

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

THE  
CHURCHMAN

---

OCTOBER, 1894.

---

ART. I.—THE PORT-ROYAL DES CHAMPS AND ITS  
MARTYRS.

THE tragedy of the Port-Royal—for the history of that venerable foundation is indeed a tragedy of crime and cruelty on the one side, and of heroic constancy and unflinching courage on the other—must ever open to the mind the most precious lessons and experiences of the power of truth, and of the invincible endurance which all who are animated and inspired with the love of the truth are able to maintain in its defence. But it has a special and an unspeakable interest for us as the solemn prelude to the most awful catastrophe which ever happened in the modern history of Europe. It was the last effort to lift up the standard of spiritual and evangelical religion in a Church and nation which had sunk to the lowest depths of moral and religious degradation—corrupted by the moral teachings of the Jesuits and the utter worldliness of the Court of Rome, and too well prepared for the terrible judgment of the Revolution. Up to the very outbreak of that reign of universal anarchy this bright light was shining in darkness, often obscured but never extinct. The splendid examples and saintly piety of the Mère Angélique de St. Jean Arnauld, of her father (M. Arnauld d'Andilli), of M. du Verger de Hauranne (Abbot of St. Cyran), of the Maître de Sacy, and of hundreds of their associates, “whose names are in the book of life” as well as in the records of their earthly trials, kept alive until the closing years of the eighteenth century the spirit of piety and devotion in a society which centuries of blind submission to the Court of Rome had kept in a state of spiritual servitude, and by which the ancient liberties of their Church had come to be regarded as proofs of heresy. A succession of publications by a kind of secret society, which was carried on till 1752, and probably up to the very eve of the Revolution, gave rest and peace to the faithful and pious who

were so soon after called upon, like their forerunners, "not only to believe in Christ, but also to suffer for His name." Among these, one of the last and most influential was the collection of the "Vies intéressantes et édifiantes des Religieuses de Port-Royal," printed in four small octavo volumes (1750-52); "Aux dépens de la Compagnie," but without place or editor's name. The compilation is said to have been made by the Abbé le Clerc. The work is now a scarce one, and the copy which I possess is rendered additionally interesting by the fact that it belonged to the aged Marchioness de Torcy, Catherine Felicitas Arnauld de Pomponne, a niece of the saintly Mère Angélique de St. Jean Arnauld, the Abbess of the Convent of Port-Royal during the years of its bitter trials. From the immense mass of memoirs and letters which are comprised in this collection it is difficult to select those which give in any degree a clear and continuous history of the Port-Royal from 1660 to 1711, the year of its ruthless and inhuman destruction.

An interesting paper (given at the close of the third volume) furnishes us with a valuable summary of the earlier history of the famous foundation, and may here be briefly epitomized :

The Abbey of Port-Royal des Champs was situated in a valley half a league from Chevreuse, two from Versailles, and six from Paris. It was founded by the younger son of the great Constable Montmorenci, who had the seignory of Marli. On his departure to the Crusades, he left with his wife, Mahault de Garlande, large sums for pious objects, and she, in conjunction with Odon de Sulli, founded the convent in 1206. Its endowment was soon largely increased through the liberality of the great houses of Chevreuse, de Montfort, de Triè, and de Dreux; and its celebrity increased with its means, the Popes conferring upon it many privileges. Its history, carried on through a long succession of abbesses mostly representing the noblest families of France, was as peaceful and uneventful as that of any other of the countless foundations which offered the younger branches of a numerous aristocracy a refuge from the world, and a home congenial to the contemplative life. The year 1642, which witnessed the election of the Mère Angélique de St. Jean Arnauld, opened a new period in the history of the State and of the Church of France. Her aunt, Jacqueline Marie Angélique Arnauld, had been appointed Abbess in 1602, at which time the convent exhibited a sad state of decadence, both temporal and spiritual. The father of the new Abbess, through whose illustrious family the foundation acquired its great subsequent celebrity, assisted in restoring its temporal fortunes, while his daughter re-established its spiritual state. About this time, Madame Arnauld having purchased the Hôtel

de Clagny in Paris, the nuns were removed thither in 1625-26, and the name of Port-Royal became attached to the city foundation, the original one being from that time distinguished as the Port-Royal des Champs. The two convents, "of the City" and "of the Fields," were regarded as being the same, governed by the same Abbess, according to the privilege granted by the Archbishop of Paris, Jean François de Gondi, in 1647.

The Mère Angélique de St. Jean Arnauld followed her aunt as Abbess of the double foundation in 1642. Her father, who devoted his entire life to the interests and advancement of the Port-Royal, appears to have lived a kind of hermit life at the country foundation. The intense affection which existed between himself and his daughter, grounded less upon their earthly kindred than upon the unity of their faith and their resolute purpose of mind in the defence of the truth, constitutes one of the most touching and inspiring features in a history which appeals in every page to the deepest feelings of the heart. A paper written by the Mère Angélique during the persecution, "On the danger of hesitation and doubt, when our duty is clearly known," gives the key to her whole life, and the first principle and motive of all her course during that period of terrible anxiety and privation. "Consider," she writes, "the rule of St. Bernard—'*Nemo super his quæ certa sunt hæsitet.*' When we doubt, it is a good thing to deliberate, in order that we may doubt no longer. But when we have no doubt, we learn to doubt by deliberating. If deliberation is necessary, it removes doubt; if it is needless, it creates it." The invincible love of the truth, and the firm resolution to maintain her testimony to it to the last, animated this noble and saintly woman throughout. Her love for the community she had almost created anew, yielded only to this higher devotion. "Our visible enemies," she writes, "desire to ruin our monastery, and our invisible enemies make use of them, and of the fear which we have of such a loss, in order to ruin our faith. But our faith is worth more to us than a monastery, and our conscience is better than a house, which would become in the sight of God only our tomb were we to re-enter it with a wounded conscience. Let us not, then, consult what we must do to save our house, for our safety consists in our doing nothing."<sup>1</sup> She then beautifully illustrates the present duty of the suffering community by the silence of our Lord during the Passion, ending with the suggestive words, "Nous parlons peut-être plus qu'il ne faut pour nous défendre, et nous parlons peut-être moins qu'il ne faut pour rendre gloire à la vérité."

<sup>1</sup> Tom. i., pp. 289-297.

The Jansenist controversy, which broke out at this time, and threatened during its progress to shatter the very foundations of the Papacy, opens too long a chapter in the history of the Church to enable us to trace its origin and to mark the stages of its progress. From the time of the Council of Trent, which touched with a very light and timid hand the doctrines of grace, fearful of condemning the Augustines, Dominicans, and Franciscans on the one side, or the new theories of Lainez and the Jesuits on the other, the Church of Rome endeavoured to keep the subject in suspense, until the controversy became too acute to render silence any longer possible. Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres, whose life had been devoted to the study of St. Augustine, with whose doctrine he absolutely identified himself, published a work called "Augustinus," in which he gives the entire view of the teaching of that great father on the doctrines of grace. The influence of the Jesuits soon brought this remarkable work under the notice and reprobation of the Court of Rome, and certain propositions were gathered out of it which in no respect represented the text or the meaning of Jansenius, who, having died long before, was unable to defend himself or his work from this shameful falsification. By a series of Bulls and decrees, culminating in the famous and fatal "Constitution Unigenitus," the Popes claimed not only to be infallible in matters of faith, but also in fact, and not merely to declare the five propositions alleged to be taken from Jansenius' work to be heretical, but also to exact the declaration that they actually and accurately represented his words. Those who were called upon to sign under the sanction of a solemn oath the formulary of submission to the Pope were accordingly compelled not only to declare Jansenius a heretic upon grounds of which they were absolutely ignorant, but to commit themselves to a shameful falsification of the truth—in other words, to lie to the Holy Ghost. M. de St. Marthe, in a brief but incisive paper "On human as opposed to Divine faith," has stated the case of the remonstrants with great force and moderation.

"It is," he writes, "to overthrow the foundations of the Catholic faith, and to open the door to all kinds of heresies, to give the Pope the power to propose to the Church as an article of faith that which is not contained either in Scripture or tradition . . . It is a real heresy to make an article of faith of a matter of fact which is in no manner revealed. And if it is pretended that the Pope has had a revelation of it, we should fall into a double heresy: one, the admission that the Pope can have special revelations, which would open the door to all kinds of illusions; the other, the founding articles of faith upon such special revelations, which is against the very

principles of the Catholic faith, which is founded only on the revelation of God contained in Holy Scripture and tradition. . . . The formulary not only makes a human faith equal to a Divine faith, in demanding, as for a Divine faith, the subjection of the mind, the belief of the heart, and the confession of the mouth, but even places it above a Divine faith, inasmuch as the Word of God tells us that all men are liars, that is to say, are capable of being deceived themselves and of deceiving others, not permitting us to believe that any other than God can be infallible."<sup>1</sup>

The determination of the Court and clergy of France, at the instigation of the Court of Rome, dominated as it was by the Jesuits, to enforce the signature of the formulary under pain of excommunication, was met by the little community of Port-Royal by a resolute but respectful refusal. Every kind of persuasion and entreaty was urged upon them, but in vain. At length a ruthless and cruel campaign of persecution was entered upon, which was inaugurated by the *Procès Verbal* of August 27, 1664. From this point the various relations of the lives and sufferings of the nuns of Port-Royal, and of the history of the outrages inflicted upon them by the officers of the State begin.

A letter from the Mère Angélique from the house of the community at Paris to her father, then living at the Port-Royal des Champs, dated July 10, 1664, forms the touching prelude to the violent intrusion of the Archbishop and his clerical and secular satellites.

"The hour of conflict," she writes, "is so near, that being unable to foresee whether we shall pass through it alive, I intreat you to give us the comfort of seeing you before we die."

The threatened hour came on the 27th of the following month, and the convent was entered by almost a host of invaders, shamefully led on to their work of intimidation by the Archbishop of Paris, M. de Péréfixe. Threats of extreme severities were followed up by the demand to open the gates of the convent to the Archbishop, who, assembling the community, ordered the sisters to form a chapter. After making the protestations of kindness and forbearance, invariably put forth by those who are about to commit some cruel action, the Archbishop, raising his voice, said: "To-day, my dear sisters, I am come to carry out my design. Let those whom I intend to take away listen attentively." He then gave out the names of the eleven recalcitrant nuns who had so nobly refused to perjure themselves by signing the formulary, and pronounced his sentence of their removal from the convent.

---

<sup>1</sup> Tom. i., pp. 162-171.

He then ordered them to retire to their houses, to which they would be conducted until his further order. To this outrageous and insulting proceeding the mother superior, the Mère Madeleine de St. Agnès, of the noble house of Ligni, made this worthy answer in behalf of all the community :

“ Monseigneur, we hold ourselves bound in conscience to appeal from this violence, and to protest, as we do now, that all that has been done or may be done against us is null and void.” Hereupon the community joined in exclaiming with one voice : “ We appeal, we protest, we protest !” “ What !” cried the Archbishop, “ you appeal against your Archbishop ? Take care that you do not get your affairs into a worse state. I ridicule the idea—protest, appeal, do what you will—but you shall obey me !”<sup>1</sup>

In vain the unfortunate sisters fell at the feet of this merciless tyrant, entreating him to have pity, if not on them, at least on the dying Sister Agnes, who had had three attacks of apoplexy, and to whom this terrible blow would almost bring certain death. Force and violence having now been found ineffectual, recourse was had to persuasions and solicitations ; but the constancy of the community was proof against every temptation to surrender to treachery what they had so successfully defended against the most violent assaults of an almost irresistible combination of temporal and spiritual adversaries. The Archbishop had resolved to break up the opposition by placing over the sisters an abbess of another order, who had yielded to the fatal temptation and signed the humiliating formulary. The reader will bear in mind that this did not involve merely a confession of faith, but a declaration of fact. The Port-Royalists were not disputing the decisions of the Pope in the one case, but his claim to determine a matter of fact ; and to compel them to declare on oath, in the most solemn form, that he had rightly interpreted the words of Jansenius, whose doctrine was beyond their comprehension, and had justly excommunicated its author, of whose life and alleged heresy they knew nothing. Never in the history of the world had a more monstrous claim been put forth, and never, we might add, had the assertion of such a claim been more nobly and bravely resisted. The Port-Royalists at this critical moment were as well armed for their defence against the subtleties of the Jesuits as they were against the violence of M. de Péréfixe and his satellites. The extraordinary skill with which the Sister Angélique d’Hecaucourt de Charmont maintained her cause against M. Chamillard shows that the argumentative power of the nuns was equal to their heroic constancy in defence of the truth.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Tom. iii., pp. 271-274.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 290-437.

The expulsion of the eleven more influential and distinguished of the sisters from the Port-Royal, and their relegation to other monasteries where they were treated as prisoners and allowed to converse with no one, and the occupation of the convent by the Mère Eugénie and her nuns of Ste. Marie formed the ground of the appeal of the outraged community to the Parliament of Paris. The fact that all this was done by the Archbishop without any form of law or pronouncement of sentence, and without any *procès verbal* having been drawn up to record it, enabled the appellants to have recourse to the *appel comme d'abus*, which forms so important a feature in French jurisprudence.

From August, 1664, to July, 1665, the "government," or rather (to speak truly), "the tyranny" of M. Chamillard, the confessor set over the community by the Archbishop, was carried on; but its result was rather the more confirmed resolution of the sisters to refuse to sign the formulary, than the success of his alternate threats and persuasions. The dispersion of the rest of the sisters was threatened; and the relegation of the Sister de Charmont, whose argumentative skill has been already mentioned, to the house of the Port-Royal des Champs was one of the earliest indications of the design of the Archbishop to break up the entire community.

The grand and ruling spirit which directed the resistance of the sisters still remaining at Paris was the Mère Angélique de St. Jean Arnauld, who, though her influence was exercised from a distance, seemed from her very separation from them outwardly to give them a greater strength and a more continuous inspiration. Her words of consolation and encouragement, full of eloquence and beauty, and enriched by the theological knowledge she had acquired from her father, as well as by the deep experiences of her own life, form a treasury of Christian practice and doctrine from which every spiritual mind might derive lessons of the highest value. And truly at this critical moment such a resource was deeply needed. The threatened denial of absolution and virtual excommunication of the sisterhood by the privation of the Sacraments was soon carried out in practice. The infatuation of the Court of Rome had inserted another article in its already extensive creed; had added another fact to the great facts upon which the faith of Christians rests, but a fact which involved a falsehood, and a violation of the claims of conscience such as was never before demanded from the member of any Christian Church whatever. This cruel and unnatural proceeding had, however, a very salutary, though unexpected, result. It gave a spiritual elevation to the minds of the sufferers which raised them to a higher and grander view of the nature of the Sacraments and



their spiritual meaning and design, and drew forth from the *Mère Angélique* a beautiful confession of the truth in connection with the Sacraments, and of the value of that higher and internal communion in them, of which all the malice and cruelty of their enemies could not deprive them. After reminding them of the unjust excommunications of earlier ages of the Church, and the declaration of St. Augustine that those who are unjustly excommunicated "God, who seeth in secret, crowns in secret," and of the noble words of one of their body to the Archbishop, who refused her the Sacrament because she had refused to sign the formulary: "We will not sign it in order that we may communicate, because if we had signed it we should judge ourselves for ever unworthy of the Holy Communion," she continues:

"It is not sufficient to believe that you have not the least temptation in the world to sign in order that you may communicate, and that it is absolutely necessary to suffer in peace the privation of the Sacraments. You ought, further, to force yourself to see that, judging of things according to the faith, this necessity is not a source of misery. For it is certain that to attach all the virtue of the Sacraments to their outward character and to the exterior sign, is to regard them in a Jewish, and not in a Christian manner. It is in this that they are principally distinguished from the Sacraments of the ancient law, that they are full of God and of His Spirit. But the Spirit of God is not attached to the outward element. He communicates Himself to souls by His own self, and in yet greater abundance when they are deprived of the outward means, not for their infidelity, but for having inviolably kept the faith. Never has there been a more appropriate occasion for our belief that the truth of the Lord Jesus Christ is fulfilled in us: 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing.' For as those who receive unworthily, receive the body of Christ to their condemnation, those from whom it is unjustly withheld, while they receive not the body of Christ, receive His Spirit, which is the source of holiness and life."<sup>1</sup> She then reminds her companions in privation of the example of St. Paul the Hermit, who lived for near a hundred years in the desert without any means of communicating, and of the Anchorites mentioned by St. Augustine, who only communicated once a year. She then consoles them with the reflection that the very humiliation they are enduring ought to be a special consolation to them. The privation of the Sacrament was the lot of the penitents in the ancient Church. They were in the lowest rank among her children,

---

<sup>1</sup> Tom. i.; p. 301.

and the Son of God bids us take that lowest place. She reminds them next of the man who was born blind, and who was cast out of the synagogue for his testimony to the power of Christ. Finally, she points to the contrast drawn by St. Gregory the Great, between the officer who desired Christ to come to his house to heal his son, and the centurion who thought he was unworthy that Christ should come to him, and desired Him to speak the word only that his servant might be healed; and she shows how closely those who communicate in spirit, and not visibly, resemble the good centurion, believing as they do, that though His sacramental presence is denied them, His spiritual presence is able to heal them through the infusion of His grace and Holy Spirit, since by His very least word, even uttered at a distance, He can give life and health. It was thus that the light sprang up to those who in the brighter day of temporal peace had been sitting in spiritual darkness, and who discovered for the first time in the day of affliction that "the flesh profiteth nothing." But the light that was thus breaking in upon them cleared up other doctrines also, and removed from their hearts the veil which human subtlety and priestly authority had woven between their souls and the Saviour. This veil was most effectually lifted by the *Mère Agnès*, in a remarkable memoir on the subject of confession. It will be remembered that she was the afflicted person who was scarcely expected to outlive the day of the Archbishop's inroad. The title of the brief treatise is "On Confession, Internal and Spiritual, which is made to the Prince of Priests, Jesus Christ our Lord."<sup>1</sup>

"In order not to deprive ourselves of the grace which is received in Sacramental confession, we should place in its stead another confession, which is not less effectual, if we bring to it the dispositions which are necessary for the former kind of confession, in which we address ourselves to the ministers of Jesus Christ in lieu of that which we address immediately to Himself, who, as the Sovereign Pontiff, neither needs the power to pardon our sins, nor the knowledge and wisdom to judge them with equity." She then proceeds to show how this higher confessional is to be entered. Upon imagining our Lord Jesus Christ to be seated in the same tribunal in which He will judge mankind, we are to ask for His benediction as we ask it of the priest, in order to enable us to give a true confession. Then she enjoins a careful self-examination and review of our state during the week both in deed and in thought. After this full confession, and the diligent fulfilment of those acts of penitence which the suppliant imposes on himself, he is quali-

---

<sup>1</sup> Tom. i., p. 235.

fied to be present at the Mass, as being confident that he has received absolution from Christ Himself.

To return to the history of the persecution, we find that the eleven sisters who were transferred to distant convents were treated rather as State prisoners than as nuns affiliated to other houses. The captivity of the Mère Angélique was specially severe. "God has favoured her," writes the Mère Agnès, "with a heavier captivity than all our other sisters who were taken away with her; as she was kept under lock and key for six months, a severity which was not exercised to any other."<sup>1</sup>

The supervision which was carried on over the house of Port-Royal des Champs was so severe that its inmates were not allowed to see anyone. Their devoted friend M. de Ste. Marthe contrived, by mounting a tree which rose above the wall of the garden, to address words of comfort and encouragement to the unfortunate captives who were on the other side, and this was carried on even in the season of winter.

Meantime, the priests who had refused to sign the formulary were exiled to various parts of France, some as far as the Isle of Oléron. The lives of many of these devoted witnesses to the truth might well deserve a place in the martyrology of the Christian Church, but one of them has a special interest and a fuller record than any other. The Maître de Sacy and his cruel persecutions and long captivity in the Bastille fill a most eventful and important page in the history of the Port-Royal. The greater part of the fourth volume of our collection, from p. 159 to p. 411, is taken up with this subject, and opens to us a vivid picture of the state of French society in the second half of the seventeenth century. We gather from it that the personal liberty of the noblest and best of the subjects of the kingdom was at the mercy of judges and officials whose sole object was to pander to the passions and caprices of the most corrupt and dissolute court in Europe; that all who were endeavouring to live a higher life, and to rise above the level of the multitude and the influence of Jesuit teaching, were regarded as dangerous and suspected persons, and that the newly-invented crime of holding the Augustinian doctrines of grace, miscalled Jansenism, was regarded as involving the guilt both of heresy and treason.

There is little doubt that M. de Péréfixe, the Archbishop who so ingloriously triumphed at Port-Royal, was the main-spring of the persecution of the Maître de Sacy, which followed that of the sisters, in May, 1666. For when he heard that

---

<sup>1</sup> Tom. i., p. 231.

M. de Sacy and his companions were still under guard at the place of their detention, he exclaimed, with visible disappointment: "What? are they not already at the Bastille?" and went to St. Germain immediately after to effect their removal thither. Meantime the sisters of Port-Royal des Champs were not slow to send words of touching and almost inspired comfort to M. de Sacy, and among these the *Sœur Angélique* was the most prominent and the most effectual in her sympathy and devotion. She consoled him with the thought of the example of Christ when He foreshowed His approaching sufferings, and asked His disciples who' deprecated them, "How else shall the Scripture be fulfilled that thus it must be?" The deportation of the Jansenist prisoners to the Bastille speedily followed. M. de Sacy was kindly received by the governor of the famous prison, and his friend M. Hérissant was permitted to be with him. But this mildness was of short duration. Orders came from the Court that he was to be treated with great severity, and regarded as a prisoner of consideration and influence.

The life of M. de Sacy in the Bastille was one of constant reading of the Scriptures—which he afterwards so beautifully translated—of silent meditation, and of unceasing prayer. The prisoners were allowed a daily walk on the terrace of the prison, which the impatience and ill-temper of the guard who accompanied them made by no means a very pleasant relaxation. One of the most cruel and relentless of these guards was killed in an affray, to the great grief of the governor, whom in all his worst qualities he closely resembled. The picture which M. de Sacy draws of the Bastille, its wretched inmates and savage officers, is in the highest degree exciting and graphic. Many of the unfortunate captives had been reduced to insanity or idiotcy by the cruel conditions of captivity in which they were placed, shut up in horrible dungeons built in the fosse of the fortress, without light or warmth, and praying only for the relief of death. Many of them were merely charged with uttering some disrespectful word of the king—probably falsely charged—and condemned, without inquiry and without a trial, to be immured, perhaps for life, in this den of wickedness and misery.

M. de Sacy gives many interesting anecdotes of his companions in the Bastille, including an amusing account of the young Gascon officers of the establishment, but he closes with the suggestive words: "*La reste de ceux qui demeuroient à la Bastille, étoient ou fous, ou presque fous, ou en état de le devenir.*"<sup>1</sup> It was little less than a vast establishment for the creation of lunacy by the exercise of cruelties which left the

---

<sup>1</sup> Tom. iv., p. 275.

sufferers in a state of physical prostration and mental despair. Through the skilful management of his friends, M. de Sacy was able to keep up the correspondence with the Port-Royal which was so unspeakable a source of comfort and support to the sisters and to himself. His great influence over them induced the Court to offer him his release if he would promise to break off all connection with them. This he indignantly refused to do, and the prolongation of his captivity was due to this honourable resolution. He suffered with them the privation of the Sacraments, which was the bitterest ingredient in the cup of their affliction. Returning to his description of his companions in captivity: "It would be waste time," he writes, "to describe more particularly the other prisoners in the Bastille. Their misery is greater than one can imagine. It is an image of hell, and nothing can be more horrible than a place where nearly all the officials, from the governor to the porter, and where all the prisoners, with the whole garrison, have not an ounce of charity. Those who have the means drink, smoke, and play; the others, who have nothing, storm and cry; those who are in close confinement cast missiles, by which they make themselves heard, though they are not seen."

But not the terrors of the Bastille nor the solicitations of the Court and its creatures could shake the constancy of the Port-Royalists in their fiery trial. The recreant nuns, who were the gaolers of the sisters at Port-Royal des Champs, were justly regarded by M. de Sacy as far more culpable than the gaolers of the Bastille, inasmuch as they were women dedicated to God, while the male persecutors were mere brutalized beings, whose only motive was a base avarice and a great barbarity.

In 1668 M. de Sacy was released from his terrible captivity. He lived till the year 1684, and all France is said to have mourned his loss. The light of his great example, which had kindled so many others, shone even through the thick darkness that covered France on the publication of the fatal Bull *Unigenitus* in the year 1713. In that constitution the doctrines of Quesnal were condemned, as those of Jansenius had been in the earlier day, and the old controversy burst forth into a flame which smouldered until the day of the Revolution, when the terrible judgment of the sins of the Court of Rome and the Court of France fulfilled the words of the prophet, "Because I have purged thee and thou wast not purged, thou shalt not be purged from thy filthiness any more, till I have caused My fury to rest upon thee" (Ezek. xxiv. 13). The purifying influence of the Port-Royal, which had spread for a while like leaven through the corrupt society of France, had been crushed out and destroyed. The scene of the great revival had been sacrilegiously violated and desecrated

under circumstances of brutality too dreadful to contemplate without horror and amazement. The cemetery in which so many saintly women had been laid to rest was broken up and their remains scattered by the roadside, and even torn limb from limb. The story is too terrible for translation, and can hardly bear the transfer of its horrors to another language than that in which it has reached us. We will give it, therefore, to the reader in the original :

LETTRE DE \* \* \* LE 2 FÉVRIER, 1712.

Mr. \* \* vertueux Ecclésiastique, m'a raconté ce qui suit, le premier Janvier dernier.

Son frère étoit à la chasse avec un de ses Amis environ le 15 Décembre, 1711, aux environs de Port-Royal des Champs ; avant de retourner chez eux, ils eurent envie d'aller voir ce qui se passoit à Port-Royal, où on leur avoit dit qu'on déterroit les morts. Ils y allèrent donc et entrèrent dans l'Église, où ils virent plusieurs hommes qui creusoient la terre et en tiroient les morts dont quelqu'uns n'étoient pas à moitié pourris. Ils entendirent ces hommes dire les sotises les plus infames à l'occasion des membres nus qu'ils trouvoient. Ils leur virent rompre ces corps et les jeter hors des fosses, ne pouvant pas les enlever tout entiers. . . . ces ouvriers buvoient, rioient, chantoient et se moquoient de ces personnes qu'ils trouvoient ainsi en chair. Mais ce qui est le plus horrible, c'est qu'ils en avoit dix chiens dans l'Église occupés à manger les chairs qui restoient encore à ces membres séparés des corps et personne ne s'avisoit de les chasser. Ces deux Messieurs furent indignés de voir une telle profanation. Ils chassèrent à coups de bouts de fusils les chiens, et s'en retournèrent bien étonnés et bien scandalisés de ce qu'ils avoient vu.<sup>1</sup>

We see here the predecessors, probably some of the ancestors, of the savages of the Reign of Terror in the next generation. We see the results of the teaching of that implacable society which had obtained so fatal an ascendancy over the Church and Court of France, and completed its work of cruel vengeance against the community of Port-Royal by ploughing up the very ground on which stood the last pillar of testimony in behalf of spiritual religion, and of warning against the sins of a corrupt and degenerate people. By a just dispensation of Providence the same violence which had been directed against the persecuted Jansenists fell upon the Church and people who had promoted or tolerated it. The once dreaded Bastille, fortress and prison, the scene of the sufferings of M. de Sacy and his devoted fellow-captives, was the first object of the vengeance of the populace, and its fall was the prelude of the Revolution which overthrew the dynasty and broke up the power of the feudal nobility who had taken so large a part in the demoralization of their country. Surely the great moral of all this history to every Church and people before whom the light of a great example and the standard of a higher life has been raised

<sup>1</sup> Tom. iv., p. 59.

is the same; and it is given us in the words of our Lord Himself:

“Yet a little while is the light with you; walk while ye have the light, lest darkness come upon you.”

ROBERT C. JENKINS.

---

## ART. II.—INSPIRATION.<sup>1</sup>

ONE of the mental tendencies of the age is to minimize the supernatural. In no region of thought do we see this tendency more manifest than in present-day views of inspiration. I see English Churchmen, of great scholarship, of profound research, of untiring industry, and, I must add, of earnest piety, coming under this influence. As we study their writings we are reminded of a forest, whose trees, by their bent, show the quarter of the prevailing wind. We have not to discuss on this occasion the question of a revelation. “The idea of a written revelation may be said to be logically involved in the notion of a living God.” John Stuart Mill writes: “On the hypothesis of a God who made the world, the probability of His communicating Himself is inevitable.” If God speaks to man He must speak through man. “God inspires,” says Dr. Fairbairn in his “Christ and Modern Theology” (p. 496), “man reveals; inspiration is the process by which God gives; revelation is the mode or form, word-character or institution in which man embodies what he has received.” The Bible has, therefore, a human side, as well as a Divine. The relationship between the two is the question which is agitating the Church to-day. In the limits of a paper necessarily brief, I must state at once that my object is to meet certain conclusions of the Higher Critics with reference to the Pentateuch, its Mosaic authorship, and its historic accuracy. I shrink from the task, but if I can safeguard the mind of any younger brother from any hasty conclusions—if from the imperfect consideration of a fragment of a great subject I can stimulate him as regards the question of inspiration to “ask” as he has never done before “for the old paths where,” I believe, “is the good way”—I shall be thankful indeed. I venture to tell him my own experience after a somewhat careful study of the subject. I find in my mind, on the one side, a rectification of some traditional beliefs; and, on the other, a realization, such as I never had before, that “every Scripture” (*πᾶσα γραφή*), whether historic

---

<sup>1</sup> A paper read before the Yorkshire Evangelical Union, at the Victoria Hall, York, Friday, June 22, 1894.

or prophetic, is "given by inspiration of God." If our anchors begin to drag from their moorings we may make shipwreck of our faith. The mind of man, created to lean upon the unseen, demands an infallible "rule of faith." Let a man lose the sense of the Divine authority of the Word, and he either wanders into the morass of scepticism or seeks rest in a Church which professes the infallibility which the constitution of man's moral nature demands.

"Modern theology," says Bishop Ellicott in his "Christus Comprobator" (p. 71), "leaves the earlier formative and fundamental periods of the history of Israel almost completely without a literature, in order that it may concentrate all the productive energies of the nation in the age of Ezra." Professor Sanday, in his Bampton Lectures (p. 227), says that "the critical school would assign the change from the oral to the written Scriptures to two moments in Jewish history: (1) the moment at which the prophets of action made way for the writing prophets, *i.e.*, according to the current view when Amos and Hosea succeeded to Elijah and Elisha, in the middle of the eighth century; and (2) the promulgation of the Deuteronomic law by Josiah, 621 B.C." Professor Ryle, in his book on the "Canon of the Old Testament" (chap. ii.), writes: "It is not until the year 625 B.C., the eighteenth year of the reign of King Josiah, that the history of Israel presents us with the first instance of a book which was regarded by all—king, priests, prophets, and people alike—as invested not only with sanctity, but also with supreme authority in all matters of religious conduct." I will take one sentence from Wellhausen, in which he assigns a reason for this late period of authoritative writings. He says that it "hardly admits of any other answer than that" a "non-literary had developed into a literary age." We must consider this statement. The culture of the East, in which the earliest periods of Israel shared, has been proved to be literary from the remotest epoch. I need not remind you of the disintombled libraries of Assyria and Babylonia. I keep to Palestine and Egypt, the cradles of the Jewish people. The Siloam inscription discovered in 1880, if not of the age of Hezekiah, near that age, proves, from the formation of its letters, that the Jews were accustomed to write with the pen. The inscription is pure Biblical Hebrew. Professor Sayce, who is to the Higher Critics what Balaam was to Israel, says ("Higher Criticism and the Monuments," p. 380) that the Siloam inscription proves "that the Hebrew spoken in Jerusalem before the exile" is identical "with that of our Old Testament books. At the time when the inscription was written the Hebrew language was already that which is embodied in the Biblical text." Recent discoveries prove



that Moses lived about 1290 B.C. Professor Driver states that the discovery of the "Book of the Law" by Hilkiah in the temple was 621 B.C. The interval, therefore, between Moses and Josiah is under 700 years. The question arises, Is there a probability of a language remaining unchanged, as a comparison of the Book of Jeremiah with the Book of Deuteronomy, if of the age of Moses, would indicate? The late Bishop of Bath and Wells answers: the Latin of Plautus is the same as the Latin of Gregory the Great, 800 years afterwards, and the Greek of Thucydides is the same as that of Procopius, a thousand years later. I turn to the East, where all things are conservative, and a great Arabic scholar tells us that the Arabic spoken at Mecca to-day is precisely the same Arabic as that of the Qurân, twelve centuries before. The comparison of the papyri rolls is still more striking. At an interval of 1,000 years there is not even the slightest change in grammar. "You will see, then," says the Bishop, in his admirable little book on "The Chronicles" (p. 39), "that there is not the slightest improbability in the Hebrew of the Pentateuch being really the Hebrew of the Mosaic age."

I turn at once from the highest probabilities to ascertained facts. The marvellous discovery of the Tell-el-Amarna cuneiform tablets proves not only that the populations of Western Asia in the age of Moses were highly cultured and literary, but also that the Babylonian language was the medium of literary intercourse from the Nile to the Tigris and the Euphrates, just as Latin was the medium of communication in Europe in the Middle Ages, or the *Lingua Franca* in the time of the Crusades. The land of Canaan was included in this condition. Among these tablets are letters from Jerusalem and Lachish, from Gaza and Megiddo, from Tyre and from Sidon. We understand now more clearly than before why the early Canaanite name of Debir before its captivity by Othniel should be Kirjath-Sepher, "City of Book," and in Josh. xv. 49 Kirjath-Sannah, "the City of Instruction." In that early age there were scribes and schools of scribes not only in Jerusalem, but certainly in one, and most probably in many towns of Palestine. Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians; he probably studied these very records; one thing is certain, he had before him authentic documents. Take one instance: I select Melchisedek, because those of the school of Wellhausen have always spoken of him as a myth (I use the term in its technical sense). The facts stated about Melchisedek in Genesis are, as regards the historical books, a "single instance," as in the case of Sargon in Isaiah. We have in these tablets Ebed-Tob, who tells us that he was not appointed King of Jerusalem by any earthly potentate.

He says that his position did not come "from his father or his mother." He was King of Jerusalem because he was priest of its God. Here we have in these tablets the records of a king-priest. We have the reasons why he should be called King of Salem and not of Jerusalem. They prove that the description of Melchisedek in Genesis is in accordance with facts. They prove, above all, that the inhabitants of Canaan recorded events upon imperishable clay long before the time of Moses, or the entrance of Israel into the promised land. The objection to the Mosaic age of the Pentateuch—"that the Pentateuch betrays a much higher state of civilization than could have existed at so early an age"—falls pointless in our present-day knowledge of the high culture of Egypt in the earliest times—a land which stood far ahead of all contemporary nations, and was the leader of the civilization of the world—a land in which the Israelites went to school, so to speak, for more than two hundred years. In this literary culture Moses, their law-giver and prophet, stood pre-eminent.

2. I must at once, and very briefly, address myself to another fact which contravenes the views of the Higher Critics as to the late period of the Pentateuch. The records are those of a writer, or compiler, of the time—speaking generally, of one who was intimately and personally acquainted with the facts recorded. I would say in passing that in those historic portions where the writer of the Pentateuch was not contemporary he is evidently recording, under "selective inspiration," from documents, and not from oral tradition. We must all have noticed that impostors, when cross-questioned, always "come to grief" on minute details. The Tichborne Claimant was a notable instance. How is it that, in the minutest details, in points where mistakes could easily have been made, the records of Israel in Egypt are proved to be absolutely accurate? Time will only allow me to give one illustration out of hundreds. I will select one not found in the many books which prove the point before us. Until recent years it was believed that the Pharaohs of the Oppression and the Exodus lived at Memphis. We are told incidentally in the Book of Exodus that Pharaoh's daughter was in the habit of bathing in the Nile, by which Memphis was situated, and that the mother of Moses placed her infant in an ark of bulrushes among the flags of the river. The Nile at Memphis abounded in crocodiles—surely here we have a "slip!" We know now that Rameses II., the great oppressor of the Hebrews, removed his capital, as a matter of State policy, to Zoan, the ancient capital of the shepherd kings. He rebuilt the city, and called it after his own name. "And they (the Israelites) built for Pharaoh treasure cities, Pithom and Raamses." Here his son and successor Menephtah, the Pharaoh

of the Exodus, lived and reigned. Here Moses wrought his miracles. "Marvellous things did He (God) in the field of Zoan." It is an interesting fact that *the branch of the Nile on which Zoan was built is the only part of the river or its branches in which the crocodile was never found.* No one will ever persuade me that these narratives of the Pentateuch were written in a late period of the history of Israel. They were written by some Israelite who lived in Egypt at the time covered by the records. Strauss did not fail to perceive the force of this line of argument. He naïvely remarks, in his "Leben Jesu": "The books which describe the departure of the Israelites from Egypt and their wanderings through the wilderness bear the name of Moses, who, being their leader, would undoubtedly give a faithful history of these occurrences, unless he designed to deceive; and who, if his intimate connection with Deity described in these books be historically true, was eminently qualified by virtue of such connection to produce a credible history of the earlier periods." In this point I agree with Strauss rather than with the Higher Critics, who say that the Pentateuch was written partly in the days of Josiah, and partly in the post-exilic age in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. It is very significant that Ewald, who declares that Deuteronomy was written in the reign of Manasseh, is obliged to make his supposed author live in Egypt, to account for his remarkable acquaintance with Egyptian customs. I unhesitatingly declare my belief in the traditional view of the Jewish and Christian Churches.

I think that those who have at all studied the subject must hold what Bishop Ellicott calls "the rectified traditional view," and that, as regards the Book of Genesis, Moses was a compiler or editor, rather than an original composer—in other words, that he had before him primeval documents, patriarchal records, registers and biographies, archives, in part the property of the Hebrew race, and partly a possession common to that race with others, and that, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, he chose such as were historically true, and which bore upon the religious history of the human race. It is a strange and interesting fact that the only book out of the five which expressly claims to be from the hand of Moses, that of Deuteronomy, is the very book which modern criticism refuses to admit to be of Mosaic authorship. With reference to the anachronisms of the Pentateuch, I can only refer my readers to the extremely valuable remarks of Lord Arthur Hervey in his book "Chronicles in relation to the Pentateuch," published by the Christian Knowledge Society. We do not deny that the Pentateuch may have been authoritatively revised more than once; hence the glosses which do exist; and then finally edited

by Ezra, under inspiration. This fact would explain the occurrence of "Chaldaisms" in the text. We quietly wait for further light. "There is nothing new to Him who is from everlasting." Those are weighty words of the late Bishop Wordsworth in his "Introduction to the Pentateuch": "Faith, Patience, and Humility are wise readers of the Bible; and Time is an excellent interpreter."

3. I must mention a third reason why the Higher Critics impugn the authenticity of the Pentateuch and deny its historic character. They say that "there is no evidence of the existence of the Mosaic institutions between the time of the Exodus, when the Mosaic laws purport to have been given, and the later times of the Jewish monarchy." I can only suggest reasons for disbelief in a statement so subversive of inspiration. The Mosaic ritual as a whole cannot be of later introduction than the time of the Judges, from the fact that twelve or thirteen of its chief points are noted as being at that time in force. It is always dangerous to argue from silence. Here the silence is only partial. The Scriptures do not give us an exhaustive account of all the events which happened in those times of which they wrote, but only such a selection as seemed good to the wisdom of God, *e.g.*, there is an absolute blank as to the events of thirty-eight out of forty years in the life of Israel in the wilderness. Is there silence with reference to the Mosaic institutions? Take the Tabernacle, in which the ritual centred. I ask are there no traces of the existence of this tabernacle between the Exodus and the reign of Solomon? I read, Joshua xviii. 1, "And the whole congregation of the children of Israel assembled together at Shiloh and set up the tabernacle of the congregation there." Jeremiah confirms this statement. Again, in 2 Sam. vii. 6, the answer of God by Nathan to David is decisive: "Whereas I have not dwelt in any house since the time that I brought up the children of Israel out of Egypt even to this day, but have walked in a tent and in a tabernacle." Again, 1 Kings i. 39, "Zadok took a horn of oil out of the tabernacle and anointed Solomon." At the consecration of Solomon's temple we read that the Priests and Levites "brought up the ark of the Lord and the tabernacle of the congregation, and all the holy vessels that were in the tabernacle." The writer of the second book of Chronicles adds, chap. i. 3: "The tabernacle of the congregation of God which Moses the servant of the Lord had made in the wilderness." The Tabernacle of Witness is mentioned eighty times in the Pentateuch, and in the other historical books eighteen times. We have six recorded instances of the observance of the Passover, and we have hints of others. We have the unbroken succession of High Priests from Aaron to

Zadok. In the Chronicles we have the genealogy of High Priests, beginning with Aaron and ending with Jaddua, containing twenty-nine generations. We meet with nineteen men filling the great office of High Priest, each turning up in his right chronological place. Priests and Levites always appear as occasion requires, and yet we are told by Kuenen in the *Hexateuch*, and by Wellhausen in his "History of Israel," that the Priestly Code, which comprises the great bulk of what has been commonly known as the Mosaic or Levitical Law, with its whole round of sacrifice, priesthood, central sanctuary, one altar, dates from about B.C. 445 (Hervey, p. 10), that there was no such thing as the tabernacle and the ceremonial law in the time of Moses, but in the imagination of credulous men like the writer, and, it may be, the reader of this paper. Kuenen says of the altar of witness, "It is an absolutely unhistorical invention framed to defend the doctrine of a unique sanctuary" (p. 109), and Wellhausen, the high priest of the critics, in defiance of the facts I have just mentioned, has the hardihood to say that "the suddenness with which the full-grown hierarchy descended on the wilderness from the skies, is only matched by the suddenness with which it disappeared from Canaan, leaving no trace behind" (p. 127). An objector says, "Look at the infraction of the Ceremonial Law! Look at David's 'Priests of the tribe of Judah!'" Is this a proof that the Mosaic ritual was not yet in existence? Precepts may be heard and known, and not carried out in fact. An authority may be acknowledged, and yet not obeyed. I ask a question. You believe that the moral law was given by Moses? Yes. Because David broke the seventh Commandment in the case of Uriah's wife, did that infraction of the moral law prove its non-existence?

I come at once to the last and much the most important part of my subject. What was our Lord's attitude to the Pentateuch? We are face to face with a question of vital interest. It is allowed (1) that the Old Testament, to which our Lord referred, was practically identical with that with which we have to do. (2) It is admitted on all hands that our Lord Jesus Christ taught plainly and unreservedly the Divine authority and Mosaic authorship of the books traditionally ascribed to him. I have, therefore, no necessity to prove this all-important point. Would that time had allowed me to show how carefully Christ authenticates as distinctly historical and official the very parts of Genesis which Canon Gore in his essay in "*Lux Mundi*" on "The Holy Spirit and Inspiration" describes as being "of the nature of myth, using the word in its technical sense, or of an allegorical picture." How do the Higher Critics meet this difficulty? Professor Sanday, the

most moderate of them, says in his "Oracles of God" (p. 111): "I should be loth to believe that our Lord accommodated his language to current notions, knowing them to be false. I prefer to think, as it has been happily worded, that He condescended not to know." But most men of his school would answer you that in His human nature Christ shared the ignorance of the men of His own generation. There is much confusion of argument. This is not a question of limitation of knowledge, but of liability to error.<sup>1</sup> Was the verdict of Jesus Christ fallible or infallible? Of whom are we speaking? (1) Of One who in His human nature was absolutely sinless by reason of His supernatural birth, and who had, therefore, a Divine illumination such as we cannot possess, and upon whom the Spirit was poured "without measure." (2) Of one who had qualities and powers above nature which it is indisputable both the body and soul of Christ did receive by the influence of Deity wherewith they were united. I ask all candid students to read again the fifth book of the "Ecclesiastical Polity," and ponder over Hooker's magnificent illustration of the heated sword. Standing upon these two facts as upon a rock, Christ's verdict of the Old Testament is the only one which I can possibly receive. Remove the supernatural from the historical books of the Old Testament, and you prepare the way for the denial of the evidence upon which the Incarnation rests. We who keep to the traditional view of the Old Testament regard it as Christ regarded it. In the words of another, "For Him it possessed the peculiar and awful characteristic of Divine authority. He stated no theory of its construction; but, looking upon it as it existed, He recognised in it the decisive utterance of God, even in its minor features of expression. For the mind which recognises in Jesus Christ all that He claimed to be, this verdict on the supernatural character and Divine authority of the Old Testament is final" (Moule's "Outlines of Christian Doctrine," p. 6). In conclusion, I would warn my readers of one of the most subtle errors, and, to my mind, one of the most dangerous positions of some of the men of the analytical school; subtle because it is a one-sided view of a most precious truth. They imply that those parts of the Scripture are inspired which "find" the soul. The word is that of Coleridge. In his "Confessions," p. 12, he says: "In the Bible there is more that *finds* me than I have experienced in all other books put together; and *whatever finds* me brings with it an irresistible evidence of its having proceeded from the Holy Spirit." In

---

<sup>1</sup> See Canon Liddon's masterly discussion of this subject. Bampton Lectures. Fourth edition. Pp. 453-472.

other words, I read the second book of Chronicles, it does not "find" me; I read the "Imitatio Christi," and it does "find" me—therefore the latter is inspired, the former is not. The written word is more than a reflection of the inward light; *it is an outward and objective revelation of God, which exists entirely independent of the intuitional faculty of the soul.* The whole historical record of the Old Testament is part of the great depository of God's revealed will. It comes to us with Divine credentials attested by Christ and the Apostles; it is Θεόπνευστα, "God-breathed." And yet there is an inward witness to the truth—there is an experimental evidence—there is a key which unlocks the sacred treasury. The sheep know the voice of the Divine Shepherd. I walk along the sea-shore; there is a pool of salt-water. I place in it a land-plant; it collapses and withers and dies. I take up a piece of sea-weed which seems half-dead, and place it in the pool; how beautifully it expands its feathery fibres, how brightly it unfolds its radiant hues, how joyously it waves its elegant streamers. There is an affinity between the sea-weed and the salt-water. "He that heareth hath the witness in himself."

J. W. BARDSLEY.



### ART. III.—JOSHUA'S LONG DAY AND THE SUN-DIAL OF AHAZ.

"The will of God has been active and operative as the sole cause throughout all ages of the world's creation and history."—Sir J. W. Dawson, "Origin of the World," p. 14.

**T**HE battle of Beth-horon (Josh. x. 8-14), one of the most wonderful in the world, is not so well known as are many of less importance. It was fought by Israel, under the leadership of Joshua, against five kings of the Amorites and their combined armies. The armies being discomfited by Israel with a great slaughter, the surviving Amorites were chased along the way to Beth-horon, and were smitten to Azekah and unto Makkedah. As they were going down to Beth-horon, "the Lord cast down great stones from heaven upon them unto Azekah, and they died: they were more which died with hailstones than they whom the children of Israel slew with the sword. Then spake Joshua to the Lord . . . and he said in the sight of Israel, Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon. And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. Is not this written in the Book of Jasher? So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not

to go down about a whole day. And there was no day like that before it or after it, that the Lord hearkened unto the voice of a man : for the Lord fought for Israel."

The account may have been taken from, or may merely refer to, a work then in existence, *Jasher*, the Book of the Upright, twice mentioned (*Josh. x. 13* ; *2 Sam. i. 18*), a book of songs in praise of Israel's great men. In any case, fables of falsities would have no record in Scripture ; and the miracles, being recorded, are a part of that whole which is by inspiration of God (*2 Tim. iii. 16*). Verses 13 and 14 are regarded as a quotation from the Book of *Jasher* : "The sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. . . . So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day. And there was no day like that before it or after it, that the Lord hearkened unto the voice of a man : for the Lord fought for Israel."

If we say "the strange occurrences were not miraculous, the sun and moon only seeming to stand, and the storm of stones but a greater storm than usual," that exchanges one miracle for another, which, if less wonderful, is not more credible. It was no miracle for stones to be rained from heaven, but it was a remarkable coincidence that they fell during the battle, and certainly a miracle that the Amorites were slain and the Israelites not injured.

History records many storms of stones. Livy mentions one very remarkable, and we have much more satisfactory evidence of them than that he gave. They are in relation to the meteors, shooting-stars, and aerolites, of which there are many systems within the solar domain ; not reckoned by "hundreds and thousands, but by millions and millions."<sup>1</sup> The November grand displays of star-falls are of the same order. In times past the earth has been again and again cannonaded by such splendid artillery, as it will be also in the future. Were we so placed as to see all the many and various systems within the sun's sphere of influence, they would appear as a complicated network of interlacing streams of cosmical matter. They are superbly vast, and related to systems greatly vaster ; for "as the sun is one among the stars, so the milky way is held to be but one among the nebulae."

They are arranged in heavenly and earthly periods and motions with an accuracy beyond that of our most skilfully-constructed chronometers. Upon unintelligent elements intelligible arrangements are enforced, and the harmonies of an all-embracing purpose. No man, even in a state of barbarity

---

<sup>1</sup> Richard A. Proctor, "The Universe," p. 54.



(as Cicero states, "De Nat. Deor.," L. ii., c. 34), "dubitet, quin ea Sphæra sit perfecta ratione;" and as for the scientific, they are well aware that we have the workmanship of reason displayed in the heavens, and, on the earth, day unto day uttereth speech.

Though the world is naturally full of miracles and mysteries, there is a strange unwontableness, almost incredibleness, as to the sun and moon appearing to stand still, owing to the pausing of the earth's aerial rotation, that renders the narrative a jest to unbelievers and a trouble to the weak in faith; it is therefore necessary to vindicate the reasonableness of our faith as to

### THE MIRACLE OF THE SUN AND MOON.

It would cause an alteration in the course of time. There have been two alterations. This during the life of Joshua; another in the days of Hezekiah, a recession marked by a measurement of ten degrees on the sun-dial of Ahaz (Is. xxxviii. 4-8; 2 Kings xx. 8-11; 2 Chron. xxxii. 24). The long day of Joshua, we are told, was made by an addition of twenty-three and one-third hours to the twenty-four which marked that day of the winter solstice. The reversal of the shadow, by ten degrees gone down in the sun-dial of Ahaz, added forty minutes; thus extending the twenty-three hours and twenty minutes of Joshua's day into one of twenty-four hours.

From Joshua's point of view, on the west of Gibeon, the sun would be in the east standing over Gibeon; and the moon far west, below the horizon, over the valley of Ajalon; the time, between eleven and twelve o'clock. Charles A. L. Hotten, Professor of Military Science and Tactics at Yale University, United States of America, writes that he has gone over calculations on the whole subject. The miracle occurred on the days of Tuesday, 24, and Wednesday, 25, of the fourth civil month of the year 2555 A.M., Jewish reckoning.<sup>1</sup> Calculating again, by reversal of the cycles, from the solar-eclipsing moon, June 17, 1890, A.D., Joshua's long day was 3,435 lunar years and ten lunations ago. The sun then stood over Gibeon, the moon over Ajalon, and Joshua was at Beth-horon. The sun was quiet, or still, שָׁמַת. The stoppage or retarding of the aerial movement of the earth concerns astronomy only so far as this: "Did such a conjunction, as the record demands, take place at Beth-horon within the limits set forth?" The reply is given by Professor Hotten: "It did."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "Joshua's Long Day," pp. 17-19.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 31, 35.

We neither refuse nor accept the Professor's statement. Some mathematicians assert that an accurate calculation cannot be made; others maintain that it can. An unbeliever, shutting his eyes against the most forcible proof, will say, "It is no proof." We, who believe, do wisely to rely on the plain statement of God's Word, though the whole world should say—"It is a lie."

As to belief in miracles, all men ought to believe. They are natural and universal; everything rests on miracle; nor can we explain anything apart from miracle. The so-called laws of nature are but the observed or usual sequences of phenomena in heaven and earth. The usual and the unusual are to be proved by exactly the same evidence. The outcry against miracle arises chiefly from ignorance, both as to the smallest and largest masses in the universe: because they are so large, or so small. Day by day we give credit to events which surpass our own experience; and age after age accepts in art and science and philosophy that which before was unknown and seemed impossible. The wonderfulness of an event is no plea against the evidence in support of it. The principle of belief is not to be confounded with the subject matter to which it is applied. Any alleged event is a possibility. The history of science is full of startling discoveries, and the secret of discovery is the art of finding surprises. God could effect a universal stoppage without causing the least perceptible tremor. For nature to be amazed, and the earth forget to go round, being so intent to see the battle, were very little things to Him who is the Maker of all.

Anyone may suppose, if he likes, that astronomy is silent as to any evidence concerning the miracle wrought in honour of Joshua; and probably always will be. Some persons will assure us that there was only an optical or apparent stoppage; only a seeming lengthening of the day—men were so weary; only an unusual refraction of light; only a remarkable continuance of lightning, turning night into day; only—something else; but miracles were plain enough to madden Porphyry and to stultify Gibbon. It is fully reasonable to side with the writer of the Book of Joshua. He believed in the correctness of his narrative, meant what he said, and wrote with scrupulous and accurate regard for the truth. He was not a man to tell a lie and call it poetry. Any theory, apart from miracle, is inconsistent with the character of a Divinely-inspired writer, and is baffled in every attempted interpretation. The supernatural is that founding and crowning of revelation without which there is no certainty for human faith; and, apart from the supernatural, we respectfully challenge any man to give either an intelligible or a reasonable interpretation whether as to the

origin or continuance of nature. It is our sense of the unknown, of the mysterious, of something that exceeds every thought and all present knowledge, which underlies all scientific, philosophical and artistic investigation.

A man may demonstrate to himself the universal prevalence of miracle. Imagine, with a scientific imagination, as commended by Professor Tyndall, an ultimate atom. It is in a state of ceaseless activity, and probably of continual change as to form; nevertheless, it is always the same, like an immortal being. If we combine two or more atoms in compound molecules, the molecules and constituent atoms are never at rest. We discern no motion, but we may aid our thought of it by a picture. Take a coloured disc, set it going, say, at the rate of sixty miles an hour, illuminate it with an electric flash, and the disc, during the time of the flash, will appear to be stationary. Not so with the molecules and elementary atoms: for could we light them up by a flash, they would vibrate many times during the exceedingly transient moment of that flash. Is this natural wonder less a miracle than the staying of the earth on her axis? Nay; the visible miracle looked on by Joshua and his army was not so marvellous, and is really more credible than the unseen prodigy which is now wrought every moment. The all but infinitesimal atoms contain in their inconceivable minuteness a galaxy of wonders surpassing the splendid spectacle of the sun giving light in the sky.

Another natural marvel. Chemical affinity may be taken as the highest known degree of heterogeneous attraction. Its action between the ultimate particles constitutes matter of distinct qualities and essence from any of its ingredients, and separates it from every sensible property, in common with its constituent elements, but that of their gravity combined, and not always that. Sir John Herschel observed, "A clever man, shut up alone, and allowed unlimited time, might reason out for himself all the truths of mathematics by proceeding from the simple notions of space and number of which he cannot divest himself without ceasing to think; but he could never tell, by any effort of reasoning, what would become of a lump of sugar if immersed in water, or what impression would be produced on the eye by mixing the colours of yellow and blue."<sup>1</sup> Thus a chemist, an artist, any man, may momentarily work natural miracles of an order altogether unimaginable by the inexperienced. Thus he may feed the high traditions of the earth, and help to spread and leave the sacred spirit of revelation in our children's breasts. We, and whatever is around us,

---

<sup>1</sup> "Discourse on Nat. Philos.," p. 76.

are full of mysteries, which it is not less our wisdom than our delight to penetrate.

Another remarkable event is that shown on

#### THE SUN-DIAL OF AHAZ :

the bringing back on that dial the shadow of the sun ten degrees, as a sign to Hezekiah of recovery from sickness (Isa. xxxviii. 1-8 ; 2 Kings xx. 4-11 ; 2 Chron. xxxii. 34).

The equinox of this year was remarkable, occurring at high-noon. Its advent was foreknown as an astronomical event by the ancient astronomers, and no doubt watched for. Ahaz had given himself to Sabaism, star-worship (2 Chron. xxviii. 22, 23), and had erected a sun-dial in connection with the idolatrous service as a sort of altar, and for observations of the sun-course. We can think of Hezekiah slowly dying, listening fearfully to Isaiah, and the priests watching the gradual approach of the shadow to noon-mark. The shadow is just about to coincide with the meridian. Isaiah inquires, "Shall it go back ten degrees, or forward ten degrees?" Hezekiah said, "It is a light thing for the shadow to go down ten degrees ; nay, but let the shadow return ten degrees" (2 Kings xx. 10, 11), and it returned. Men could not doubt the evidence of their senses. The king and the high priest would be the most amazed : the king now knowing himself restored by grace of heaven ; the high priest, most resolved, not letting belief take hold of him without this "sensible and true avouch to his own eyes."

To strengthen Hezekiah's faith, for the shadow to go forward, being usual and natural—we are not certain what portion of time is meant by degrees—would not avail ; but to go back would be a miracle, whatever the time. Archbishop Usher, in his annals, following the opinion of the ancient Jews and Christians, says, "The sun and all the heavenly bodies went back ; and as much as was detracted from the next night was added to this day." Some prefer to accept the smaller miracle as wrought on the dial ; not the larger, on the sun and moon and earth ; as if the wonder were optical, not cosmical, simply a phenomenon of refraction. They state : "the sun returned" (Isa. xxxviii. 8) ; this does not mean the sun in heaven, but the sun upon the dial." Now the event is certainly represented, and is meant to be understood, as a miracle ; and a miracle is not a snare for noble hearts, but a proof that holy hopes are not deceptions, and that our life has present meaning with full assurance of a future very wonderful.

Herodotus noted a record of the Egyptians : "that the sun had four times risen out of his usual quarter, and that he had twice risen where he now sets, and twice set where he now

rises; yet that no change in the things of Egypt was occasioned by this, either with regard to the productions of the earth or the river, or with regard to diseases, or with respect to deaths" ("Euterpe," 142). To this may be added: It was not likely that a star-gazing people like the Babylonians would be ignorant of the wonder wrought on behalf of Hezekiah. We rightly regard the ambassadors of Babylon, with their present, as not only coming to congratulate Hezekiah on his recovery, but to learn of the sun-miracle. "The princes of Babylon . . . sent unto him to inquire of the wonder that was done in the land" (2 Chron. xxxii. 31).

Professor Hotten, in "Joshua's Long Day, and The Dial of Ahaz," states—we give a summary of his words: The autumnal equinox of 1889 A.D., on Sunday, September 22, did not really commence until its sundown had been recorded at the eastern primary meridian. The ephemeris time of this autumnal equinox was about 8.45 after Greenwich mean noon of that Sunday, which is set back just six hours from the old time; and the true time was about two hours forty-five minutes after the Greenwich mean sunset beginning, of this particular Sunday, or nine hours thirty-seven minutes thirty-one seconds after sunset, commencement of ancient sunset at meridian; but it only comes so by intercalation of twenty-four hours. This intercalation being the twenty-three and one-third hours (about a whole day), and the forty minutes' backward motion in Hezekiah's time on the sun-dial of Ahaz. Thus the calendar is made correct.

The two events form the complement of each other, and their combined action wrote a unique day in our chronology. We may approach the verification thus: the lunar, or metonic cycle, is a period of nineteen tropical years, or nineteen years, two hours and a few seconds. The year 1890 A.D. was the tenth of this current cycle, and the epoch is nine, that is, the moon was nine days old on January 1. Careful calculation shows that the sun and moon were in conjunction at mid-day of the winter solstice of 2555 A.M.; and their epact was at that time 0, a cycle was then beginning. There are in 3,334 years 175 full cycles and nine-nineteenths of a cycle, hence the solar year beginning at the winter solstice of 1889 A.D., was the ninth year of the 176th metonic cycle from Joshua's long day. Advance 1,441 solar years from that long day, and we have the birth of our Saviour.

An important fact should be noted. Despite changes in heaven, earth, and computations of time, the measured sequence of weeks, months, years has not been lost. Through the Flood, the Confusion at Babel, Joshua's Long Day, the Change marked on the Dial of Ahaz, the Weeks of Daniel to the Birth and

Sepulchre of our Lord, there has been no utterly confusing break. Men of every region, time, and religion have preserved the knowledge of an orderly, timely sequence as to days—sacred and profane—weeks, months, years, with sufficient accuracy.

This accuracy could hardly have been preserved had the writers of the Old Testament books been very numerous, and were their compositions liable to be altered by others more numerous and even less known. The unfolding of religious truth, by the advance of revelation, would scarcely be assured from human caprice and grave error, were the selection from so many small inspirations to be made by another unknown many, mere editors without any inspiration whatever. It was the personal indwelling of men by the Holy Ghost which gave unique glory to the Pentecost; and it was the known communion of Moses and of the prophets with the Almighty and wise God that made the Bible precious. Holy and inspired men were not in clusters; nor would Israel have believed, nor can we have undoubting faith, in itinerant books of wandering formation by men of uncertain name and dwelling. The most profound scholars, in union with touching reverence, themselves capable of most critical and accurate investigation, familiar with all that is useful in sceptical research, regard the darkest, most difficult, and improbable events, as amongst those readings whose very improbability guarantees their genuineness. Men are only strong as they rest on God; and we cannot, we will not, think that self-seeking priests, opposed by fault-finding, disputing, professional prophets, produced a book whose God-like character has won undying love from those good and great who beautify and sanctify the world.

Demonstration that the past is not the only age of miracles, but a mere beginning, not confined to the lives of saints, is being given by modern investigation. The star Groombridge overcomes the might of the known universe, and is speeding toward us with a velocity of three or four hundred miles a second, which, if continued, will carry it beyond all relation to whatever we see. Shall we speak as were it improbable for the Supreme sometimes to stay with His hand the revolution of a planet, small as our earth, as too great a display of power and love for the children of men?

From time to time our lecture-halls resound with strange things just brought to light, and splendid results are made visible by scientific skill. Solids, liquids, gases, are various forms of matter controlled by temperature and pressure. Platinum, and we suppose anything else, can exist as a fine vapour. By attaining a greater coldness than has hitherto been possible for man, twice as far below the freezing-point as

boiling water is above it, Professor Dewar has liquified the atmosphere, and no doubt it will soon be rendered solid. Oxygen and hydrogen are of a faint blue colour, oxygen being the darker. We can see the vital gas; keep it within a bulb in a heated room, and it will not suffer any rapid loss. Enough has been done to dissipate despair as to proof of the most astounding facts in connection with our faith. We are coming nearer and nearer to the mysteries of matter and energy. Transmutations of their forms are being applied to all the purposes of existence. The infinitely great and the infinitely little are in close physical relation. Experimental verification, which begins to require astronomers to revise their theories of heaven, is finding wonders in our common life, and in lowest strata of society, so that many of us are all aglow with hopeful expectation of a brilliant future. Mr. W. H. Preece<sup>1</sup> has devised a new form of cable that quadruples the rate of telegraph working. We in London may soon be able to converse with every capital in Europe, and speak even across the Atlantic. The electric light will make the streets of our towns brilliant by power gathered from the streams running past them. This beneficent and sanitary mode of illumination reminds us indeed of that other and spiritual light coming from above, which reveals how we may convert the now greatly wasted forces of heart and conscience into a power laying hold of the eternal. Our time is a wonderful time, and we are glad of it. We know that epochs in which faith and purity prevail are elevating and fruitful in all manner of good. No great deeds are done by falterers; no brilliant advantages are certain to them, but to the steadfast mind, the holy, faithful, unconquerable will, belongs all that is excellent.

JOSEPH W. REYNOLDS.



#### ART. IV.—THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE LAITY.

**I**N the Church of Christ all the members are priests. It is remarkable that the title itself is actually given to them by two only of the inspired writers of the New Testament; yet they all address them as admitted to all the privileges that the title implies, and instruct them as to the nature and duties of the sacred office they bear, as a holy priesthood.

The following are the passages in which they are called priests:

(1) 1 Peter ii. 4: "Ye also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ."

---

<sup>1</sup> Chief electrician to the General Post-Office.

(2) 1 Peter ii. 9, 10: "Ye are an elect race; a royal priesthood; a holy nation; a people for God's own possession; that ye may shew forth the excellencies of Him who called you out of darkness into His marvellous light; which in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God; which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy."

(3) Rev. i. 5, 6: "Unto Him that loveth us and loosed us from our sins by His blood, and He made us to be a kingdom, to be priests unto His God and Father. To Him be the glory and the dominion for ever and ever. Amen."

(4) Rev. v. 9, 10: "Thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with Thy blood men of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation; and madest them to be unto our God a kingdom and priests; and they shall reign upon the earth."

(5) Rev. xx. 6: "Blessed and holy is He that hath part in the first resurrection; over these the second death hath no power; but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with Him a thousand years."

These are the passages which will at once claim our attention. That in them the title of priesthood is given to the whole body of Christ's Church is so obvious that no argument is needed to prove it. Would any venture to dispute it?

1 Peter ii. 4, 5: "Unto whom coming, a living stone, ye also as living stones are built up a spiritual house, to be a holy Priesthood."

Here St. Peter declares plainly who they are that constitute "the Holy Priesthood": they are those who come to Christ, who believe in Him; to whom He is "the preciousness," as contrasted with those who disbelieve; "Living stones built up a spiritual house" (as St. Paul says) "for a habitation of God in the Spirit."

Living stones coming to Christ the Living Stone; in the Authorised Version we lose the re-echo of the word "living." Does it not point to the intimate, vital, and abiding union between Christ and His people? built up in Him; through Him it is that they become living stones. Look at the rock whence they were hewn, the hole of the pit whence they were digged—"dead through trespasses and sins"; but now, "quicken'd together with Christ, raised up together with Him;" their life is derived from His life. "He that hath the Son hath life; he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." In this real and blessed union they are built up a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood—the priesthood of those who are made one with the Great High Priest, who was anointed with the holy oil which flowed down to the skirts of His garments. Truly, a holy priesthood!

In 1 Peter ii. 9, 10 they are called the elect race; a people



for God's own possession ; who " have obtained mercy ;" who are " now the people of God."

In the three passages in Revelation they appear as the great family of the redeemed and saved ; it is the first of these that will now claim our special attention : " Unto Him that loveth us, and loosed " (margin, or washed) " us from our sins by His blood ; and He made us to be a kingdom, to be priests unto His God and Father ; to Him be the glory and the dominion for ever and ever. Amen." In these words the Church asserts her claim to the title and privileges of priesthood ; and reverently and gratefully offers her adoration to Him who conferred them upon her.

It was by a most solemn and impressive ceremonial that under the law, by a Divine command, Levi was set apart to be the priestly tribe ; and it was by another Divinely-appointed ceremonial that from the tribe of Levi, those called of God to the priesthood and high priesthood were consecrated ; and the description of these occupies several chapters in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers.

But it was by a far more sacred and solemn ceremony that the Christian Priesthood is consecrated, though the description of it is contained in a few words : " He that loveth us washed us from our sins in His own blood, and He made us to be Priests unto His God and Father." Such, then, is the sacred calling of all true believers ; their exalted dignity ; made by the Lord Jesus Christ to be a kingdom, to be priests unto His God and Father : in precise and striking agreement with the title given them by St. Peter—" a royal priesthood."

Made a kingdom that they might be priests—members of that holy priesthood established by Him, who was " called of God a High Priest after the order of Melchizedek," the King of Righteousness and Priest of the Most High God ; of whom it is said, Zech. vi. 13, " He shall build the Temple of the Lord, and He shall bear the glory ; and shall sit and rule upon His throne ; and He shall be a priest upon His throne"—the Priest-King. It was meet, therefore, that those called into this holy fellowship with Him should be *kings and priests* ; anointed with the same holy oil wherewith He was " anointed above His fellows."

And how are they admitted to the office, with its sacred rites and privileges ? The answer is : Jesus in His love made them priests.

In Numbers viii. we have the consecration of the Levites described. And how did the solemn ceremonial begin ? Moses took the water of purifying to cleanse them. And so, in consecrating the priests (Lev. viii.) he was commanded to bring Aaron and his sons, and wash them with water. This

was the first essential requisite for priesthood—cleansing from defilement. And thus it was with those whom the Lord Jesus called to be His priests. Whether we follow the reading of the Revised Text, *λύσαντι*, He loosed them, through (*λύτρον*) a ransom; or the margin, *λούσαντι*, washed them in His blood; it signifies His act as the Divine Mediator in freeing them from sin, from all its guilt and defilement; thus cleansing, justifying, consecrating them to be priests unto His God and Father.

Then follows the ascription: To Him be the glory and the dominion. *To Him*, leading the mind back to the previous words, extolling Him as “the faithful witness, the first-born of the dead, the Ruler of the kings of the earth”—anointed to be the Prophet, Priest and King of the Church of God; the Everlasting Prophet—the perpetual source of spiritual light and wisdom; the Great High Priest, who, having made atonement for sin by His death, rose again, the first-born of the dead; and the all-glorious King, the Ruler of the kings of the earth, asserting His supreme authority, His Divine and universal sovereignty: “Prince of the kings of the earth;” King of kings and Lord of lords; all power in heaven and earth given to Him, and Head over all things to His church. It is HE that redeemed them by His blood; it is He that has given them their priesthood; HE MADE THEM PRIESTS.

*Ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς . . . ἱερεῖς . . .* on the construction here, Alford quotes from de Wette: “It belongs to the delicacy of the Hebrew diction to follow up the participle which gives the tone to the sentence by finite verbs; which, through the influence of the relative notion embodied in the participle, are themselves to be taken as conditioning clauses.” Everything is combined to exalt in our view the Author of this great act.

Here we may pause for a moment to think of these words as the utterance of the beloved Apostle: “To Him that loveth us!” Is it not the tender expression of his confiding trust in the unchangeableness of his Master’s love? he that was wont to call himself the disciple whom Jesus loved, who leaned on His bosom at the Last Supper, was still basking in the sunshine of the same love. In all His glory in heaven, He loveth us still. And He made us Priests; US—St. John takes his place among the whole company of believers in this glorious priesthood; he claims for himself no distinction in it; Christ Jesus made US to be priests unto His God and Father. Does not this absolutely exclude the idea of any other priesthood in Christ’s Church? What higher priesthood could there be? What place is there for any other?

We now proceed to the function of the Christian priesthood. It is clearly to offer sacrifice. “Ye as living stones are built

up a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices."

As they are priests in a spiritual temple, the sacrifices that they offer must be spiritual. And what are these, as taught by the holy Apostles? They are:

1. The sacrifice of ourselves.
2. The sacrifice of praise and prayer.
3. The sacrifice of faith.
4. The sacrifice of good works.

### 1. OF OURSELVES.

Rom. xii. 1: "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service." This means the entire and unreserved surrender of the heart and life to God—the whole being, like the lamb for the burnt offering—nothing must be kept back; even the body shall be laid upon His altar, as a consecrated thing—spirit, soul, and body—the body with all its parts, and passions, and powers, for the Lord.

This was the Apostle's joy over the Macedonian Christians, that "first they gave their own selves to the Lord." The love of Christ constrained them "that they should live no longer to themselves, but to Him that died for them and rose again." The utterance of such from the heart must be: "I am not my own;" "I am bought with a price;" "To me to live is Christ;" "Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do?" "Here am I, send me."

And this is the daily sacrifice of the Christian priesthood. That it is not to be regarded as merely a single and final act of the believer is evident from the fact that it is to living members of the Church that St. Paul makes this appeal; he pleads with them by the mercies of God to make this surrender—by those mercies which had been displayed in the previous chapters of the epistle, and which they had themselves appropriated, and of which they had a blessed experience.

Therefore, again they are to present themselves a living sacrifice, and yet again, and that continually, even as our Church teaches in the Communion Service, "Here we offer and present ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee."

It is the sacrifice of Christ's priests, of those whom He has made priests unto his God and Father; it is offered by His own appointment, and therefore it is holy, and acceptable to God, and a reasonable service, or, as in the margin, "a spiritual worship."

## 2. OF PRAISE AND PRAYER.

*Of Praise* (Heb. xiii. 15).—Let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually: that is, the fruit of the lips giving thanks to His Name.

The royal priesthood is charged “to show forth the excellences of Him that called them out of darkness into His marvellous light.”

*Of Prayer*.—St. Paul says: “I desire that the men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands;”<sup>1</sup> “Be instant in prayer;” “Pray without ceasing;” “Continue in prayer;” “In everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known to God.” And, again, more fully and comprehensively (Ephes. vi. 18): “Praying with all prayer and supplication at all seasons in the Spirit, and watching thereunto in all perseverance and supplication for all the saints, and on my behalf.”

“And for me.” There is no feature in St. Paul’s addresses to Christians more striking than his fervent desire for their intercession on his behalf. That he prayed for them, night and day, we know; but we never find a trace of any claim to a higher title to the privilege, or any thought of a nearer access to God, than that which is enjoyed by all believers. He said to them, “Brethren, pray for us,” as to those who were admitted to the same privilege as himself. All alike have “boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus.”

Under the old covenant, the High Priest alone might enter the holy of holies, and that only once in the year; but, says the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, we, who belong to the Christian priesthood, have boldness to enter into the holiest at all times, whatever our condition in life may be, “by the blood of Jesus,” by the way which He hath dedicated for us—“a new and living way.” When the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world, was slain, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom, the way into the holy of holies was opened, and the same liberty of access was granted to all the faithful without the slightest distinction or difference.

## 3. OF FAITH.

Phil. ii. 17: “Yea, and if I am offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith”—*ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ*—the expression of the Apostle’s devotion to God, and of his confiding love to the Philippians.

We observe that while St. Paul never once speaks of himself as officially offering a sacrifice in behalf of the laity, he here

<sup>1</sup> See Ps. cxli. 2, compared with Rev. v. 8; viii. 3.

acknowledges how thankfully he looks for blessing from the sacrifice that the laity offer for him.

Bishop Lightfoot observes that *λειτουργία* is to be taken as supplementing the idea of *θυσία*, and giving additional force to it. And he adds: "Thus, St. Paul's language expresses the fundamental idea of the Christian Church, in which a universal priesthood has supplanted the exclusive ministrations of a select tribe or class (see I Pet. ii. 5). The Philippians are the priests; their faith (or their good works springing from their faith) is the sacrifice; St. Paul's life-blood the accompanying libation."

#### 4. OF GOOD WORKS.

Believers are called to be "rich in good works;" they were created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God afore prepared that we should walk in them; they are to be "thoroughly furnished unto all good works;" showing a pattern of good works; to be careful to maintain good works; a people for God's own possession, zealous of good works. And these are said to be sacrifices acceptable to God. Heb. xiii. 16: "To do good and to communicate forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." This comprises the whole range of Christian charity, and practice, and service (*cf.* Phil. iv. 18). We need say no more than that it is the practical outcome of the priestly consecrated life.

Such being the Christian priesthood as taught in the New Testament, it becomes the distinguished duty and privilege of those who are ministers of Christ's Word and Sacraments faithfully to instruct all Christians as to the sacred office they hold, to do their utmost to make them realize its high dignity and the wide and solemn responsibilities attached to it.

But there are some whose aim is to suppress or obscure the dignity of the layman's priesthood, in order that they may advance their pretensions to another priesthood of a superior order, and which is of purely human invention, totally different from that which we find in the New Testament.

It may be well to notice that there are five priesthoods mentioned in the Apostolic writings:

1. The Jewish priesthood and high-priesthood.
2. The priesthood of the heathen idolaters.
3. The priesthood of Melchizedek.
4. The priesthood of our Lord Jesus Christ.
5. The priesthood of believers; AND NO OTHER.

It has been contended that, as Israel was called "a kingdom of priests, a holy nation," and yet they had a priestly tribe set apart, and an order of priesthood selected from them, so a priestly order may be gathered out from the Christian priesthood. But the argument will not stand. If such an order

were appointed it would, according to New Testament teaching, have nothing to do. How can a man be a priest, except he has somewhat to offer? As regards propitiatory sacrifice, "there remains no more offering for sin"; and as regards spiritual sacrifices, they are to be offered by all saints.

There is, however, no parallel between the two cases. The tribe of Levi was separated by a special appointment of God according to a Divine plan; and the account of the consecration of the priests and Levites is given very fully, occupying several chapters in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. And afterwards we find the priestly order mixed up with all the subsequent history of Israel, even to the time of our Lord and His Apostles. There they are, a great reality, for good or for evil.<sup>1</sup>

There is, of course, no question as to the Divine commission of a Christian ministry. The teaching of the New Testament is on this point distinct and emphatic. Take, for instance, the Apostle's words (1 Cor. ix. 13, 14): "Know ye not that they which minister about sacred things eat the things of the temple, and they which wait upon the altar have their portion with the altar? Even so did the Lord ordain that they which proclaim the Gospel should live of the Gospel."

In this comparison between the ministers of the two dispensations, St. Paul asserts that the Christian ministry is as truly a Divine ordinance as the Aaronic priesthood; that its functions were as clearly and authoritatively defined; and its claims upon the laity for their support as real and binding. But, on the other hand, as regards the consecration of a sacerdotal priesthood, we must ask, Do we find it in the New Testament? Where is the record of a ceremony of such vast and far-reaching importance?

---

<sup>1</sup> The words of Bishop Lightfoot on this point are most forcible and important: "The sacerdotal system of the Old Testament possessed one important characteristic which separated it from heathen priesthoods, and which deserves especial notice. The priestly tribe held this peculiar relation to God only as the representatives of the whole nation. As *delegates* of the people, they offered sacrifice and made atonement. The whole community is regarded as 'a kingdom of priests,' 'a holy nation.' When the sons of Levi were set apart their consecration is distinctly stated to be due, under the Divine guidance, not to any inherent sanctity or to any caste privilege, but to an act of delegation on the part of the entire people. The Levites are, so to speak, ordained by the whole congregation. 'The children of Israel,' it is said, 'shall put their hands upon the Levites.' The nation thus deposes to a single tribe the priestly functions which belong properly to itself as a whole.

"The Christian idea, therefore, was the restitution of this immediate and direct relation with God, which was partly suspended, but not abolished, by the appointment of a sacerdotal tribe. The Levitical priesthood, like the Mosaic law, had served its temporary purpose. The period of childhood had passed, and the Church of God was now arrived at mature age. The covenant people resumed their sacerdotal functions."—Bishop Lightfoot's "Dissertation on the Christian Ministry," pp. 180, 181.

Throughout the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles the title of priest is not given to any member of the Church otherwise than in reference to the whole Christian community. Those who had been ordained to Christ's ministry were known in Scriptural language by ten different names, but never as priests. Five of these names occur in Eph. iv. 11.: "Christ gave some to be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the Body of Christ: till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." Where are the priests? What need of them, when the Church can attain to such Divine perfection without their ministrations?

In another passage (1 Cor. iii. 5): "What, then, is Apollos? and what is Paul?"—not priests—but "ministers by whom ye believed."

There are three Epistles specially addressed to those who were ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God, but they are there never styled priests: the word *ιερεός*, or "sacerdos," does not once occur in those Epistles. In the instruction given them by St. Paul as to their sacred duties there is not the most distant allusion to any sacerdotal functions, excepting those which are common to all saints.

Do we consider what this imports? A holy Apostle, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost in critical times, writes a letter to a bishop of the Church, in which he gives earnest, thoughtful, and explicit teaching and admonition for the benefit of those called to the sacred office of the ministry; a letter which, we are expressly told, is for the guidance and instruction of the Church till the second coming of our Lord; and throughout three such Epistles, written at three different times, by the great Apostle who had the care of all the churches—that wise master builder—there is not a trace of the title, which many now assume as that which is the highest and most significant connected with their sacred office; nor is there a single word to direct, admonish, and instruct them in the discharge of the functions belonging to it. As to those which they hold to be the holiest, the most important, the most essential, they find in each one of the pastoral Epistles nothing but a most significant silence—a mysterious and awful blank. Contrast the ordinal of the Church of England with that of the Church of Rome, and say whether those striking omissions of our reformers were not warranted by this absolute silence of Holy Scripture.

In asserting the absence of any Scriptural authority for an order of priesthood in the Christian Church, we have not overlooked the second canon of the Council of Trent, *de Sacrificio*

*Missæ*: "If any man shall say that in those words, 'Do this in remembrance of Me,' Christ did not constitute the Apostles priests, and did not ordain that they and other priests should offer the sacrifice of His body and blood, *Anathema sit*"—on which foundation the Church of Rome builds her whole Sacramental system. To such extremities is she driven to find in Holy Scripture the shadow of an argument in its favour.

We have a magnificent assertion of the principles of our Church in Bishop Lightfoot's "Dissertation on the Christian Ministry."<sup>1</sup> Speaking of the Kingdom of Christ, he says: "Above all, it has no sacerdotal system. It interposes no sacrificial tribe or class between God and man, by whose intervention God is reconciled and man forgiven. Each individual member holds personal communion with the Divine Head. To Him immediately he is responsible, and from Him directly he obtains pardon and draws strength."

Or, as the Bishop adds afterwards:<sup>2</sup> "So it was also with the Christian priesthood. For communicating instruction and for preserving public order, for conducting religious worship and for dispensing social charities, it became necessary to appoint special officers. But the priestly functions and privileges are never regarded as transferred, or even delegated, to these officers. They are called stewards or messengers of God, servants or ministers of the Church, and the like; but the sacerdotal title is never once given to them. The only priests under the Gospel, designated as such in the New Testament, are the saints, the members of the Christian brotherhood."

And the Church of England is a faithful witness to this truth. She knows nothing of sacerdotalism; her clergy are never spoken of as sacerdotes. In her ordinal they are exhorted in these words: "That you have in remembrance into how high a dignity and to how weighty an office and charge ye are called," "to be (not sacerdotes, but) messengers, watchmen, stewards of the Lord, to teach and to premonish, to feed and provide for the Lord's family."

We observe that, in view of the "high dignity" and the "weighty office and charge," there is a complete and most impressive silence as to a priesthood offering sacrifice;<sup>3</sup> the idea is as entirely excluded from our Prayer-Book as it is from the New Testament.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 179.

<sup>2</sup> Pp. 182, 183.

<sup>3</sup> Archdeacon Wilberforce, after seceding to the Church of Rome, writes of our Communion Service: "The service, consequently, was divested of its sacrificial character, and no longer bore witness, as in early times, to the great event which is transacted at the altar."

Hear Dr. Lightfoot again: "If the sacerdotal office be understood to imply the offering of sacrifices, then the Epistle to the Hebrews leaves no place for a Christian priesthood."



In the use of the word "priest" in the Prayer-Book, it may be as well to mention, though it can scarcely be needful to do so, that when the word is applied to the clergy it signifies "Presbyter." In his "Church Dictionary," Dr. Hook so explains it: "Priest is another form of Prester; and Prester the contraction of Presbyter, or 'elder,' by which name they are known in the New Testament.<sup>1</sup> In this and in no other sense is the name priest applied to the Christian ministry between the two covers of our Book of Common Prayer.

In conclusion, we thankfully return to our starting-point, leaving human inventions and speculations for the sure and infallible teaching of God's own word, and fixing our mind on the Great High Priest and on that holy priesthood which He Himself instituted and ordained. "To whom coming as to a Living Stone, ye also as living stones are built up a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood; to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ."

So as believers in Jesus, we claim our privilege to join in that hymn of joyful praise and reverent adoration—"To Him that loveth us, and loosed us from our sins by His blood; and He made us to be a kingdom, to be priests unto His God and Father: to Him be the glory and the dominion for ever and ever. Amen."

R. L. ALLNUTT.



#### ART. V.—APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION.

Miserum est aliorum incubere famæ  
Ne collapsa ruant subductis tecta columnis.

JUVENAL: *Sat.*

'Tis poor relying on another's fame,  
For, take the pillars but away, and all  
The superstructure must in ruin fall.

**A**POSTOLIC SUCCESSION in a ministry is made by some the crucial test of a true or false Church, and the possessor alone capable of conferring a saving grace in the administration of the Sacraments.

Were we to ask any ordinary person what is meant by, and

<sup>1</sup> "Before proceeding further, some definition of terms is necessary. On no subject has more serious error arisen from the confusion of language. The word 'priest' has two different senses. In the one it is a synonym for presbyter, or elder, and designates the minister who presides over and instructs a Christian congregation: in the other it is equivalent to the Latin sacerdos, the Greek *ιερεὺς*, or the Hebrew *כהן*, the offerer of sacrifices, who also performs other mediatorial offices between God and man. How the confusion between these two meanings has affected the history and theology of the Church it will be instructive to consider in the sequel."—Bishop Lightfoot, "Dissertation on the Christian Ministry," p. 184.

included in, the expression "Apostolic succession," the probability is that we should get a very vague and unsatisfactory answer. Nor do I think that we should be better satisfied were we to consult those who make the claim in their own person. I would put the following questions to such persons last referred to :

1. Do you make the claim as professing the same *doctrines* as were taught by the Apostles ?

2. Do you rely on an uninterrupted and unbroken succession from the Apostles from man to man, sealed by a certain formula or ceremony ?

3. Do you restrict that succession to such only who have been duly ordained "priest" by a duly consecrated bishop ?

4. In the latter case, do you consider *form*—say, for instance, "Receive thou the Holy Ghost," etc., "and the laying on of hands" of the Bishop, essentials in transmitting Apostolic succession ?

5. If this be asserted, do you place the same virtue in a Bishop's touch as in the breath of Christ which He breathed on His disciples ?

6. Having asserted the claim, I would ask, What are the characteristics of that "succession" ? What virtues, powers, privileges, conferred by our Lord on His disciples, are transmitted through this succession, and proof that they are vested in the present claimants ?

If Apostolic *doctrine* be the sole test, then such of the laity, male or female, who hold, profess, and teach Apostolic *doctrine*, have in them the true Apostolic succession. Our Lord's commission to His disciples, and to "the seventy" (all laymen ; indeed, the "twelve" were only missionary labourers in the Lord's vineyard) was to go unto all nations, baptizing, "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded them" (Matt. xxviii. 20) ; and in that condition He promised His presence. Accordingly, we read (Acts ii. 42) that "They continued steadfast in *Apostolic doctrine* and fellowship, and in breaking bread and prayer." If, on the other hand, either of the other requirements, such as an unbroken personal succession, and form of words and laying on of hands by a bishop, are required as essentials, then of necessity the laity and all Nonconforming ministers are excluded. But if *doctrine* be conceded, the question so far is concluded ; but it is not so, if we accept the statement of the late Dr. Littledale, who may be accepted as a fair representative of the Ritualistic "priest." In his tract "The Christian Priesthood," one of a series, the doctor tells us that in order to exercise the sacerdotal functions of his "priestly office," he claims for himself and the "Anglican priesthood" a personal

Apostolic succession. The Anglican priest, he maintains, "must be a real minister of God's Church," "he must have a regular commission, and be sent by the laying on of hands of those who have received the commission in regular succession from the Apostles." And why not also of "the seventy"? And he further maintains that no one can act in any of the offices of bishop, priest, or deacon, "who has not been regularly ordained by a bishop," in regular succession from the Apostles.

It will, nevertheless, be conceded that a profession of *Apostolic doctrine* is an essential element in the claim to Apostolic succession. St. Paul wrote to the Galatians (i. 8, 9), "Though we or an angel preach any other Gospel than that we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." The mission of the Apostles was to preach the Gospel of Christ, which, according to Ignatius, a writer of the first century, the Apostles, "for the sake of greater certainty, deemed necessary to attest by committing to writing."<sup>1</sup> Oras Irenæus, a Christian bishop of the second century, said, "This (Gospel) the Apostles preached, but afterwards, by the will of God, delivered to us in the Scriptures as the foundation and pillar of our faith." So essential did that ancient writer consider the teaching of *true doctrine*, that he directed all "to obey those presbyters who had the Divine gift of *faith*;" and, on the other hand, to "forsake all wicked ministers," and to learn from such as have the *Divine* "gift of faith."<sup>2</sup> Tertullian, a Christian writer of the second century, clearly estimated the usefulness of a *personal* succession where the true faith was wanting:

But if the heretics feign or fabricate such a succession this will not help them, for their *doctrine* itself, compared with the doctrine of the Apostles, will, by its own diversity and contrariety, pronounce against them. To this form of trial will appeal be made by those churches henceforward daily establishing, which, though they have neither any of the Apostles nor apostolic men for their founders, yet all agreeing in the same faith *are, from their consanguinity of doctrine*, to be esteemed not the less apostolical than the former.<sup>3</sup>

Gregory Nazianzen, Bishop of Constantinople, a Greek (A.D. 378), who, like Ignatius and Irenæus, is claimed to be a canonized saint of the Roman Church, tells us that:

Succession of piety ought to be esteemed the true succession, for he who maintains *the same doctrine of faith* is partner in the same chair; but he who defends a contrary doctrine ought, though in the chair of St. Mark, to be esteemed an adversary to it. This man, indeed, may have a *nominal succession*, but the other has the very thing itself: the succession in deed and in truth.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Apud Eusebius, Hist., Lib. iii., cap. 36.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Lib. iv., V. 43, 45.

<sup>3</sup> Tert. De Præscrip. Hær., c. xxxii., Tom. ii., pp. 40, 41; Hertæ. Magel., 1770.

<sup>4</sup> In "Athanas. Opera," Tom. ii., appendix, edit. Paris, 1627.

And, again, Ambrose, the venerable Bishop of Milan, of the fourth century, also claimed as a saint, was no less explicit. He said: "Faith is the foundation of the Church, yet it was not said of the flesh of Peter, but of his *faith*, that the gates of hell should not prevail against it."<sup>1</sup> Again, "Non habent Petri hereditatem qui Petri *fidem* non habent." "They have not the *succession* of Peter that lack the *faith* of Peter."<sup>2</sup> And the illustrious Augustine, the African bishop, said: "We who are Christians do not believe in Peter, but in what Peter taught."<sup>3</sup>

Thus, then, it would appear, by the testimony of these "Fathers of the Church," that *Apostolic doctrine* is essential; and that without it the claim to a personal Apostolic succession is of no avail.

It is, however, asserted that an Apostolic succession of faith is not sufficient, since there are other essentials necessary to constitute the claim to a true and legitimate Apostolical succession: such as an unbroken and uninterrupted *personal* succession from the Apostles from man to man, sealed by a certain formulary or ceremony, restricted to such only who have been duly ordained "priest" by a duly consecrated bishop, and—as asserted by the Roman Church—by a *form* so precise that any, even a trifling, variation from that prescribed would nullify the ordination; the order of priesthood being deemed a sacrament by the Roman Church, and, indeed, by some in the Anglican Church. In the ritualistic organ, the *Church News*, for July 7, 1869, we read:

It is a declared duty of all who pray for the peace of Jerusalem to do their utmost to show that the English Church, of which they are members, is really one with the Church of Rome *in faith, orders and sacraments*.

A precise *form* is laid down to be adopted; any deviation from that *form* would, as observed, nullify the sacrament and vitiate the "succession." And be it remembered that for a series of years such a succession can only be claimed through Roman ordinations; and if that ordination was invalid from the year 1438 (as will be proved in the sequence) then the Anglican succession was forfeited.

C. H. COLLETTE.

(To be continued).

<sup>1</sup> "De Incar. Dom. Sacram.," lib. i., c. v., p. 711; edit., 1690.

<sup>2</sup> "De Pœnet.," tom. i., p. 159, Basel apud Frob.; and tom. vi., col. 391, H.; Paris, 1661.

<sup>3</sup> "De Civit. Dei.," xviii., 54.

## ART. VI.—RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN BOARD SCHOOLS.

I WISH to say a few words at the outset, in order to explain the origin and object of the meeting held at Sion College on June 18th for the discussion of the religious difficulty at the London School Board. I had myself all along intended to call a meeting of the kind, my original idea being to give those clergy of my archdeaconry who, like myself, are distressed at the prolonged religious dissension on the London School Board an opportunity of expressing their opinions. Many clergymen have written or spoken to me on the subject, and wished to take counsel together as to the wisest thing to be done. I have even been asked by a rural deanery not in my own archdeaconry to stand again as a candidate for the London School Board. That is impossible; but, as a former member of the Board, I have watched the religious controversy from the beginning, and have never concealed my opinion as to the way in which it has been conducted.

But, besides this desire of myself and of some of the clergy of my acquaintance, I found that the members of the National Club, a large body of men of strong Evangelical opinions, were deeply impressed with the view that if these dissensions are continued (and there seems at present no prospect of their ending), then will occur the opportunity of the Secularist. He will stir up the opinion of the men of the world, and especially of politicians, to the tune of "A plague on both your houses." He will say: "We have given you twenty-three years in which to make your experiment of united Biblical instruction. From the beginning we told Mr. Forster that it was an impossible task; but he was strongly in earnest, was himself a religious man, and he carried the House of Commons against us. At the end of twenty-three years you are farther from a solution than ever. It is high time to put a stop to all this bickering, and to resort to the plan which we always recommended: secular education pure and simple." That is the language of the Secularist at these unseemly sights, and it is that prospect that is very justly dreaded by the members of the National Club.

Again, I found to my great satisfaction that a large number of earnest and religious Nonconformists, acting with Dr. Lunn, who is always to the front in anything that can promote unity in the Christian faith, were anxious to record their solemn determination "that all attempts to rob elementary School Board education of its Christian character should be firmly resisted," as well as to express their protest against any departure from the compromise of 1871.

It had appeared to me, therefore, that the three meetings

contemplated might well be held together, and I applied to the president and librarian of Sion College for leave to invite those interested in them to a united conference in that hospitable hall, which is always available for purposes of this important character.

I must add that it was agreed that members of the existing School Board should not be invited to attend. It was a meeting neither on the one side nor the other. It was neither called in the interests of the Progressives, nor of the existing majority. It was intended for an independent and unbiased expression of opinion. Our hope was that both sides would listen to our appeal, lay down their arms, and revert to the system which, though not at all in itself ideal, worked happily for twenty years. It is obvious, therefore, that if we were to invite members of one side of the School Board we should have to invite those of the other, and the result would have been only a repetition or a continuation of those debates on the London School Board which we had already had the advantage of reading. On the other hand, if we only invited one side we should be merely prolonging the existing struggle. In consequence of lists for invitation being sent in by various people, some members of the School Board were invited. They would kindly see that these invitations were issued inadvertently, and understand that they were not members of the conference. If we were to do any good at all we must be entirely disconnected from either side.

One disadvantage of attempting to interfere between combatants in religious matters is this: you are sure to disoblige both sides, and to be labelled with opprobrious and misrepresenting epithets. I observe that all who prefer to adhere to the compromise of 1871 are now styled promoters of Unitarianism. Such an absurd accusation could only be thrown out in the heat of religious controversy. I believe the Bishop of London, the Bishop of Rochester, the Bishop of Brisbane, Archdeacon Farrar, Prebendary Webb-Peploe, Dr. Rigg, and others, besides myself, prefer the compromise of 1871. It would be ludicrous to connect these names with Unitarianism, and the same must be said in the fullest degree of the rank and file of those who support the compromise. But I was happy to observe that, at a meeting of the English Church Union to be held in Marylebone a few days later, it was to be moved by a very distinguished High Churchman: "That in the present emergency, in view of the recent unhappy agitations, and until some other workable scheme be propounded, there is no wiser policy for Churchmen than that they should insist upon the honourable observance of what is known as the compromise of 1871." I have also been told that I and Arch-

deacon Farrar, Prebendary Webb-Peploe, and others are being made cats-paws by Radical politicians. Let me assert distinctly that we are acting with entire independence in the matter. If we mix up politics with this effort we shall achieve absolutely nothing at all, but do more harm than good. We are united to try and proclaim the truce of God between the combatants.

Let me remind you how that compromise used to work. The special branch of the machinery of the Board for religious instruction was called the Scripture Sub-committee. We prepared a syllabus every year, which, except that it could not teach any Catechism, was as good as anything in any voluntary school. It is said by authority that if any School Board desire it, they are permitted by the law to teach the Apostles' Creed, as well as the Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments. The Lord's Prayer and the Ten Commandments, being the *ipsissima verba* of the Bible, can of course be taught without question wherever the Bible is adopted; and although it would probably be impossible in London ever formally to adopt the Apostles' Creed in a School Board syllabus, yet the provisions of the syllabus and the questions in the examination papers were, according to the wishes of the whole Scripture Sub-committee, drawn up in accordance with the general principles of the Apostles' Creed. No statement of the New Testament, however miraculous, was considered in the smallest degree out of place in syllabus and questions. Considering that London is the headquarters of Secularism, Agnosticism, and all kinds of religious difficulties, I used to wonder that we were able to teach the New Testament so fully and frankly, and so entirely without hindrance or complaint. Far from conceiving that any member of my Church or any religious Nonconformist had any ground whatever for grievance, I used to think that any reason for complaint might be expected, if at all, from the other side. We had eighteen members of the Church of England on that Scripture Sub-committee, of whom eleven were clergymen; the other members were earnest and devout Nonconformists.

For the conscientious carrying out of the system we depended on our teachers, most of them trained in religious colleges, either Church or Nonconformist, and on our own inspectors who examined each school in religious knowledge, and specially on the local managers, who might listen, if they pleased, to every Scripture lesson delivered. On every board of local managers there were one or more of the local clergy and Nonconformist ministers. Every day's session of every department was opened and closed with a prayer and a hymn. It seemed impossible under the circumstances that any system could be more complete. If any teacher should give improper Scripture teaching, he or she could be dealt with by the

Scripture Sub-committee. One teacher in my time was found to have given an agnostic lecture not in school. He was told that he was acting in an unseemly manner for one commissioned to teach the Bible, and the objectionable fact came to an end.

What has happened since to put an end to this state of things, which, under the circumstances, ought to be satisfactory to every true believing Christian? Certain new and inexperienced members of the Board find again one instance, or perhaps two, of improper teaching. Instead of dealing with it by the Scripture Sub-committee, they put a notice on the notice-paper, the issue of which must be the reopening of the whole controversy, settled with such difficulty and by such eminent men in 1871. The chairman made an attempt to come to an agreement with the Nonconformists by asking them to permit the insertion of the word "Christian" before the word "religion" in the old terms of the compromise. But the Nonconformists were aroused, and were in an attitude of distrust; they declined any departure from the compromise, even by a single word, for fear of further demands being made. In itself the word "Christian" could not have made the slightest difference, because in the sentence of the compromise immediately preceding the principles of the Bible are mentioned as the basis of all religious teaching; and nobody can for a moment assert either that the New Testament is not Christian, or that the word Christian does not imply the religion of the New Testament. Personally, I extremely regret that our Nonconformist friends did not accept the word Christian, believing, as I am told, that at that time it would have ended the controversy. But their attitude of not parting from the compromise was perfectly intelligible, and the real thing to be done was to take away the militant motion from the notice-paper, and to refer the cases of scandal to the Scripture Sub-committee. The word "Christian" has since been added to the compromise with the consent of the great majority of the Board.

But the controversy went on, and has resulted, besides the addition of the word "Christian" to the word "religion," in the circular which calls attention to the fundamental Christian doctrine of the Divinity of our Lord.

Now, there is nothing in the addition of the word "Christian" or in the circular itself to which any ordinary Christian could have any objection. What is objected to is the danger at this time of any departure from the compromise whatever.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Our Committee have unanimously resolved that they would not vote for any candidate who should support the omission of the word "Christian."



Now I have no desire to blame the majority of the School Board. My friend, the chairman, was, I know, led most reluctantly into the controversy. We appreciate their zeal and faith and love in the highest degree, and give them credit for the highest and best motives. But what we say is, that we think they ought not to have allowed young and inexperienced members of the Board, members perhaps not wholly friendly to the School Board system, to bring them into a position which was unnecessary, and which was sure to lead to an indefinite religious dissension, the end of which could not be foreseen.

I say deliberately, "Unnecessary." It has been widely represented in the campaign that has already been begun that there has been an organized attempt on the part of the Unitarians to capture the Board. There has been no such attempt. These few cases of improper teaching, which are distinctly contrary to the law as attaching children to the denomination called Unitarianism, are like the men in buckram trotted backwards and forwards to produce an impression on Falstaff. They are few and far between. The 3,000 teachers who have asked to be relieved have done so, not from Unitarianism, but from *esprit de corps*, and because they have been disturbed and traduced. Mr. Copeland Bowie himself has admitted that Unitarian children are few, and that they are amply protected by the conscience clause. The representation of an attempt by Unitarians to capture the Board is an entire misunderstanding of the facts of the case.

The compromise was one between Churchmen and Non-conformists, and not between 'these on the one hand and Unitarians on the other. We do not criticise Unitarians, but Mr. Bowie's representation of their position is sufficient; they are few enough in number not to affect the general question, and are well protected by the conscience clause. It may be true that Professor Huxley signed the compromise in a special sense of his own, that Mr. Stanley claims that sense, and that various eminent Nonconformist ministers were led into strong statements of the rights of conscience by hostile cross-examination before the School Board. But there is no doubt whatever as to what the great majority of Christians mean by the teaching of the New Testament. They are represented by the majority of the Scripture Sub-committee. If they will act fairly and conscientiously, with them we are content to leave the matter; whatever is lacking we can fill up in our Sunday-schools and churches. If anyone asks me for my policy, it is contained in one single sentence, an ancient Greek proverb: *Μὴ κίνει Καμαρίναν, ἀκίνητον γὰρ ἀμείνων*: Do not disturb the town of Camarina; for it is much better left undisturbed.

There were unwholesome conditions in that town, which only became serious when stirred up. There are unwholesome conditions in popular religious dissension amongst a city containing five millions of people; they are always ready to burst forth; you do not know where they will land you; in God's name leave them alone if you can.

Let me remind you of an eloquent passage on the possibility of wholesome results from Scriptural teaching, even without formulated definition, from the celebrated biographer of the Evangelical movement, Sir James Stephen. "Biblical knowledge, like the manna rained on the wilderness, ever tends to dissolve into a warm, and generous, and healthful nutriment. From ecclesiastical lore we learn how to be subtle in distinction, exact in the analysis of particular doctrines, and clear-sighted in the synthesis of them all. But from the Bible, and from the Bible alone, we may derive, though with no scientific accuracy, and by no logical process, the one great prolific and all-embracing idea—even the idea of Him in Whom we live and move and have our being. There also and there only we learn all that is to be known, or rather all that is to be felt and experienced of our relations to Him, how they have been impaired by sin, and how they have been restored by an adorable though utterly inscrutable Atonement. There, also, we discover what are the spiritual agencies employed for the restoration of our nature to its primæval image. There, too, is lifted the veil which interposes between our present and future state, so far as to disclose to us that this mortal is to put on immortality. There, in no recondite learning, no abstruse speculation, nor in any abstract creed, but in the very Person of Christ Himself, is exhibited to us the Way, the Truth, and the Life. There we may contemplate and listen to Him who is the Word, or communicative energy of God. There is set before us the very image of Deity, so far as it can be projected on the dark and contracted mirror of our feeble humanity. There we become cognizant of a spiritual relationship—a consanguinity of the soul of man with Him who assumed man's nature—an alliance which, though human words can but ill express it, the Gospels reveal to us as not less real, and as far more intimate and enduring than those which bind us to each other in domestic life. These, and such as these, are the disclosures which day by day dawn with still-increasing brightness on him who continually refers to the revealed Word of God for light, and day by day examines by that light every theological opinion which he has gathered from any other source."

It is because I believe that the vast majority of the teachers are conscientiously performing this process, and because I

know that they have been trained in religious colleges to a high sense of duty, that, in the midst of vast divergences of opinion, I am content with their work. I have made inquiries in all directions from clergymen who are on local boards of management, and I have received but one opinion. Under the Board School system you cannot expect much knowledge of doctrine; that has to be supplied in Sunday-school and church. But nothing improper is taught, and you get the Christian belief in God and in His Son Jesus Christ. The Bishop of Rochester tells us that large numbers of Board School teachers are the best teachers in his Sunday-schools. The gracious ladies who are going about saying that if we go back to the compromise there will be no Christian teaching at all, are acting wholly under a misapprehension. Even if the word Christian were dropped, the word Bible, which is in the compromise, covers precisely the same ground.<sup>1</sup> And as to circulars, it is better to trust to the constitutional method of the Scripture Sub-committee than to rouse opposition by attempts at definition. What I venture to recommend to those clergy who ask my opinion is, that without reflecting on the members of the present Board, they should ask the candidates for the November election to go back to the compromise of 1871. And, on the other hand, we count on our Nonconformist friends firmly to stand by the declaration of our meeting, "that all attempts to rob the education of its Christian character should be uniformly resisted." As long as members of the Established Church are firmly persuaded that their Nonconformist brethren agree to that Christian character, not in strict terms of definition, but in that general sense which I have quoted from Sir James Stephen, they will assure them, on the other hand, that they desire nothing more for the united general Board School teaching, and that any thought of the thin edge of the wedge of Sacerdotalism is as impossible under the law, and as far from their thoughts, as the definite Unitarianism, of which in the few notorious instances complaint has been made. So peace will be restored, a disastrous conflict avoided, the opportunity taken away from that absolute Secularism which we all dread; and the education of our children will proceed on those simple Christian lines which the vast majority of the parents desire and welcome.

It is said, of course, that without the definition in the circular there will be no guarantee that the teaching will be on the basis of the Divinity of our Lord. But there will be

---

<sup>1</sup> The word "Christian," as now part of the amended circular, has been adopted by both sides of the Board, and our Committee, as noted before, have resolved not to support any who propose its omission.

the same guarantee that there has been for twenty years, the words of the Bible itself. From every page of the New Testament blazes forth the Divine Nature of Christ. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. . . . And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us (and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth." "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing that shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God."

It is said that if the circular is withdrawn, it will amount to withdrawing the doctrine which the circular asserts. But that depends on the way in which it is withdrawn. If the manner be simply something like this: "That without prejudice to any of the questions raised the circular of 1894 be not re-issued, and the religious teaching of the Board be on the basis of the compromise of 1871, as amended," matters will be as they were before; the Christian loyalty of the majority of the Board and the good faith of the teachers will prevail; the evident meaning of the Bible will impress itself; improper teaching, which would attach children to Agnosticism or Unitarianism, will be dealt with as contrary to the law that forbids children in the Board Schools to be influenced towards any particular denomination.

It is said that without tests you cannot be sure that the teachers will teach Christian truth. The reply is very simple: the security comes not by tests, but by testimonials. In appointing teachers in Voluntary Schools no tests are applied—testimonials are all that is required. The testimonials for Board School teachers would naturally vary somewhat from those given for Voluntary Schools, but they would be efficient.

It is said that those who ask candidates to discontinue the circular will be voting for the Progressives, or supporting them. We refuse to believe that there must necessarily be only two parties on the Board, those who follow Mr. Riley and those who follow Mr. Lyulph Stanley. We believe that the introduction of a few independent members, if they can be found, would have the happiest effect on the religious disputes. And whether we believe with the Progressives or not, there are very few of them who do not wish for sound Scriptural teaching. To describe them in a body as Secularists is absurdly untrue.

It is said that as the London Diocesan Conference and so many of the clergy, both High Church and Evangelical, support the circular, the best plan is for all Church people, whether they agree with its policy or not, to submit to it and accept it,

and that in the end the opposition will cease. But the circular was unlike the compromise in this particular respect, that the Board was nearly equally divided upon it, whereas the compromise was carried with almost unanimity. One of the leaders of the Nonconformist opposition was assured by one of the fuglemen of the circular that he intended to have more circulars. The opposition will plainly be continued, and without the agreement of the Nonconformists no permanent religious settlement at the Board is possible.

It is said that the teachers are to a large extent promulgating Unitarianism and Agnosticism, or at the least are doubtful what kind of Christianity they ought to teach. The facts are these. One class of infants was found saying that Joseph was the father of our Lord ("Thy father and I have sought Thee sorrowing"), and one headmistress dropped the doxology at the end of a hymn. To argue from single instances is one of the most fatal of the mistakes pointed out by Lord Bacon. These cases should have been quietly dealt with by the Committee at the Board. The great mass of the teachers teach the Christianity which all orthodox Christians believe. The head teachers of the whole vast Division of Greenwich have unanimously repudiated the insinuations of Lord Halifax. The imaginary Unitarian aggression is the wildest of fictions. The imaginary Unitarian Plot of 1894 is only fit to rank with the Popish Plot of Titus Oates.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

---

## Short Notices.

---

*Evening Communion: the Argument for the Practice stated, and the Objections against it answered.* By the Ven. JOSHUA HUGHES-GAMES, D.C.L. Pp. 160. Price 2s. 6d. Nisbet and Co.

**I**N this interesting volume by the able and learned Archdeacon of Man the reader will find ample material to enable him to form a sound judgment on the important subject of which it treats. The arguments for and against the practice of evening Communion are fully and fairly stated; and after what even opponents must admit to be a temperate discussion of the subject, the practice itself is recommended as being Scriptural and primitive, as well as reasonable and right, under circumstances which happily obtain largely in our day. We refer to evening services being largely attended, especially by the working classes, including many who are practically hindered from attendance at Divine service at any other time of the day. Testimony is given (at p. 93)—which might be greatly increased—that the cessation of evening Communion where it has been established has driven many Church communicants and their families into Dissent. The supposed necessity that the Holy Communion should be partaken of fasting is shown to be the main objection to

evening Communion in the minds of those who object to it on principle. There can be little doubt but that this same supposed necessity had much to do with the practical abolition of evening Communion in the second and third centuries, and onwards. Really primitive Christianity, however—the Christianity of Christ and His Apostles and prophets, and of the New Testament Churches—knew nothing of such materialistic superstition, except to condemn it, and consequently saw no objection to partaking of the Holy Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ in the evening, and “after supper.” We sincerely welcome and heartily recommend the Archdeacon’s book in defence of the lawfulness, the propriety, and the reasonableness of evening Communion. Neither he nor we have a word to say against mid-day or early-morning Communion, but we maintain the right to provide that holy ordinance for our communicants at such times as suit the convenience of those especially who are least able to choose their time, whether morning, noon, or evening.

*Bunyan’s Pilgrim’s Progress.* Pp. 423. Samuel Bagster and Sons.

Many who have read and loved Bunyan’s rare old allegory will welcome this handy little edition, with its clear type, interesting preface, and quaint side-illustrations, reminding us of the woodcuts in our grandfathers’ days.

*Lessons on the Church Catechism.* By the Rev. T. H. BARNETT. Pp. 176. Church of England Sunday-School Institute.

Mr. Barnett has given us a useful manual for Sunday-school and other Church teachers. His work is a little wanting in illustration, but he succeeds in his attempt to place before his readers Church doctrine as Bible truth. This manual is unexceptionable in its teaching, and clear in its arrangement.

*Epistles and Hymns of St. Patrick.* Edited by the Rev. THOMAS OLDEN. Third edition—revised. Pp. 128. S.P.C.K.

Protestant Churchmen in Ireland will be glad to learn that all the Church of Ireland holds to-day was held by St. Patrick, and that nothing that she rejects was accepted by him. Especially is it noteworthy that his teaching was in accordance with that cardinal principle of the Church—that “Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation.”

*Everyday Religion.* By Mrs. PEARSALL SMITH. Nisbet and Co. Price 2s. 6d.

Though not written from the point of view of the ordinary Churchman, still, we must cordially welcome another work from the pen of the spiritually-minded author of “The Christian’s Secret of a Happy Life.” That work, we believe, has already passed through forty editions, and has been translated into more than a dozen languages; and we may confidently predict that a similar usefulness will attend her latest book. Mrs. Pearsall Smith holds, with Fénelon, that true religion resides not in the emotions, but the will, and this wholesome doctrine may be said to underlie her teaching. There breathes through the book a pleasant spirit of practical piety, assured peace, and trustful faith, characteristic of the Society of Friends.

*The Book of Job and the Song of Solomon.* Translated into English metre by Talmid. Pp. 85. James Thin, Edinburgh.

For this attempt “to convey more accurately the structure and emphasis” of these two books there will no doubt be admirers, if they do not find the metre too halting, and the meaning more obscure than in the Authorised Version.

*The Village Church, and what it Teaches.* By the Rev. G. F. MACLEAR, D.D.  
Pp. 105. S.P.C.K.

This is a reprint of chapters that have appeared in *The Dawn of Day*. It is intended to present in a popular form the argument for the truth of the Resurrection of our Lord to be derived from the realization of all that the fabric of a church and its services imply. It is written with all Canon Maclear's ability, and will be valued by those who look at things from a moderate High-Church point of view.

*The Resurrection Glory; or, Thoughts on 1 Cor. xv.* By S. S. Pp. 76.  
Elliot Stock.

This little commentary is written in an earnest, devout spirit, but we do not think it will otherwise commend itself to our readers. The writer says in his preface, "In some respects the views set forth differ from prevailing theological opinions"; two of these views are, the future annihilation of the wicked, and that "there appears to be within the Godhead some difference of rank."

*The Golden Secret in Christian Work.* By J. OSWALD JACKSON. Pp. 64.  
R.T.S.

The "Golden Secret" is "the principle of individual effort—of one bring one." There is not much else in this book.

*Little Rests by the Way.* By E. H. G. Pp. 154. Elliot Stock.

An excellent little work. It pleasantly reminds us of F. R. Havergal's "Morning Bells" and "Little Pillows," though written for older children. We recommend it to god-parents and guardians for those under their charge.

*Foreign Missions and Home Calls.* By the Author of "Are Foreign Missions doing any Good?" with introductory letter by the present Bishop of Durham. Twentieth thousand. Pp. 102. Elliot Stock.

We rejoice to find that this most useful and forcible little work has had so much deserved success.

*The Word in the School.* By ANDREW S. LAMB. Nisbet and Co. Twenty-first thousand. Pp. 104.

This little work is a review, from the point of view of an Evangelical Christian, of the comparative capacities of Board School, Voluntary School, and Sunday School for the conveyance of Gospel truth. Dissatisfied with the Board School system, except as a vehicle of Biblical knowledge, recognising that the Voluntary Schools cannot provide for many more than half the children of the country, and conscious of the defects of many Sunday Schools, Mr. Lamb suggests that Boards of Managers should arrange their syllabus from passages of the Bible compiled to illustrate each other. Such a manual for Board School teachers would be of high utility.

*Facing the Foe: Notes on Bible Characters, for a Young Men's Bible-Class.* By VIOLET BROOKE HUNT. Pp. 64. S.P.C.K.

There is in these Bible lessons a tone of true sympathy with young men in their troubles and difficulties and aspirations. The characters are vividly drawn, the lessons are practical, and the book will be of service to other teachers. We strongly recommend it.

*Fifty-two Simple Meditations for Lent.* By the Rev. HARRY WILSON.  
Price 1s. Griffith Farran and Co.

Though we cannot agree with the teaching of this course of meditations

on such subjects as "absolution," "the sacred food," and others, which are treated from a sacerdotal standpoint, still, there is much in them that we are glad to find. The arrangement of the meditations is excellent.

*Self-Discipline*: Six Lectures on Pastoral Theology. By Principal GIBSON. Pp. 157. S.P.C.K.

These lectures, which were delivered in the Divinity School, Cambridge, last year, do not touch on controversial matters. They contain vigorous, kindly, wise, and much-needed advice, and should do much good. We commend them most earnestly to all young clergymen.

*The Poems of George Herbert*. With a Preface. Pp. 256. Samuel Bagster and Sons.

This is one of the "Bagster's Christian Classics" series, and is a neat and well-got-up little edition of the saintly Herbert's works. Herbert expressed a hope in his simple, humble way that his poems "might turn to the advantage of some poor dejected soul"; and this edition cannot fail to add to the already ample realization of his diffident hope.

*Lessons on Confirmation*. By the Rev. PETER YOUNG, M.A. Third edition. Pp. 170. S.P.C.K.

Mr. Young gives us a new edition of his plain and useful heads of instruction to Confirmation candidates. Probably every clergyman has formed his own Confirmation lessons, but many will value the help of this admirable little work. There are twenty-one lessons, each amply illustrated by Scripture references. Forms of private prayer are added.

*Present Day Tracts*. Vol. xii. Pp. 52. B.T.S.

Our readers will be heartily glad to have a new volume of this admirable series. The present one contains six papers: Testimonies of Great Men to the Bible and Christianity, by Dr. Murdoch; Theology an Inductive and Progressive Science, Dr. Angus; Modern Scepticism compared with Christian Faith, M. Kaufmann; Human Suffering in the Light of Christianity, Dr. Sterling Berry; the Psalms of David and Modern Criticism, Dr. Green; and Christ's Doctrine of Prayer, Dr. Edgar. The essays will be no inconsiderable help to consecutive thought on these great subjects.

#### MAGAZINES.

We have received the following (September) 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 National Church, The Foreign Church Chronicle, The Evangelical Churchman, The Gospel Magazine, The Church Sunday-School Magazine, Blackwood, The Cornhill, Sunday Magazine, The Fireside, Cassell's Family Magazine, The Quaver, 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, The Philanthropist, Light in the Home, Awake, India's Women, Parish Magazine, New and Old, The Dawn of Day, The Bible Society's Gleanings for the Young, The Bible Society's Monthly Reporter, The Cottager and Artisan, Friendly Greetings, Little Folks, The Child's Pictorial, The Children's World, Our Little Dots and The Boy's and Girl's Companion.*





## THE MONTH.

THE most interesting event of the month has been the speech of Cardinal Vaughan at Preston on Reunion. The following passage, with its naturally complacent view of Cardinal Newman's counter-reformation within the Reformed National Church, is full of suggestion and warning: "There can only be two cases of reunion so far as doctrine and authority are concerned—compromise, that is, federation and mutual recognition, and submission, that is, individual or corporate absorption. The first is inconsistent with the Divine constitution of the Church. There remains only the second. Our hopes of a gradual submission by an ever-increasing number of Anglicans rest on the growing realization of the Catholic, and therefore of the non-national, character of the Church of Christ; the increasing distrust of national limitation in the idea of realization, the growing appreciation of Catholic doctrine and devout practices, and a sensible diminution of the difficulties and prejudices that have hitherto obscured them. Contrast the churches of the Establishment of sixty or seventy years ago, closed from week end to week end, with the present churches, which are often distinguished only with extreme difficulty from those belonging to the Church of Rome. The doctrines of the Catholic Church, which had been rejected and condemned as blasphemous, superstitious and fond inventions, have been re-examined and taken back, one by one, until the Thirty-nine Articles have been banished and buried as a rule of faith. All this speaks of a change, and a movement towards the Church, that would have appeared absolutely incredible at the beginning of this century, and the movement has been stronger than the rankest Protestant, stronger than the lawyers and the Legislature. A spasmodic protest, a useless prosecution, a Delphic judgment, and the movement continues and spreads, lodging itself in Anglican homes and convents, in schools, churches and even cathedrals, until it is rapidly covering the country. Has there ever been seen a more marvellous change than this in within half a century? I hope and believe that we are witnessing, at least in a very large measure, an instance of the marvellous ways of Divine grace. What, then, do we desire for those who seek reunion? Not that they should come over to us blindly. We could not receive them thus, even were they to offer themselves. All that we ask is, that they would break down the walls of prejudice, that they would examine our claims with an open mind, that they would freely take evidence from Catholic priests and laymen, and read Catholic books, that they would cease to be deluded by the enemies of the Catholic faith, that they would emancipate their souls from a servitude to individuals which hinders their approach to the Catholic Church. We ask nothing unreasonable. We know the force of invincible ignorance and insuperable prejudice. We judge no man finally. We beseech our Blessed Lady, whose dowry is England, again to hasten the time of her Son's miracles, and to obtain an outpouring of Divine grace upon souls such as may give not only light to see, but fortitude and courage to make all those needful sacrifices to flesh and blood, which in God's ordinary providence are required of those who are mercifully called by God to return to the Church of their fathers."

The annual report of the National Protestant Church Union states that the membership has reached nearly 4,000. Some 48,000 pamphlets have been sold or circulated, comprising 21,000 copies of Archdeacon Farrar's tract on "Undoing the Work of the Reformation." A Parliamentary sub-committee have been nominated, and the formation of a board of patronage has engaged the careful consideration of the council. The income reached the sum of £1,500.