as well as in some published lectures on St. Luke and Chronicles.

He was held in affectionate esteem throughout the diocese for his piety, his generosity, and his learning, and the announcement of his death caused a feeling of real sorrow to prevail not only among Churchmen, but among Nonconformists also, few of whom failed to recognise the breadth of his sympathies.—From the *Times*.