---

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

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

THE

# CHURCHMAN

JULY, 1895.

## ART. I.—POLITICAL PREACHING: ITS INFLUENCE AND DANGERS.

### A RETROSPECT.

FEW, we might almost say none, of the many writers who have taken in hand the history of our country during the troubled times of the Stuarts have realized the vast influence which the pulpit exercised (unhappily almost entirely for evil) on the mind of the nation and on the fate of that unfortunate dynasty. Poisoned with a flattery which knew no bounds, and invested with attributes which could only belong to the Divine Being by the clergy of that day, from the episcopate to the humblest teacher of the Church, the claims of the successive sovereigns rivalled, and almost exceeded, those of the Papacy itself. Even in the days of the despotic Elizabeth there were not wanting men to give faithful advice and even solemn warning to kings and princes—a memorable instance of which was given by the famous divine, Mr. Edward Dering, who, in a sermon preached before the Queen in 1569, warned her, "lest she, who had been *tanquam ovis*, as a sheep appointed to be slain" (Ps. xliv. 22), "should come to be chastised *tanquam indomita juvenca*, as an untamed and unruly heifer." He had taken up the mission of a prophet, and naturally incurred the fate of a prophet by undergoing persecution as a Puritan.

But the accession of James I. found the Church of England in a state of servile submission to the Crown, which renewed the worst days of Henry VIII., and from which for two centuries it never rose. No English Churchman can read without the deepest humiliation the narrative of the Hampton Court conference as it is recorded by Bishop Barlow. Every utterance of the King was met with the Herodian response,

"It is the voice of a god, and not of a king." When we read the frivolous arguments and puerile discourse of the King, and the peremptory and overbearing manner in which he met every difficulty of the Nonconformists, we may well be amazed at the information that "the Conference raised such an admiration in the Lords in respect of the King, his singular readiness and exact knowledge, that one of them said he was fully persuaded his Majesty spake by the instinct of the Spirit of God. My Lord Cecill acknowledged 'that very much we are bound to God who had given us a King of an understanding heart.' My Lord Chancellor, passing out of the Privy Chamber, said unto the Dean of Chester, standing by the door: 'I have often heard and read that *Rex est mixta persona cum sacerdote*, but I never saw the truth thereof till this day.'" To which the narrator adds his own estimate of the royal perfections, by applying to him the title of a "living library and a walking study."[1]

The sermons preached before the King during the conference were of the same inflated character. Instead of charitable endeavours to heal the wounds of the Church and to meet the difficulties of the Presbyterians and other Nonconformists, they were devoted to magnifying the exclusive powers of the episcopate, the rights of the King in the calling of religious assemblies, and the duty of entire subjection. As a climax to all this will-worship and false humility, Dr. King, who calls the King "our Solomon, our peacemaker, who, after the Prince of Peace, hath best interpreted that name amongst us," completes his adulation by addressing him with the words of the Queen of Sheba to Solomon; and in his zeal for the King, forgets even his reverence to the Trinity, by ascribing to Christ, with the *Father* and the *Holy Ghost*, all might and mercy in the Church for ever.[2]

The "King's son," for whom these worthy divines invoke so many blessings, was present with his father at the conference. "This noble young prince," writes Dr. Barlow, "was sitting upon a stool," and received on this occasion the grounds of his education in the Divine right of kings, and, in their virtual impeccability, a lesson which was so fatal to him in his after-life. In the year 1627, two years after his accession, his education in the nature and extent of his own powers and attributes was completed by his chaplain, Dr. Maynwaring, in two sermons on "Religion and Allegiance," preached before him, on July 4, at Oatlands, and on July 29, 1627, at Alderton, and published by his command. These sermons were after-

[1] Barlow's Hampton Court Conference. Lond., 1604, p. 83.
[2] Sermon of Dr. King, Dean of Christ Church. Oxford, 1607.

wards burned by order of both Houses, suppressed by proclamation, and the author of them impeached. They were reprinted in 1709, on the occasion of the confusions occasioned by the famous sermon of Dr. Sacheverel, who renewed their doctrine. The doctrine of passive obedience, that corollary of the "Divine right," was brought out by Dr. Maynwaring in its most unmitigated form, and the deification of kings in what we must designate as its most blasphemous development. The former of the two sermons referred to is on Eccles. viii. 2.

"The sublime power," he writes, "which resides in earthly potentates, is not a derivation or collection of human power scattered among many and gathered into one head, but a participation in God's own omnipotency, which He never did communicate to any multitudes of men in the world, but only to his own vicegerents. And that is His meaning when He saith, 'By Me kings reign. Kings they are by My immediate constitution, and by Me they rule and exercise their so high and large authority.'

"All the significations of a royal pleasure are, and ought to be, to all loyal subjects in the nature and force of a command. As well for that none may nor can search into the high discourse and deep counsels of kings, seeing their hearts are so deep by reason of their distance from common men, even as the heavens are in respect of the earth. As also that none may dare to call in question the judgment of a king, because the heart of a king is in the hand of God, and he turneth it which way he pleaseth. Who, then, may question that which God doth proclaim from heaven to be in His hands and at His guidance? And for his sovereign will (which gives a binding force to all his royal edicts), who may dare resist it without incurable waste and breach of conscience? . . . Nay, though any king in the world should command flatly against the law of God, yet were his power no otherwise to be resisted, but for the not doing of his will; in that which is clearly unlawful to endure with patience, whatsoever penalty his pleasure should inflict upon them, who in this case would desire rather to obey God than man. By which patient and meek suffering of their sovereign's pleasure they should become glorious martyrs, whereas by resisting of his will they should for ever endure the pain and stain of odious traitors and impious malefactors."

Of the duty of the Parliament, he further writes: "Although such assemblies . . . be most sacred and honourable, and necessary also for those ends for which they were at first instituted, yet know we must that ordained they were not to this end to contribute any right to kings, whereby to challenge tributary aids and subsidiary helps, but for the more equal imposing and more easy exacting of that which unto kings

doth appertain by natural and original law and justice, as their proper inheritance annexed to their imperial crowns from their very births.

"Secondly, if they would consider the urgent and pressing necessities of state, that cannot stay without certain and apparent danger, for the motion and revolution of so great and vast a body as such assemblies are, nor yet abide those long and pawsing (*sic*) deliberations when they are assembled," etc.

He then proceeds to assert the urgency of the King's demand for subsidies, involving the honour of the King, his security, the relief and succour of his uncle, the King of Denmark, and similar reasons.

In the second sermon he pursues the same theme. One extract will be sufficient to complete the view of his doctrine, which unhappily guided his too willing pupil to the precipice over which he fell. "If we demand the reason why religion doth thus associate God and the King, it may be conceived to be from three causes: 1, Either from the communion of names, for God is not only said to be standing *in synagogâ Deorum*, 'in the assembly of Princes,' as One of them, but doth also vouchsafe to them the participation of His own most blessed name—a privilege which he never did impart to any creature, but only unto such as are most near and dear to Him—namely, to kings, whom alone the Scriptures honour with that high and noble grace to be called Gods. 2, Or else from the propinquity and near-bordering of such offences as reflect upon God and His anointed King. 3, Or else from that purity of beneficence which men enjoy from God and sacred kings."

In this fatal teaching we may truly say that "coming events cast their shadows before." The ship-money, the dispensing with or suspension of Parliamentary Government, the demand of subsidies for foreign wars, the limitation of the power of the Parliament in granting supplies to the mere adjustment of whatever burden the King might lay upon it—all these unconstitutional doctrines were here impressed upon the mind of the unfortunate King, and a Laud was too soon found to carry out the theory of a Maynwaring into a successful practice. For Laud was less a preacher and a theorist on Governments than an energetic actor in the events which gave such doctrines so vivid a reality.

In the terrible reaction which followed so speedily, the pulpit was still the most important factor. A new school had arisen, which, taking its stand upon the Old Testament history, forced into an unnatural harmony with its terrible judgments the gentler laws of Christianity which were in direct opposition to them. The very texts of the sermons preached before the

Houses of the Legislature at this time, not to speak of their polemical and sometimes grotesque titles, gave to the pulpits a strange reactionary influence. It would seem as though the Puritan divines of that day were rather following the Parliamentary forces into the field than encouraging them by their distant prayers. The sermons on the appointed fast days, which were renewed on every reverse of the army, had so stirring a character, and presented so far greater an eloquence and force than those of the Monarchy, that the influence of the pulpit for evil was more than ever conspicuous. Every sermon of the great divines of that day (and when we remember that they included the Owens, the Calamys, the Caryls, the Marshalls, the Sedgewicks, and a number of really eloquent preachers, we cannot but give due weight to their influence) was like a call to arms. A favourite theme was the curse of Meroz for not coming to the help of the Lord against the mighty.

With the Restoration, this great reactionary influence passed away, and the canonization of the murdered King, and the celebration of the day of his "martyrdom," brought in the influence of the pulpits in a new form and to a new end. It was the day of revenge and of reprisals, and too well and bitterly was it celebrated. The 31st of January found all the pulpits of the Church attuned to one pitch, and those who care to examine the dreary literature of the "martyrdom" sermons, of which the writer of these lines has many of the more popular specimens, must be led to confess that no greater injury was ever inflicted on the Church of England than the institution, on that day, of a service which kept alive for generations every saddest memory of events which had no bearing upon their present interests or feelings, but which were represented as though they lived for ever, and involved sins which, contrary to every Divine promise of mercy, were described as being inexpiable. Even learned and moderate men like Bishop Beveridge, Bishop Blackall, and others, forgetful of the words of Ezekiel (chap. xviii.), which their extreme interpretation of the visitation of the sins of the fathers upon the children so absolutely refutes, carried on the delusion, which sometimes assumed an almost absurd manifestation. In a sermon of Dr. Friend, preached before the House of Commons in 1710, on Jer. iii. 25, "We lie down in our shame," etc., he asks: "Is there no way of blotting out the infamy of this day—must we always lie down in our shame? and must our confusion for ever cover us? It must—for 'it is written in a table, it is noted in a book,' in an immortal book, 'that it may be for ever and ever, that this is a rebellious people.' But though no method can be found wholly to

extinguish the reproach, yet there is room left to lessen the degree of it." More, surely, could not be said of the death of our Lord and its effects upon the Jewish people—though our forefathers never invoked the penalty of the King's death for themselves and their children. But these excesses of idolatrous zeal were even less injurious than the opportunity thus yearly given to the extreme Episcopalians to pour forth the vials of their wrath upon the helpless Presbyterians, a course which at last forced the Nonconformists to break the silence they had wisely maintained on these anniversaries, and to clear themselves of the charges brought against them without any reason or historical authority. A defence of this kind was put forth with much moderation at the chapel in Blackfriars by S. Wright in 1714, who observes: "The more I have acquainted myself with the history of those times, the more I wonder at such men as are continually ascribing those fatal divisions to religion, when it is plain that for several years religion was not concerned in the quarrel. They were matters of State and of the Civil Government, illegal raising of money, discontinuing of Parliaments for twelve years together, with several trials of men, and very hard sentences passed upon them, for things that would by no means justify such severity. Sometimes forces were raised and fleets fitted out to no purpose, and at other times, as was suspected, to ill purpose. These, I say, and such like things, were the first occasions of public strife and contention. And if religion, together with these things, was insisted on, it was not more than what everyone might expect, when the Queen was a Papist, and Archbishop Laud was so very severe upon all that did not come as near the Papists as himself" (p. 13). The preacher, passing on to the almost universal prostitution of the celebration of the 30th of January to the cause of strife and contention, and to the perpetuation of all the evils it professed to deplore, proceeds to say:

"The 30th of January fast we have reason especially to complain of being thus perverted. Instead of being solemnized by a humble reflecting upon, and heartily bewailing the vices and contentions which once proved so destructive, some men are doing all they can to revive our jealousies and uneasinesses, cherishing an implacable temper against a whole body of men for an action which is as generally abhorred among us as among themselves. And our fathers did more to have prevented it than many of theirs did, though some, indeed, of our warmest accusers are the children of those men that were then of the same denomination as ourselves. The Dissenters have rather chosen to be silent upon the stated returns of these days than to say anything that should renew or widen our breaches.

This behaviour we think more suitable to the religion we profess, and most conducive to the healing those disorders that have been our shame and misery in former times." If we needed any proof of the spirit engendered by the commemoration in question, we might find it, among many similar ones, in a sermon on the anniversary in 1715 by Luke Milbourne at St. Ethelburga's, the opening sentence of which will be enough for the patience of the reader: "Those infamous rebels who about the middle of the last age made the kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland but one great field of blood, the dismal theatre of all those prodigies of impiety which men or devils could invent or perpetrate, and which earth or heaven itself could suffer; those rebels, out of their principles of hellish policy and impudence, were wont to mock God by a pretended fast," etc. These excesses of invective, carried on ever since the Restoration, and the association with them of the name of Laud —a name of bitter recollection to all who had heard or read of his reign of terror—were the main cause of the divisions between High and Low Church which we see this day in their full development. For the apotheosis of Charles I. recalled that of Laud. We even read that a medal of the Archbishop was coined in the Tower soon after the Restoration, with this inscription, "Sancti Caroli Precursor," by which title the Archbishop is compared to St. John the Baptist, as the King in the 30th of January commemorations is constantly and emphatically paralleled with our Lord.[1]

But, as if January 30 did not give a sufficient opportunity for the bitter invectives of the preachers against Nonconformity, November 5 was added as a fitting occasion for recalling to the minds of their hearers the dangers not only of Popery, for which the celebration was instituted, but also of Nonconformity, then regarded as more immediately dangerous. Accordingly, on November 5, 1709, the too famous Dr. Sacheverel, the Coryphæus of the High Church party of the day, preached his well-known sermon entitled "The Perils of False Brethren both in Church and State." To anyone who reads this mass of inflated nonsense it must appear wonderful that it should have occasioned so great a celebrity as to become the subject of a State trial and a solemn condemnation by the highest authority in the land. It set forth the old doctrine of the "subject's obligation to an absolute and unconditional obedience to the supreme Power in all things lawful, and the utter illegality of resistance upon any pretence whatever." It denounces any attempt at resistance under the pretext of self-defence, and places among the number of "false

[1] See "Observations on the Keeping of Jan. 30 and May 29," by J. G. G., Lond., 1694, p. 5.

brethren" all who oppose the monstrous doctrines which were believed by the public and by the Church itself to have been buried with their author, the fated Archbishop. The confusions which followed this attempt to revive all the worst evils of the former century are too well known to need the pursuit of them in this rapid sketch.

We have now briefly traced the evils which the political preaching of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has inflicted upon our Church, how much it has contributed to increase and perpetuate our "manifold divisions," how justly it has brought us under the charge of will-worship and idolatry, and into the sin of "having men's persons in admiration because of advantage" (Jude v. 16). For these "great swelling words" were not uttered without the motive, however latent, of proving a higher degree of orthodoxy, a more unquestionable loyalty, a greater horror of crime, a more profound affection for the person of royalty, and, in a word, proving that the preacher "was not as other men are." And though the provocations to this guilt have been removed by the wise severance of religion from politics and the disuse of polemical services, the danger still remains. The pulpit is still too panegyrical in its character, too onesided in its appreciation of the great events that are passing on around us, and too partial in their application. We may well, therefore, take a solemn lesson from this brief review of the influence of the pulpit for evil during our past history, and fix more and more upon our minds the great rule of the Apostolic preaching, "We preach Christ crucified"—a sufferer with whose life no human life can ever be compared without dishonouring it, a Teacher whose lesson was ever one of love and mutual forbearance, and who proved in His Divine life and expiatory death that the truth of God can never be reached but through love unfeigned; that, in the words of St. Augustine, "Non vincit nisi veritas; victoria veritatis est charitas" (Sermon 358).

ROBERT C. JENKINS.

## ART. II.—THE DEFENCE OF CHITRAL.

> Not once or twice in our fair island story
> Has the path of duty been the way to glory.
>
> TENNYSON.

THE defence of Chitral is a very brilliant episode in the recent history of India. We have heard that it has been compared with the memorable defence of Lucknow; but it

seems to us much more closely to resemble the historic siege of Arcot nearly one hundred and fifty years ago, when Clive first won his spurs as the ablest strategist and soldier of that time in Southern India, and when Indian sepoy and European soldier first learned to combat shoulder to shoulder. There are some striking points of resemblance between these two events. They both lasted about the same length of time. In both the odds against the besieged were enormous; in both the devotion of the sepoys to their officers and to their duty was conspicuous; in both the unselfishness and the self-denial of the sepoys were pre-eminent; in both the enemy made one great final effort and was repulsed, and in a brief space of time after it dispersed. One well-known instance of the unselfishness of the sepoys at Arcot may here be given. They were half starving, but they came to their young leader and requested leave to give all the remaining rice to their European comrades, the water in which it was boiled being, they said, enough for them. Well might Macaulay write: "The devotion of the little band to its chief surpassed anything that is related of the Tenth Legion of Cæsar or of the Old Guard of Napoleon." The heroism at Chitral may be set beside the devotion exhibited at Arcot.

Chitral is a small town in a valley sloping down from the Hindu Kush about seventy miles from the eastern frontier of Afghanistan. It is a hundred and eighty-six miles due north of Peshawar, the great north-western frontier garrison of British India, and in comparatively close proximity to the Pamirs, which have of late become the bone of contention between Russia and England. It has not come prominently into notice until within the last five years, and, in fact, it has, owing to recent events, only within the last few months been an object of anxiety and attention to our Indian statesmen. The fort is a rude but strong fastness, built in the fashion common in that neighbourhood, possessing the advantages and the weakness of similar constructions. The walls are made of rough stones wedged into a wooden framework. They are strong, but liable to destruction by fire on account of the quantity of wood which they contain. The fort is quadrangular, the angles being defended by tall loopholed castellets. It is situated about forty yards from the left bank of the river which runs through the valley, and there is a fifth tower on the north, intended to protect the access to the river. The walls are about twenty-five feet high, and the towers double that height. There are several gardens adjoining the fort on the east and south, and these were of considerable service to the enemy and a source of peculiar peril to the besieged. Nestling amidst the luxuriant foliage of plane-trees, near to

the mountains which there close in upon the valley, the fort is commanded by these heights, and is within range of the enemy posted on them. The principal difficulty during the siege was to obtain protection from the incessant fire poured into the interior from the adjacent mountains, as well as from the gardens. Chitral is of great strategical importance, not so much on account of its own intrinsic strength as because it commands the roads issuing from certain comparatively easy passes over the giant guardian mountains on the north.

The recent history of the Chitral State is rather intricate owing to the relationships of its successive rulers, and a minute description of them would be unnecessarily wearisome. In 1885 a diplomatic mission was sent thither by Lord Dufferin under Sir William, then Colonel, Lockhart, and a close alliance was entered into between the Mehtar, or ruler of Chitral, and the Indian Government. The Mehtar at that time was Aman-ul-Mulk, a strong and sturdy governor, who had got the whole State into his firm grasp, and knew how to retain it by the rough and ready means too well known in that primitive part of the world. So long as he reigned there was neither division nor anarchy in the country. He died suddenly in September, 1892. There then ensued a thoroughly Oriental scramble for the throne. In such contests the weakest invariably goes to the wall, and the strongest gains the day. Might is always right. The absent have not a shadow of a chance. Old Aman-ul-Mulk left four legitimate sons, two by one mother and two by another. The first two were by name Nizam-ul-Mulk and Afzul-ul-Mulk. The latter was in Chitral at the time of their father's death. He accordingly promptly seized the throne, and marched against his brother Nizam, who precipitately fled. There seemed every probability of his remaining in peaceable possession; but though he had apparently got rid of his brothers, he had forgotten a likely claimant in the person of an uncle, a brother of his father's, named Sher Afzul, who had been driven by Aman-ul-Mulk into Afghanistan, and who, seeing a favourable opportunity for asserting himself, suddenly appeared before the fort. It was a bold stroke, but one of those daring feats which prove successful owing to its very rapidity and daring. In the conflict that ensued Afzul-ul-Mulk was killed by a stray shot, as he was hurrying to the defence of the walls. This settled the matter. His time-serving citizens at once perceived that the new-comer, who had appeared so promptly and rapidly, was the right man for them, and forthwith enlisted themselves on his side. He was profuse in promises. He assured the people that under him a golden reign would commence, and they were quite content to be his humble slaves—until

another claimant should turn up. Very soon another did turn up. This was the old Mehtar's eldest son, Nizam-ul-Mulk, and on his appearance Sher Afzul rapidly fled back again to Afghanistan.

Right seemed now to have come to the right, as the Eastern proverb says. Nizam-ul-Mulk had been a good deal in the company of English officers, and he requested that a representative of the British Government might be sent to Chitral. Accordingly Mr. Robertson was commissioned to proceed thither, and he arrived there in January, 1893. The consequence was that Nizam-ul-Mulk was fully recognised by the Indian Government as ruler; and a political officer was appointed, who, after remaining at Chitral for a few months, withdrew to Mastuj, a town about sixty miles north-east of Chitral, though from time to time he visited that place. Tranquillity and good government prevailed for the space of two full years, but on New Year's Day of the present year the whole country was once more thrown into confusion. One of the sovereign's half-brothers, named Amir-ul-Mulk, instigated some of his partisans to shoot his brother while out hawking, the latter being passionately fond of sport. This was the reason of the recent hostilities. Amir-ul-Mulk was evidently acting under the inspiration of his father-in-law, Umra Khan, the chief of Jandol, a small territory to the south of Chitral. This man, whose name is now so familiar to us all, was a born soldier. He at once grasped the situation, despatched forces across the lofty passes that separate Jandol from Chitral, took the fort of Drosh, and hastened to invest Chitral. That fort had meanwhile been in great peril owing to the political agent, Lieutenant Gurdon, having with him but a slender escort. He was, however, reinforced by Mr. Robertson, the British agent at Gilgit, which is some two hundred miles east of Chitral, with some Sikhs and one hundred and fifty men of an Imperial regiment belonging to the Maharajah of Kashmir. Umra Khan found a ready ally in Sher Afzul, the brother of the old Mehtar, who, it will be remembered, had been for a short season on the throne, and who, scenting war and plunder, had emerged from his hiding-place in Afghanistan. The inhabitants of Chitral were enthusiastic admirers of Sher Afzul, whose former promises of unlimited enjoyment they appreciated. A few remained within the fort, but they were a source of embarrassment to the garrison, and had to be carefully guarded. Nothing daunted by the number and ability of their assailants, Mr. Robertson and his brave little garrison calmly made preparations for defence. A small detachment, under Captain Ross, which had been despatched for their relief, was almost annihilated, and the

defenders of Chitral were in sore straits. They were not, however, to be left to their own resources; and we will turn aside for a few minutes to consider the efforts which the Government of India was making for their relief, though we intend to concentrate our attention chiefly on their own achievements.

There are two principal routes from British India to Chitral. One is through Kashmir and Gilgit, where the number of troops had been increased, but it is long, very mountainous, and very difficult. The other is from Peshawar, which is geographically situated in Afghanistan, though it is politically in the province of the Punjab. It is much shorter than the other, but lies across several stiff passes, two of which are more than ten thousand feet in height, and are crowned with snow. This route also lies through a country inhabited by tribes who are the inveterate frontier enemies of the British Government. A compact army of 14,000 men of all arms was assembled at Peshawar under the command of Sir Robert Low, and warning was given to Umra Khan that, unless he raised the siege of Chitral within a given time, he would be attacked. A proclamation was issued to the various tribes, stating that if they remained peaceful they would not be molested, but plainly informing them that the object of the Indian Government was to put an end to the present state of affairs, and to prevent any future lawless aggression on the territory of Chitral. As no satisfactory reply was received, the force marched from Peshawar on April 1. At the same time, Colonel Kelly was endeavouring to advance from Gilgit by the more difficult route with a small detachment of 600 men, consisting of the 32nd Pioneers, some Kashmir troops, and local levies. It does not appear that the garrison of Chitral were aware of these efforts being made for their relief, and it is to their doings that we now return.

On March 2 the usurping Mehtar, Amir-ul-Mulk, resigned, and Mr. Robertson, having good reason to believe that he was intriguing with Umra Khan, placed him under arrest, and put his younger brother, Shuja-ul-Mulk, in temporary occupation as Mehtar, subject to the future decision of the Government of India. Next day Sher Afzul, Umra Khan's ally, arrived with his forces in the neighbourhood of Chitral, and it was resolved that an attack upon him should immediately be made. The main object was to ascertain the strength and disposition of the enemy. Captain Colin Campbell, of the Central India Horse, was in command. The chief attack was made under him on a village where Sher Afzul was posted, while a smaller body of men was sent under Captain Baird to scour the mountain-side on the right, and to endeavour to out-

flank the enemy. Both were greatly outnumbered. In the attack on the village Captain Campbell was wounded on the knee, and General Baj Singh and Major Bhikam Singh of the Kashmir forces were killed. The enemy was well armed, and swarmed around them. The retreat was conducted in a calm and soldierly fashion. At first great apprehension was felt regarding the fate of Captain Baird, for his party was completely cut off from the main body; but, though he was severely wounded, he was rescued by the courageous heroism of Surgeon-Captain Whitchurch, who carried him on his back, defending him against tremendous odds. Under cover of darkness he sometimes supported and sometimes carried him along a circuitous route some three miles long. Once he had to leave him for a few moments, and clear a way with the few men with him at the point of the bayonet, but eventually brought him safely into the fort. Unhappily his courage was unsuccessful so far as Captain Baird's life was concerned, for the latter died from his severe wounds the next morning. Calm, collected, and resigned, his last words to Mr. Robertson were, "Good-bye, sir. I hope your plan will succeed."

The enemy closed in on the next day, March 4, and the siege began. Before describing the salient points of the siege, which lasted just forty-six days, let us think for a few moments of the actors on the scene on either side. Within the fort were 543 men, of whom 370 were combatants. The Chitralis were a source of weakness and danger, for they had, as already stated, to be watched and guarded. There were 90 Sikhs sepoys and 300 of the Kashmir Imperial troops, besides servants and followers. There were six British officers—Mr. Robertson, the British Agent at Gilgit, whose coolness and promptitude and resource can scarcely be praised too highly; Captain Townshend, of the Central India Horse, who was in military command of the garrison; Captain Campbell, who had been incapacitated by the severe wound he had received in the action of March 3; Lieutenant Gurdon, the Political Agent at Chitral; Lieutenant Harley, in command of the Sikhs; and the brave Surgeon-Captain Whitchurch, an instance of whose gallantry has just been related. All seem to have acted together splendidly, and to have been fertile in devices and resource. On the other side, the besiegers were under the command of Abdul Majid Khan, a general of Umra Khan's, who kept admirable discipline, and who seems thoroughly to have known his business, and to have been completely versed in the art of conducting attacks against the forts that stud that country. Umra Khan was noted for his aptitude in taking such forts, and the troops under his general were equally proficient in this mode of warfare. They were splendid marks-

men, and never fired a shot aimlessly, as the garrison soon discovered to their cost. They were armed with rifles, and had plenty of ammunition, which was increased when the relieving-party under Lieutenants Fowler and Edwardes had been captured. Sher Afzul was among them, and with him levies who had come over the border from Afghanistan—Pathans who were attracted by the thought of a religious war against the Kafirs or infidels. These all tried every device to intimidate the English officers, and to allure the sepoys from their allegiance. They set before them diligently all the adverse news that they could collect. They let them know of every event that told against them, such as the capture of Lieutenant Fowler's party, but sedulously kept from them all news of Sir Robert Low's and Colonel Kelly's advances. The method in which Abdul Majid Khan conducted the attack was most careful and scientific. The chief assaults were made on the Water Tower, which protected the garrison's access to the river, and persistent endeavours were made to set the wood-work on fire. Much inconvenience was experienced from the enemy occupying a garden, which was so close to the fort that it almost formed a portion of it, for the enclosing wall ran out from the fort itself. There was a summer-house in this garden, which was a constant source of annoyance to the garrison. It was only fifty yards from one of the flanking castellets called the Gun Tower. General Abdul Majid Khan permitted no aimless, undisciplined rushes, and each advance was made by carefully-constructed *sangars*, or stone breast-works, which gave shelter and protection to each advancing party, and these were made in regular parallels. Early in the siege a desperate effort was made to set fire to the Water Tower, and such efforts were renewed at frequent intervals.

The garrison were fully on the alert. Their first business was to make a protected way to the river, and to concentrate their main attention on keeping it protected and free of access. The three military officers divided the day into watches as on board ship, and took watch and watch about. Constant care against fire had to be taken, and every device used to obtain protection from the accurate aim of the enemy. They had to be very careful regarding their ammunition, and their food supply had to be jealously husbanded. They were at once put on half rations, and, after a time, their medicines and surgical appliances failed. The most persistent attack was made on April 7, at five o'clock in the morning. A desperate effort was made against the Water Tower and the water-way, and also against the tower on the opposite side of the fort. The enemy brought great bundles of firewood, which they placed against this tower and set fire to them. This was not put out

for some hours, and with great difficulty; and, in helping to extinguish it, Mr. Robertson was wounded in the shoulder. He was, however, able to bear up; and, by the time the siege was raised, he could report that he was quite well again, and fit for any duty.

The most alarming attempt, however, was made by mining. Suspiciously loud tomtoming and other noises were made about the middle of April, and attentive listening during the intervals revealed the fact of persistent tapping which indicated mining operations, and which the noises were intended to drown. This mine was being dug from the summer-house in the garden, which was only forty yards from the south-east tower, and it had already reached to within ten feet of the walls. It was consequently determined to make a vigorous effort to dislodge the enemy from the summer-house and to destroy the mine. This sortie was completely successful. Lieutenant Harley commanded it, and he had under him forty Sikhs and sixty men of the Kashmir Regiment. Every man was told exactly what was to be done. The summer-house was taken, and the occupants of it driven out, and although a hot fire was kept up on the party from behind a breastwork beyond and from the garden walls, the head of the mine was captured, some five-and-thirty of the men who came creeping out of it were bayoneted, and the mine itself was blown up with the very powder which had been placed there for use against the fort.

This was the last effort of a determined enemy. On the night of the 18th they fled, and the brave little garrison were relieved from the incessant attacks whereby they had been harassed, except during short truces, for the past six weeks. It was reported that Colonel Kelly's force, after his wonderful march from Gilgit, had reached a place two marches distant, and on April 20 it arrived at Chitral. It is not within our purpose to narrate the account of his march over snow-clad mountain passes, through carefully fortified valleys, and against an active enemy, nor of the slower but not less admirable advance of Sir Robert Low's army. These had both dispirited the enemy and caused his retreat, now that the mining project had been defeated. Sher Afzul and Umra Khan were both in full flight. No wonder that, after a siege which had lasted forty-six days, and during which some of the finest qualities of man had been exhibited, the English officers are reported to have looked "worn and set," bearing even on their faces marks of the intense strain they had undergone. The testimony which they bear to the discipline, the devotion, and the fortitude of the sepoys, and especially of the Sikhs, is clear and unstinted. The Muhammadans of the garrison were true

to their salt even amidst persuasions and inducements to join their co-religionists, which were more trying and difficult to bear than the strain and stress of the siege. Since writing the greater part of the above from the telegraphic accounts contained in various papers, we have had the pleasure of reading the animated and vivid narrative of the siege written on the spot by the Special Correspondent of the *Times*, which enables us to supply here and there local colour and life.

The great problem which now remains for the Government of India to solve is the future policy regarding Chitral. It is generally supposed that this will eventually be solved by the retention of the fort, and by the construction of a road to it from Peshawar. This question has the warmest advocates on either side. The evidence regarding it is very equally divided. The military witnesses, headed by the undoubted authority of Field-Marshal Lord Roberts, are mostly in favour of retention; civilians, among whom are numbered Sir James Lyall and Sir Lepel Griffin, but supported by military men like Sir Neville Chamberlain, generally advocate its abandonment. All have an eye to the ultimate designs and movements of Russia. Our own feeling is that Russia has no idea whatever of invading India at any time and in any way. Her sole object is the possession of Constantinople; and any trouble that she may occasion on the frontier of India is solely intended to distract the attention of Europe, and especially of England, from that object. The constant scare regarding Russian designs on India, which has troubled England like an evil nightmare during the last sixty years, strikes us as not very worthy or dignified. We have lately been reading again the history of the first Afghan War, and very sad reading it is. It would have been well for India if the counsels of Sir Alexander Burnes and others like him had never been allowed to disturb the equanimity either of the English Cabinet or of the Indian Government. The position of affairs has enormously altered since those days. Russia and England have drawn closer. Russia now possesses as well-ordered and peaceable cantonments on the north of the Hindu Kush and the Himalayas as England has on the south. The latter should be watchful and vigilant, but never nervous, and should be careful not to fall again into the same condition of alarm as in the earlier days to which we have alluded. The stiff mountain ranges and a friendly Amir of Afghanistan are the two strongest outward bulwarks of India; righteousness and justice are the best securities within. If Chitral should be retained, it will be an enormous drain on our Indian resources. The territory intervening between it and the Punjab would have to be kept in force by strong European and Indian troops. The fort of

Chitral would have to be rebuilt on better principles, and in a position where it would not be commanded from the neighbouring heights; and an overpowering force would be required to keep in check the hill-tribes, who are noted for their passionate love of freedom and for their dread of annexation. Even if annexation is not enforced, it would be most difficult to keep our hold on a country so far from our Indian border and so liable to local disturbances. The evidence seems to us in favour of retiring from the neighbourhood of Chitral, while a vigilant watch is kept on all that may be going on there; but we sympathize heartily with the Government of India in the very difficult problem which is now before it, and feel sure that it will be guided to do what is just and right.

HENRY MORRIS.

## ART. III.—THE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.[1]

### IV.

THE eighth and last class of variants in Gesenius' classification contains alterations made, as he considers, in favour of Samaritan theology. This, which is really a very small class of various readings, appears to be popularly looked on as if it were almost the whole.

The probability that manuscripts in the possession of the Samaritans, and still more copies of such manuscripts, might be so altered has been pointed out already, and has evidently nothing to do with the origin and age of the Codex itself, and not much to do with the value of the multitudinous variants which have no possible bearing on the differences between the Samaritans and the Jews. And, on the other hand, it must not be forgotten that, if the Samaritans during the period in which the Codex was in their hands may have made, which is certainly possible, a few alterations favourable to their own opinions or practices, we have not only reason to suspect, but ground for believing, that the Masorites during the hundreds of years, from about the sixth century of our era to the tenth, in which they were completing their very minute revision, made very considerable alterations in the Jewish Codex in opposition to Christianity.

This opinion has very sufficient grounds. The fact has already been referred to, as borne witness to by Abul-Pharagi, with reference to the chronology; implied by Jerome's asser-

[1] I., II., III.: April, 1894; July, 1894; March, 1895.

tion that our Lord always quoted the Hebrew text as existing in His day, and never the Greek when it differed from the Hebrew; and is rendered certain by a statement of Aben Ezra, respecting the work of the Masorites: "The Masorites," he says, "separated that which was sacred from that which had been mixed with it." And he further states: "Fifteen of their elders took an oath to examine three times with the utmost diligence every word and every full and defective phrase." It is not in human nature that such a revision would have no effect on some words and phrases favourable to Christianity or favourable to the Samaritans. The fact so stated, not in blame but in praise, by so unexceptionable an authority, explains at once the differences between the Jewish manuscripts of to-day and those which existed in the time of Jerome and in the time of Origen. There were five Masoretic recensions, or rather six, and the authority of these was maintained by the possession of power over the whole scattered nation concentrated in a few hands. "We know for certain," says Kennicott, "that the Jews had some kind of senate for six hundred years after Augustine, to whose decrees the whole nation, bound to it as by a religious vow, gave willing obedience; that if anyone ever so little resisted, he was immediately, with the consent of the rest, put out of the synagogue—interdicted from water and from fire. You may judge how easily, up to the year 1000, the Jewish books throughout the whole world could be corrupted."[1]

Bearing these things in mind, let us consider the alleged alterations in favour of Samaritan theology in the Pentateuch which they received, as already proved, from the Ten Tribes. They had it in their own hands, and we know that the copies we possess now are not identical in all points (the chronology of the patriarchs, for instance) with the manuscripts which Origen and Jerome saw. They may have altered other passages previously, and we can only conjecture in each case whether they are most probably altered by Jews or Samaritans.

Two passages which appear separated in our ordinary Hebrew Bibles—as Deut. xxvii. 2-8, and xi. 30—are found in the Samaritan manuscripts united, and immediately following the Ten Commandments, both in Exodus and Deuteronomy. That they naturally fit together, and that their proper place is after the Commandments, few, I think, would doubt. And it

[1] Kennicott, "Dissertatio Generalis," p. 19. Buxtorf, though the great defender of the "Hebrew verity," yet says "that infinite errors were introduced into the Masora, tearing asunder contexts, uniting separated parts, transplanting what belongs to one passage to another" (*ibid.*, p. 50).

is impossible not to see how very obnoxious any prominence given to them would be to the Jews in their controversies with the Samaritans. The words run thus in the Samaritan text, directly following the Ten Commandments: "And it shall be when the Lord thy God hath brought thee to the land of the Canaanites, which thou art going to possess, thou shalt set up for thyself great stones, and cement them with cement. And thou shalt write upon the stones all the words of this law. And it shall be when ye have passed over Jordan, ye shall set up these stones which I command you this day in Mount Gerizim. And thou shalt build there an altar unto the Lord thy God, and thou shalt offer up on it whole burnt-offerings unto the Lord thy God; and thou shalt sacrifice peace-offerings, and thou shalt eat there, and rejoice before the Lord thy God. The mountain is on the other side of Jordan, after the way of the going down of the sun, in the land of the Canaanites, that dwell in the plain over against Gilgal, that is near the plain of Moreh, over against Shechem."

The position of the passage in the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the union of the two parts of the evidently-connected subject, is not, I think, made a ground of objection by Gesenius. It hardly could be. As the words stand in Deut. xxvii. in the Jewish manuscripts, they would seem to mean that the whole Pentateuch was to be written on the stones. Placed where they are in the Samaritan manuscripts, they mean—the only meaning which can easily be imagined correct—that the Ten Commandments were to be written on them.

But besides the difference of position, there are certain other differences. In the first place, the Talmud ridicules as totally unnecessary the last words, "over against Shechem." The whole passage must have been a great difficulty for Jews in controversy with the Samaritans, whose Bible consisted of the Pentateuch; and it is quite possible that "over against Shechem" may have been introduced by the Samaritans as a kind of red flag to irritate their opponents, or omitted by the Jews from dislike to the name. But in this case the alteration must have been made earlier than in the other, as the Septuagint here agrees with the Jewish text, and it is probably a Samaritan addition to the Israelitish reading. But the most important difference is in the name of the mountain on which the altar was to be built. According to the Jewish reading, the altar was to be built on Mount Ebal; according to the Samaritan, on Mount Gerizim. There is plainly intentional falsification on one side or the other. Whiston and Kennicott charged the Jews with corrupting the text by changing Gerizim into Ebal. "It is completely given up"—this

accusation against the Jews—"by modern Biblical scholars, although it cannot be denied that there is some *primâ-facie* ground for a doubt upon the subject."[1]

The ground is a very strong one for believing the change to have been made by the Jews. The Levites who blessed the people were to stand upon Gerizim, and those who cursed on Mount Ebal. It is difficult to think that the stones were to be set up and the altar built on Ebal, the place of cursing.

But it is quite clear that both Jews and Samaritans were capable of such an alteration, and we have no sufficient warrant for any decisive judgment. It is in itself of very little importance whom we charge with the fault.

Gesenius refers, as an alteration in behalf of Samaritan theology, to Elohim being in four places joined to the singular verb, where in the ordinary Hebrew it is joined to a plural verb. Unless Gesenius, before he became a lexicographer, admitted that Elohim as a name of God is not merely a *pluralis excellentiæ*, the objection comes from him with an ill grace. What ground have we for thinking that the Jews were less jealous than the Samaritans for the unity of God? But it is just one of those changes which in a literary age like that of Jeroboam, when grammarians were in the ascendant, might very likely be made in the interests of grammar not of theology, by men ignorant of the mysteries, which in a later age, at all events, learned Jews rightly felt to lie hidden under the form of the name of God.

Kennicott, however, gives reasons for thinking that the Israelites were right. "There are three places in which the verb is now plural, although the nominative Elohim is certainly to be understood of the one true God. The three places are Gen. xx. 13, xxxv. 7, and 2 Sam. vii. 23. It is worthy of note that this distinction is almost always observable; namely, that when this plural name is used of false gods the verb annexed is plural, but when used of God the verb is singular.... In the first two of these three texts the correction is made in all the copies of the Samaritan Pentateuch which could be found; the third is corrected in the parallel passage in the Hebrew text itself—1 Chron. xvii. 21."

In his "Lexicon Manuale" Gesenius himself says that the plural form Elohim is joined to a singular verb and adjective except in certain formulas, perhaps remnants of polytheism, in which it is possible to translate Elohim also in the plural, and to understand by it "gods." Besides the three already quoted by Kennicott, he refers to Exod. xxxii. 4 and 8, where

[1] Smith, "Dictionary of the Bible, Samaritan Pentateuch" (all the quotations are from the edition 1861-63).

it is translated "gods" in the English Bible, and Exod. xxii. 8, where it is translated "judges" in the A.V. and "God" in the R.V.; 1 Kings xix. 2, where it can only be translated "gods." Psa. lviii. 12 (11), which he also quotes, seems to be an instance in point. Elohim in the sense of "God" is joined with a plural participle. He refers to his book on the Samaritan Pentateuch. In the Jewish Pentateuch, as has been shown, this only occurs in Gen. xx. 13, xxxiv. 7, and if the Samaritan reading is not really the original one—the most probable supposition—it is much more intelligible, that the alteration should be made in the time of the Israelitish kingdom than in that of the Samaritans, when the danger of polytheism had passed away.

Gesenius refers to a very curious variant in Gen. xlix. 7, which in the Samaritan, instead of "Cursed be their anger," runs thus, "Glorious was their league." That it is an alteration from the original there can be no doubt. But it is much more likely that it was made by the Israelites than by the Samaritans, who were not a fierce and warlike people. It is quite conceivable that the crime of Simeon and Levi may have seemed to the Ten Tribes honourable vengeance, and the Samaritans had no special concern in the tribes of Simeon and Levi.

He refers to certain changes of words which bear an ill sound for others more suitable for public reading. These are few, and they correspond, at all events in intention, to the "Keri" readings, most of which Kennicott discovered in the text of some of the Hebrew manuscripts he collated. Just as in our own Revised Version "judgment" in the margin of our Authorized Version in place of "damnation" has found its way into the text. These altered words are as likely to owe their origin to the Israelitish transcribers in the golden age of Hebrew literature as to the Samaritans.

It is in this last class he places the following objection: In Deut. xxxiii. 12 the word for "beloved" (יְדִיד) spoken of Benjamin is divided in the Samaritan manuscripts into two יד יד, which, instead of treating as an obvious accident, he translates "the hand, the hand," and ascribes to "the hatred of the Samaritans for a Benjamin, the founder of the Judæo-Davidian Empire."[1] Of course, if the minute criticism were of the slightest weight, it would be more rational to ascribe it to zeal for the new dynasty of Jeroboam. But it really is too absurd a criticism to be worth appropriating.

[1] "The beloved of God (Benjamin, the founder of the Judæo-Davidian Empire, hateful to the Samaritans) shall dwell securely," transformed by them into '*The hand, the hand* of God will rest securely.'"—Smith's "Dictionary," iii., p. 1110, note 6.

Kohn[1] gives another instance of Samaritan alteration on dogmatic grounds, which Gesenius does not consider to be so. It is for other reasons an interesting point. In Gen. xxii. 2, "Get thee into the land of Moriah," the Samaritan reads for Moriah "vision," the "land of vision," appearing in the Septuagint as the "high land"—a high land visible afar off. It seems that the Samaritans made use of this text so worded as an argument in favour of Mount Gerizim, as being higher than Mount Moriah, where the temple was built, and that the Jews accused them of having altered it. If there were anything in this, "Moriah" would have been found in the Septuagint, the translators of which evidently knew nothing of this argument against Abraham's offering being on the site of the future temple. If altered by anyone for the purpose of hiding this prophetic intimation, it is at least as likely to have been altered in Jeroboam's day. But the real reason of the alteration, if alteration it be, is a kind of play on words, or alliteration, in the name "Moriah" and the word "Jireh," and whoever wrote "vision" in the place of "Moriah," from which it differs only by the dropping the letter yod, was trying to connect verse 2 with verse 15.

Wellhausen is perplexed with the passage, which is one of those he calls Elohistic. He is quite sure the Elohist did not write Moriah, and agrees with the Samaritans in thinking the mountain to be Gerizim.[2]

The truth is, Kennicott settled all these questions long ago. But since his time there has sprung up a criticism of wild conjecture, based on no facts, opposed to the monumental evidence now providentially bearing witness to the truth of the Old Testament—a criticism to the very existence of which it was absolutely necessary to get rid of the Israelitish form of the Pentateuch. And it was an appropriate work for Gesenius' first literary effort to discredit it, and very consistent with the course adopted by modern criticism to allow his supposed proof of its inferiority, philologically and æsthetically, to hide the important historical question as to its age and origin which was in his thesis, but which he is admitted not to have really touched.

To estimate aright the importance to be attached to the objections of Gesenius, we must see what he says himself about them. We have already seen that neither in Smith's "Dictionary" nor in Herzog's "Real-Encyclopädie" are they looked upon as in any way deciding the admittedly most important question—that of the origin and age of the Codex. The first

[1] Kohn, "De Pentateuch Samaritano," pp. 47-49.
[2] "Die Composition," ss. 20, 21.

part of the work, as of the thesis, is on this subject, but the two are separated in a very marked manner, which clearly shows that the second part, the classification of the Variants, was not supposed by Gesenius himself to have any bearing on the first. So far as he closes it at all, he closes the first discussion before commencing the second. He begins by saying, "At what time and from whence the Samaritans received their Pentateuch is a most weighty question (*quæstio gravissima*), in solving which the critics of our age have diverged into very various opinions."[1] He then mentions the opinion of Morinus, Kennicott, J. D. Michaelis and others, that it was to be traced back to the time of the division of the kingdom, in opposition to which he quotes with approval a sentence from De Wette, that, had the Israelites possessed the law, they could not have fluctuated between Jewish and pagan rites as they are said to have done in 2 Kings xvii.—a very common mode of reasoning among modern critics, which would prove that the law did not exist in our Lord's time: "Did not Moses give you the law? and yet none of you keepeth the law." Such an argument needs no answer except a reference to the chapter in question. But he goes on in words which show distinctly what was, and is, the real ground of objection, which led Gesenius to write against it, and the critics of his school in the present day to be for the most part silent about it. "We think it must be taken for granted that the Pentateuch could certainly have passed from the Jews to the Samaritans, on the supposition that the Jews themselves had it in the form in which we now use it. But so far are we from thinking that this was the case, that arguments are forthcoming which satisfy us that the Pentateuch in its present form existed neither among the Samaritans"—by whom of course he means the Ten Tribes—"nor among the Jews, in the time of Jeroboam and the division of the kingdom."[2]

Here the real ground of objection is plainly shown. It is inconsistent with the view that the Pentateuch, instead of being written by Moses, was a succession of works, the earliest of which was much later than Moses, and the last composer a hundred years after the Babylonish captivity. That it is a "quæstio gravissima" for Gesenius and his followers is indeed most true, since, as he in these words recognises, the admission that the Samaritan Codex reaches back to the division of the kingdom is fatal to the whole fabric of the so-called higher criticism, of which he was then laying the foundations.

The words in which Gesenius concludes this first part of his work are not exactly those of a man who thinks himself to

[1] Gesenius, "De Sam. Pent. Origine, indole et auctoritate," p. 3.
[2] "De Sam. Pent. Origine," etc., pp. 5, 6.

have proved his point: "All that we claim is that there is scarcely any other moment of time suggested suitable for the origin of the Samaritan Codex, than that which we have said, and since, in a matter destitute of historical testimony, we must take refuge in a probable conjecture, this is the one which is certainly to be preferred to all the rest."[1]

If 2 Kings xvii. is believed, there is historical testimony enough. Gesenius' own "probable conjecture" has gained no favour and no following, but his criticism of the relative priority and authority of the various readings has been allowed to put out of sight the "gravissima quæstio"—the difficult question of the origin.

What has been shown is this: that the Law was brought to the Samaritans immediately after the captivity of the Ten Tribes; that it was brought by an Israelitish priest sent back from captivity to teach them; that the Law he possessed must have been that which the prophets of Israel had constantly accused them of having broken; that therefore the Samaritan Pentateuch is the Israelitish Codex; that as the Masorites altered the Jewish Codex, the Samaritans may have altered the Israelitish Codex; that though this Codex is as old as the division of the kingdom, it is more recent than the other, which has an antiquity reaching back to Moses; and that, through the providence of God, His Law has been guarded all along since Israel separated from Judah, by hostile nations first, and hostile religious bodies subsequently, each eager to find the other out, in any change even of a word.

The result we have arrived at is altogether independent of the investigations of Gesenius and Kohn as to the priority or superiority of the two recensions. Gesenius and Kohn may be right in their critical conclusions, and yet the Samaritan Pentateuch date back to the time of the separation of the kingdom of Israel from that of Judah. Gesenius treated the two questions as in entire independence of each other. He first very briefly examines the question of the origin and age of the Samaritan, and does not profess any certainty about it, only, as he did not believe that any Pentateuch at all was in existence at the division of the kingdom, he could not believe that the Samaritan text of it existed then. The fundamental objection to so believing was its inconsistency with the new views as to the Five Books themselves. It is confessed by modern critics that this question of the age and origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch he did not solve, and they consider it still unsolved. On "the recognition of the Pentateuch and the building of the temple on Mount Gerizim we are im-

[1] "De Sam. Pent. Origine. pp. 9, 10.

perfectly informed, since with respect to the first point we know absolutely nothing."[1]

"In 1815," says a writer in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible" —I have quoted it before, but it is so important to the present division of the subject that I must quote it over again— "Gesenius abolished the remnant of the Samaritan Pentateuch. So masterly, lucid, and clear are his arguments and his proofs, that there has been and will be no further question as to the absence of all value in this recension and its pretended emendations." What, then, can we do after such a statement as to the result of Gesenius' prelection but give up all thought of the Samaritan Pentateuch? But if we finish the article, we shall find that abolishing the remnant of the Samaritan Pentateuch means only proving its inferiority as a Codex to the Jewish Pentateuch, and that what "there has been and will be no question" about is not the age and origin of the Samaritan Pentateuch, but simply the value of its various readings. The same writer who has used these strong expressions goes on to say: "It may perhaps not be quite superfluous to observe, before we proceed any further, that since up to this moment no critical edition of the Samaritan Pentateuch, or even an examination of the Codices since Kennicott—who can only be said to have begun the work—has been thought of, the treatment of the whole subject remains a most precarious task, and beset with unexampled difficulties at every step; and also that, under these circumstances, a more or less scientific arrangement of isolated or common Samaritan mistakes and falsifications appears to us to be a subject of very small consequence indeed." And yet this is all that Gesenius' "masterly, lucid, and clear" argument even claimed to have done.

"It is, however," the writer goes on to say, "this same rudimentary state of investigation—after two centuries and a half of fierce discussion—which has left the other, and much more important, question of the *Age and Origin* of the Samaritan Pentateuch as unsettled to-day as it was when it first came under the notice of European scholars."[2]

This passage, or most of it, I have already quoted, and I have shown that, if unsettled, it is not for want of historical evidence to settle it, but because the age and origin to which historical evidence points is inconsistent with the critical theories of Gesenius, Wellhausen, and their followers. I quote it again for the purpose of placing it side by side with the statement of Kennicott, admitted in this passage to be the last scholar who has made any attempt to collate the manuscripts.

[1] "Wissen wir gar nichts," Herzog, "Real Encyclopädie," B. XIII., s. 342.
[2] Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible": "Samaritan Pentateuch."

It has been, as we have seen, the subject of two academical prelections for their doctors' degrees of two men who subsequently became famous.[1] But neither of them continued Kennicott's researches. Since Kennicott's time nothing has been done except the classification of the variants which we have just been examining. No fresh information whatever has been gained. There has been nothing learned about it which was not known when Kennicott wrote his Dissertation. By the admission of Gesenius' followers, and really of Gesenius himself, his book leaves the question of the origin and age of the recension where he found it. And he found it where Kennicott left it. The last great scholar who has studied the subject, and who studied it more fundamentally than anyone before him, left it as a settled question that the Samaritans received the Pentateuch from the Ten Tribes. In his summing up of what he had proved, he concludes thus:

"In the history of the Hebrew text . . . it was shown that the Pentateuch was placed by Moses by the side of the ark, and copies afterwards taken for the use of the priests all over Canaan. Nevertheless, in the reign of Manasseh, when idolatry pervaded the country of Judæa for fifty-five years, while some copies perished the rest were carefully concealed. So that at Jerusalem the Law was almost unknown when Moses' own autograph[2] was found and publicly produced in the reign of Josiah. But copies of the Law were preserved among the Ten Tribes. These were carried into captivity, but a Samaritan priest returned to teach the inhabitants the manner of the God of the land, which could not be done without the written Law. From which time, about B.C. 719, the Pentateuch was preserved by these Samaritans for a thousand years, till the times of Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, etc., who often quoted it. After a lapse of one thousand two hundred years, manuscripts were found with a few poor Samaritan families surviving to-day in Palestine and Egypt. . . . Lastly, the character in which the Samaritan Codices transmitted to our times are written seems to be more the original character than that in which our Hebrew Codices are written. . . . There are not so many errors in the Samaritan as in the Hebrew, because they have not been so often copied. How adorable is the wisdom of God, that Christians should have received the Pentateuch from these two nations, so hostile to one another for two thousand years that their hostility should have passed into a proverb!"[3]

SAMUEL GARRATT.

[1] Gesenius dedicated his book to those who had conferred the degree. Kohn's title-page contains the names of his three opponents.

[2] Heb., "By the hand of Moses," 2 Chron. xxxiv. 14.

[3] Kennicott, "Dissertatio Generalis," p. 60.

## ART. IV.—SOME CURIOSITIES OF PATRISTIC AND MEDIÆVAL LITERATURE.

### PART II.—DOCTRINAL.

BUT it is time for us now to revert to the terms of the famous recantation, "Ego Berengarius." In view of the history before us, it is important to submit them to a careful consideration as interpretative of the words of institution. In doing this, indeed, there may be something repugnant to the feelings of reverential awe with which we would desire to come to the contemplation of what pertains to "these holy mysteries." But we desire to do this with a full sense of the sacredness of the subject, and with as little as possible of what may arouse feelings of bitterness in those who differ from us, and under a strong conviction that the cause of God's truth demands of English Churchmen at the present time to be outspoken on the matter of this burning controversy.

We must observe, then, that the language of this confession, monstrous and revolting as it is felt and acknowledged to be, nay, heretical as (in its natural sense) it is now regarded even in the Romish Communion, expresses really nothing more than is actually contained in the very words which were used by our blessed Lord Himself—*if it be so*, that those words must be understood exactly[1] *ut verba sonant* in a sense excluding everything of trope, or figure, or metaphor; or, in other words, if our Lord's saying is not to be regarded as a *locatio sacramentalis*, a saying, that is, in which the sign bears the name of the thing signified and conveyed by it.

We, of course, maintain that the words of the institution are to be tropically and sacramentally understood—that, in view of the occasion and the surroundings, such an interpretation was natural and obvious, that no other could have been admitted without doing violence to common-sense.[2] And we

[1] So Thomas Waldensis says of the confession of Berengarius: "Intendebat ergo ecclesia tunc sic credere sicut dixit, nihil plus, nihil minus, sicut et Christus dicens, *Hoc est Corpus meum*" ("De Sacr. Euch.," cap. xlii., f. 73; Venice, 1571).

[2] Bishop Pearson has well said: "We must not so stand upon the propriety of speech, when it is written, 'The word was made flesh,' as to destroy the propriety both of the *word* and of the *flesh*" (On Creed, art. iii.). It is an argument which must be acknowledged to be forcible, even by Romanists. But we may apply the same argument to the words of institution, and say: "We must not so far stand upon the propriety of speech, when it is written, 'This is My Body,' as to destroy the propriety both of the *bread* and of the *body*." (See Turton's Reply to Wiseman, p. 274.)

"Certain it is," writes Bishop Cosin, "that the bread is not the body of Christ any otherwise than as the cup is the New Testament, and the different consequences cannot be drawn from these two not different

appeal in confirmation of this view to the teaching of the Fathers of the early centuries of the Christian Church, as showing that they were so understood by Christians of old time.

It can scarcely be needful to say that this sacramental or tropical sense was held and taught by the great divines of the English Church.[1] But it should be added, for the sake of correcting a too common misapprehension, that nothing was further from their intention than the idea of denying or questioning that the elements are effectual signs for conveying to the faith of the receiver the things which they signify, and whose names they bear in the delivery. There was no questioning among them of the truth that the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.

We have seen how earlier attempts to exclude the tropical or sacramental sense seem to have recognised the truth that the words could not (without doing violence to common-sense)

---

expressions. Therefore, as the cup cannot be the New Testament but by a sacramental figure, no more can the bread be the body of Christ but in the same sense" ("Hist. of Transubstantiation," ch. v., § 4).

See Wyclif, "De Eucharistiâ," p. 97.

[1] The following extract might be adduced as evidence to show how the doctrine of Berengar corresponded to the doctrine of the Reformed: "Cum dicit Dominus de pane illo, quem primo in privilegium promovit, illud ut essit Corpus Ipsius: hoc, *i.e.*, hæc res, hic panis est meum Corpus non est locutus proprie, quia nec panis ille individuus, quem in eam provexerat dignitatem, ut digne sumptus valeret ad animæ salutem, susceptibilis erat prædicati individui illius Corporis, quod sibi in utero virginis Dei sapientia fabricavit; et ita subjectus terminus, quod est panis, propria perpendendus est locutione, tropicâ prædicatus terminus, quod est in propositione: meum Corpus" ("De Sacrâ Cœnâ," pp. 83, 84. Berlin, 1834). And this must clearly determine the interpretation of what he says of the "conversion" in p. 57. He regards "conversion" as admitting a variety of senses—"Est enim multiplex et vera conversio" (p. 57).

Berengar's sense of "conversio" may be illustrated by the following extract: "Ceterum mutationi in placatum irati similis erat mutatio panis in corpus Christi, quia inefficax erat panis natura ante consecrationem ad vitam æternam, post consecrationem efficax, quia, sicut ad æternitatem amissam in Adam nemo proficeret, nisi verbum caro fieret, ita nemo Christianus ad immortalitatem redit, si per contemptum profanat sacramenta altaris, et quod dicitur panis altaris corpus Christi, eo locutionis dicitur genere, quo dicitur: Christus est summus angularis lapis" (*ibid.*, p. 145. See also pp. 161 *sqq.*). This is the more to be observed, because (though Berengar was considered a heretic by Luther) others, including Mabillon, and Martene, and Durand, think that he held the *præsentia realis*, only denying transubstantiation. (See Gieseler, "Eccl. Hist.," vol. ii., p. 411.)

It was truly said: "Qui hodie sunt Calvinistæ, olim dicti fuerunt Berengariani." (Serarius, "Trihæres," lib. i., cap. v., quoted by Abp. Ussher, "De Christ. Eccles. Succ. et Statu," cap. vii., § 23; "Works," vol. ii., p. 214. See also p. 215.)

be understood to the full *ut verba sonant*, and accordingly interpreted them as meaning something like this: "This bread is adopted by Me, to be incorporated into My flesh, and thus by augmentation to form a part of My body."[1]

But ages of ever-growing superstition had followed; and the rust of this superstition had now so far eaten into the faith of the Christian Church that men had been taught to think that religion triumphs in the overthrow of common-sense.[2] And rejecting altogether the augmentation doctrine, the new doctors would interpret the words of institution *ut verba sonant* to the full, maintaining that the consecrated bread is bread no more, but either the whole body of Christ, or a *portiuncula*[3] of that body, the *appearance* of bread alone

---

[1] See "Curiosities," No. ii.

[2] "Quo hîc ratio infirmior, eò fides fortior. Quo ratio hîc minus vel nihil operatur, eò fides plus vel totum operans amplius meretur. Libenter igitur ratio hîc succumbat, ut fidei meritum accrescat" (Hildeberti Opera, c. 1106; Paris, 1708). See "Lectures on Lord's Supper," pp. 29-31.

[3] The expression "portiuncula carnis" is so frequently repeated by Berengarius as the language of Lanfranc that it seems scarcely possible to doubt that it had been used by him. (See "De Sacrâ Cœnâ," pp. 45, 84, 114, 119, 127, 158, 171, 174, 175, 195, 197, 200, 209; Berlin, 1834.) But it is nowhere to be found, we believe, in his "Liber de Corpore et Sanguine Domini."

The fact that the exceeding difficulties connected with the idea of "totum corpus" seem sometimes to have constrained literalists of Berengar's time to understand, or to acquiesce in the understanding, the "Hoc est Corpus Meum" of a "portiuncula carnis" shows clearly how far the new and now dominant doctrine was from having yet attained to its full development. The notion of the Real Presence of Christ—"Body, Soul, and Divinity"—*there* (supralocally) on the altar under the form of bread and wine had hardly yet come to the birth. It was to be the outcome of a further growth of superstition. (See "De Sacrâ Cœnâ," pp. 148, 197-199; Berlin, 1834.) Faith had hardly yet been so universally blinded as to believe in the Real Presence of Christ's Human Body and of Christ Himself at the same time on thousands of altars. The witness had not yet died out to the truth that it is "against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at the same time in more places than one." (See "De Sacrâ Cœnâ," pp. 198, 199.)

The position of Lanfranc is thus represented by Berengar: "Confingis enim, non superesse in altari panem sensualem, sed portiunculam carnis factæ de pane; hujus portiunculæ carnis colorem, vel, ut verba tua ponam, *visibilem speciem, non ipsum subjectum*, sed quod in subjecta ea sit, sacramentum esse constituis in prioribus tractatus tui, qui tamen ipse in posterioribus ejusdem tractatus asseris, *non esse sacramentum colorem vel speciem portiunculæ carnis*, quæ sit port consecrationem in altari, *sed ipsam portiunculam, i.e., non quod in ea subjecta sit, sed eam quæ subjectum sit esse sacramentum totius Corporis, quod in cœlo est, Christi*, eamque ipsam manibus frangi, dentibus atteri. Sed vecordissimum erat, quod de Christi Corpore esse non neges, non negare etiam frangi vel atteri" ("De Sacrâ Cœnâ," p. 45; Berlin, 1834). And see especially p. 197, where he says, "Non enim totum Christi corpus tu adesse sensualiter in altari desipis."

remaining, that faith may gain victory over the evidence of the senses.

Darkness was covering the earth. But it was surely scarcely possible that, even in dark ages, the human understanding could submit, with no effort of rebellion, to the domination of such a monstrous and novel doctrine[1] as was now being set up as an idol in the Church of Christ. Berengar was the head of the rebellion; and he withstood the dominant party of innovation by going back, not to the doctrine of Damascenus and the first upholders of literalism, but to the earlier doctrine of the Fathers, shielding himself under their authority, and

---

It is to be noted that the miraculous manifestations alleged to have been seen upon the altar (and which are so seriously treated of by Lombard) were sometimes as of the whole body of a child (or of a lamb), sometimes as of a *portiuncula* of a body, as "pars digiti auricularis sanguine cruentata." (See "Mansi," tom. xix., c. 434, 435; and Bishop Jeremy Taylor, "Real Presence," sect. x., § 8; "Works," vol. vi., pp. 93, 94, edit. Eden.; and Canon Robertson, "Hist. of Christian Church," vol. iv., p. 364; and especially Morton on "Eucharist," book iv., ch. ii., §§ 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, p. 217 *sqq.*; and Ussher's "Works," vol. iii., p. 76 *sqq.*; see also Scudamore's "Notitia Eucharistica," pp. 611, 968, 2nd edit.)

A Romish divine has said of these manifestations that they "are mere fables, suggested by the father of lies." (See Archbishop Wake in Gibson's "Preservative," vol. x., p. 17, London, 1848; and Alex. Alens., as quoted in Cosin's "Hist. Transub.," cap. vii., § 24, p. 131, A. C. L.; and Wyclif, "De Eucharistiâ," p. 20).

In 1687 was published in London (translated from the French) a book full of the most extraordinary stories, entitled "The School of the Eucharist, established upon the miraculous respects and acknowledgments, which beasts, birds, and insects, upon several occasions, have rendered to the Holy Sacrament of the altar, by F. Toussain Bridoul, of the Society of Jesus." See also Cosin's "Hist. of Transub.," ch. vii., § 22; and Bellarmine, "De Sacr. Euch.," lib. iii., cap. viii.; "De Controv.," tom. iii., c. 703, 704.

Of one such wonderful story we are told by Wyclif: "Postquam narrator iste ex narratione et populi devotione fuit ad partem a quodam familiari socio commendatus, confessus est mendatium hoc turpe: *Os finxit*, inquit, *hoc pulchrum mendacium*" ("De Eucharistiâ," p. 20; Wyclif Soc.).

These strange stories well suited the doctrine taught by Paschasius and Lanfranc, but they were scarcely in harmony with the teaching of Damascenus and the earlier literalists. And they are quite repugnant to the view of this Sacrament as taught by Augustin, for he gives as an example of transitory signs, "Sicut panis ad hoc factus in accipiendo sacramento consumitur." And then he adds concerning such signs: "Quia hæc hominibus nota sunt, quia per homines fiant, honorem tamquam religiosa possunt habere, stuporem tamquam mira non possunt" ("De Trin.," lib. iii., cap. x., §§ 19, 20; Op., tom. viii., c. 803, ed. Ben., Paris, 1688. See also § 21, c. 804).

[1] If we may believe the evidence of competent witnesses, this doctrine was so regarded by its able champion, Cardinal du Perron, who, on his death-bed, declared that in maintaining it he had been defending an ill cause, and expressed, as his own opinion of transubstantiation, "that it was a monster." See Archbishop Wake on Gibson's "Preservative," vol. x., p. 9; see also Cosin's "Hist. Trans.," ch. vii., § 22.

insisting on the figurative and tropical sense,[1] as giving the only true interpretation of the words of our blessed Lord. Certainly Berengar clearly understood the meaning of a *locutio sacramentalis*, and ably maintained that in that term was contained the true key to the interpretation of the words of institution. Accordingly, the recantation extorted by the dominant party from Berengarius was simply the full and distinct expression of the most literal interpretation of our Lord's words. If what is figurative and tropical is to be rigidly excluded—if the idea of a *sacramentalis locutio* is to be condemned, then (the subtleties of the scholastic philosophy —whatever approaches[2] may have been made to them—having not yet been generally applied to the doctrine of transubstantiation) the confession, "Ego Berengarius," with all the grossness of its materialistic conceptions, is nothing but an expansion

[1] See "De Sacrâ Cœnâ," pp. 37, 38, 43, 75, 76, 77, 83, 84, 86, 119, 125 *sqq.*; Berlin, 1834.

[2] Algerus, *e.g.*, maintains: "Sicut Deus in omnibus est mirabilis, sit et in istis. Facit enim in suo Sacramento accidentales qualitates existere per se, quod in cæteris est impossibile. . . Quid mirum si sine substantiæ fundamento facit qualitates existere?" ("De Veritate Corporis Dom.," lib. ii., f. 66; edit. D. Erasmus, Friburg Brisg., 1530).

And somewhat later, Anselm (sometimes regarded as the first of the Schoolmen) wrote: "Quare autem Corpus Christi cum sit inviolabile et incorruptabile, qua ratione hoc esse potest ut dentibus atteratur, et etiam a foricibus corrodatur. Sed secundum definitiones sanctorum Patrum est intelligendum panem super altare positum per illa solemnia verba in Corpus Christi mutari, nec remanere substantiam panis et vini, speciem tamen intelligendum est remanere, formam scilicet, colorem et saporem: secundum speciem remanentem quædam ibi fiunt quæ nullomodo secundum hoc quod est possunt fieri, scilicet quod atteritur, quod uno loco concluditur, et a foricibus roditur, et in ventrem trajicetur" (Epist. cvii.; Op., p. 453; Paris, 1721).

Wyclif's interpretation of similar words quoted from Anselm will be found in his "De Eucharistiâ," p. 130.

Somewhat later, Hugo de Sancto Victore wrote: "Per verba sanctificationis vera panis et vini substantia in verum Corpus Christi et sanguinem convertitur, solâ specie panis et vini remanente, et substantia in substantiam transeunte. Conversio autem ipsa non secundum unionem sed secuudum transitionem credenda est" ("De Sacramentis," lib. ii., pars viii., cap. ix.).

For Wyclif's comment on this, see "De Eucharistiâ," p. 75 (Wyclif Soc.).

Hildebertus Turonensis also asks (if the treatise "De Sacramento Altaris" is really his): "Numquid ei [rationi] capabile est qualiter substantia panis et vini in substantium corporis et sanguinis Domini conversa, non tamen conversa sunt pariter, sed manent immutata, sine panis et sine vini substantia, tam panis, quam vini accidentia? Quomodo accidentia sine subjecto, vel hæc accidentia in quo nata sint sine subjecto? Via in istis est ignota rationi, sed non penitus ignota fidei" (Op., c. 1106; Paris, 1708).

These all were before the "Master of the Sentences," and were doubtless preparing the way for the subtle distinctions of scholasticism.

of the true and only sense of the words which were spoken by our Lord. They are nothing more than an explanatory periphrasis of the words, "Take, eat, this is My Body." If that which is seen, given, and taken by the hand and eaten by the mouth be indeed not sacramentally, but really the Body of Christ, then is that Body ground with the teeth in the mouth of the communicant.

We ask to have this well considered. We desire to have it very carefully examined.

And then we wish our readers to see this quite clearly, that the contention between Berengar and his opponents turns altogether on the question whether the words of institution are to be understood figuratively or literally.

Berengar maintains—and his position is well understood—that the true interpretation is figurative, tropical, sacramental. That this was his contention is implied in the very words of his recantation.

The Council insists that nothing is tropical—that the true interpretation is only and wholly literal. When we have this—the true *status controversiæ* of that day—before us, then and not till then are we in a position to estimate the full significance of the historical facts which we have been contemplating. When we have seen clearly the true point at issue between the contending parties, we can hardly fail to see the importance of the fact that Hildebrand expressed his approval (in some sort) of Berengar's tropical, figurative interpretation; and that, according to the testimony of Pope Gregory VII., the Blessed Virgin herself, by a revelation from heaven, condemned the novelties of the literalist doctrine—condemned them as making an addition to faith, an addition to be rejected as having no warrant in the sacred Scriptures of truth.

We cannot be surprised if at first sight this should seem to some as an overstatement of the case, and a scarcely credible account of the attitude of the Pope towards one whom Papists must regard as among the chief of heresiarchs.

But, while we do not wish to imply that Hildebrand's own views were necessarily identical with those of Berengar, we hold it impossible to doubt that the Pope must have known well what the doctrine of Berengar really was when he showed himself desirous of securing something like toleration for the man whom he so highly esteemed, in spite of the clamour which called him a heretic.

And we submit that this curiosity of mediæval literature cannot be fairly studied without seeing another example of the way in which the Romish doctrine of the Eucharist has been consolidated by accretions—the result of men's thoughts,

thinking to make perfect what in the Divine revelation was imperfect, and developing doctrines which are a human addition to the faith once for all delivered unto the saints.

The gloss has yet to be accounted for. It need not detain us long. It belongs to the expression of a later development of Eucharistic doctrine. After the fourth Lateran Council of 1215, in which Innocent III. decreed the doctrine of transubstantiation, the novel views grew rapidly, and quickly bore fruit—fruit which surely would have shocked the piety of Christians of old time. *They* had never dreamt of the elevation of the Host for purposes of adoration. *They* had never thought of carrying about the Host on high as a present Deity. *They* had known no festival of *Corpus Christi*. How could they, since they spoke of the consecrated elements as the figures, and signs, and antitypes of the Lord's Body and Blood?

But the ages of the higher scholastic theology followed on, and scholasticism has been designated "the knighthood of theology." This was a period, in some sense, of intellectual activity, but of activity which strangely submitted (for the most part) to be restrained by the iron fences of canon law. As the result, we have to contemplate some curious anomalie.. The scholastic doctors—speaking generally—do not seem to have stumbled at the teaching of Christ's Human Body being at the same time on ten thousand earthly altars,[1] and at the

[1] Very surprising is the following argument of T. Aquinas: "Manifestnm est, quod Corpus Christi non incipit esse in hoc sacramento per motum localem. Primo quidem, quia sequeretur quod desineret esse in cœlo: non enim quod localiter movetur, pervenit de novo ad aliquem locum, nisi deserat priorem. Secundo, quia omne corpus localiter motum, pertransit omnia media: quod hic dici non potest. Tertio, quia impossibile est quod unus motus ejusdem Corporis localiter moti terminetur simul ad diversa loca: cum tamen in pluribus locis Corpus Christi sub hoc sacramento simul esse incipiat; et ideo relinquitur, quod non possit aliter Corpus Christi incipere esse de novo in hoc sacramento, nisi per conversionem substantiæ panis in ipsum" ("Summa," quæs. lxxv., art. ii., pars iii., vol. ii., p. 205; Ludg., 1663. See also p. 207, and quæs. lxxxiii., art. v.). Here is recognised an impossibility in the nature of things. But the impossibility is not in the being of One Body at the same time in heaven and on many altars on earth, but only in this being brought about "per motum localem." As if it were easier to believe its being brought about by transubstantiation than by motion! Compare the teaching of the Tridentine Catechism, pars ii., cap. iv., § 37.

So Bonaventura has before him the objection: "Corpus Christi in cœlo existens, habet ibi terminum suæ substantiæ: ergo impossibile est quod sit secundum veritatem in hoc sacramento: ergo si est ibi, est solum in signo." And thus he answers it: "Quamvis Corpus Christi terminum habeat in cœlo quantum ad existentiam naturalem, non tamen habet quantum ad potestatem conversionis, secundum quam alibi potest Corpus converti in ipsum: et ideo illa virtute supernaturali fit alibi, quâ aliud convertitur in ipsum" (Bonaventura, "In Sent.," lib. iv., dist. x., pars i. art. i., quæs. i.; Op., tom. v., p. 109; Lugd., 1668).

same time on God's right hand in heaven, though they seem to have understood this in a sense which it is not always easy to apprehend or to realize, and though they can hardly have been ignorant that such teaching was utterly irreconcilable

---

Again : "Si quæratur ratio, quare Corpus Christi est in plurimis locis, credo quod hæc sit ratio, quia plura convertuntur in ipsum totum, et pluribus locis" (quæs. iii., p. 100 ; see also p. 114).

Again, in answer to the objection : "Corpus Christi . . . est in pluribus [locis] per miraculum : Ergo similiter per miraculum potest incorruptibile frangi," he answers. "Non est simile de esse in pluribus locis, quia ibi nulla est contradictio : hic autem sic" (dist. xii., quæs. i., pars i., art. ii., p. 143).

Very surprising also is the efficacy which some of the Schoolmen seem to have attributed to the word "sacramentaliter." Sayings which in themselves they might have allowed to be impossible and inconceivable become, in their view, credible and conceivable if only understood *sacramentally*. It seems almost as if, because difficulties may be easily removed by understanding language *sacramentaliter* in the sense of *in signo tantum*, the same effect might be produced by the same word understood in a sense inclusive of *in veritate rei*. The following may be taken as an example : "Ad illud quod objicitur, quod est ibi localiter, dicendum quod aliquid dicitur ibi esse localiter, aut quia est secundum corporalem præsentiam, aut secundum commensurationem Corpori debitam. Primo modo est ibi localiter, secundo modo non, immo tantum in cœlo ; unde Innocentius distinguit esse localiter contra esse sacramentaliter" (Bonaventura, "In Sent.," lib. iv., dist. x., pars i., art. i., quæs. iv. ; Op., tom. v., p. 111). Compare the Council of Trent, sess. xiii., ch. i.

But Nicolaus de Niise concludes : "Posset Corpus Christi esse in pluribus locis non solum sacramentaliter, sed etiam localiter, patet ex dictis" (Tract. VI., pars iii. ; "De Euch.," quæs. ii. ; "Resol. Theol.," f. 497 ; Paris, 1574). And of the objection he rightly declares : 'Æque concludit contra esse sacramentaliter, sicut contra esse localiter" (*ibid.*). He says : "Plura tempora non possunt esse simul, sic autem non de locis" (*ibid.* See Thomas Waldensis, "De Sacr. Euch.," f. 123).

And in this view he was followed by Bellarmine. (See Bellarmine, "De Euch.," lib. i., ch. ii. ; "De Controv.," tom. iii., c. 459 ; Ingold., 1601).

Well was it said by Bishop Jeremy Taylor : "Aquinas hath yet another device to make all whole, saying that one body cannot be in divers places *localiter* but *sacramentaliter*, not locally but sacramentally. But first I wish the words were [illegible]ase, and that I could tell the meaning of being in a place locally and not locally, unless a thing can be in a place and not in a place, that is, so as to be in that it is also out : but so long as it is a distinction, it is no matter—it will amuse and make way to escape, if it will do nothing else. But if by being sacramentally in many places is meant figuratively (as before I explicated it), then I grant Aquinas's affirmative ; Christ's Body is in many places sacramentally, that is, it is represented upon all the holy tables or altars in the Christian Church. But if by sacramentally he means naturally and properly, then he contradicts himself, for that is it he must mean by *localiter* if he means anything at all. But it matters not what he means, for it is sufficient to me that he only says it and proves it not, and that it is not sense ; and, lastly, that Bellarmine confutes it as not being home enough to his purpose, but a direct destruction of the fancy of transubstantiation ; *Si non posset esse unum Corpus localiter in duobus locis, quia divideretur a seipso, profecto nec esse possit sacramentaliter eadem ratione.* I might make

with some very clear and distinct statements of the ancient Fathers. They do not seem to have felt any difficulty in applying to the glorified Body of the Saviour above what was spoken of the Body as crucified and the Blood as poured out—

---

advantage of this contestation between two so great patrons of transubstantiation if I did need it, for Aquinas says that a body cannot be in two places at once locally, Bellarmine says then neither can it be sacramentally ; it were easy, then, to infer that therefore it is in two places no way in the world." ("Real Presence," sect. xi., § 21 ; "Works," edit. Eden., vol. vi., pp. 111, 112. See also p. 109 ; and Bramhall's "Works," A. C. L., vol. i., pp. 18, 19 ; and Crakanthorp, "Defens. Eccles. Angl.," pp. 285-287, A. C. L.).

Compare the words of the Tridentine decree : "Neque enim hæc inter se pugnant, ut ipse Salvator noster semper ad dextram Patris in cœlis assideat, juxta modum existendi naturalem ; et ut multis nihilominus aliis in locis *sacramentaliter* præsens *suâ substantiâ* nobis adsit" (sess. xiii., cap. i.)—words in which, according to the history of Pallavicini, "abstinere Synodus voluit eâ quæstione, quæ inter Aquinatis et Scoti sectatores agitatur, utrum idem Corpus divinitus possit pluribus in locis eo collocationis modo, quo in uno per naturam est, collocari" (lib. xii., cap. vi., pars ii., p. 116). Observe also the expression, "Sacramentaliter ac realiter," in canon viii., sess. xiii.

"Modus existendi *sacramentalis*, et tamen simul verus et realis, non poterat melius explicari, quam illo adverbio *substantialiter*" (Bellarmine, "De Sacr. Euch.," lib. i., cap. ii.).

It may be added, however, that in Wyclif's time there seems to have been a prevalent suspicion that the writings of Aquinas had been largely tampered with by the *pseudo-fratres*, who, for filthy lucre's sake, desired to be inquisitors of heresy. (See "De Eucharistiâ," cap. v., p. 139, Wyclif Soc.) Wyclif himself understands the "sacramentaliter" of Aquinas (pp. 232, 233) in a sense which he can himself approve (p. 268), adding : "Patet de Corpore Christi, quod est dimensionaliter in cœlo et virtualiter in hostia ut in signo" (p. 271).

And this view he sets in contrast with that of Duns Scotus (the Doctor Subtilis) : "Ponens quod stat idem Corpus in numero multiplicari dimensionaliter simul tempore per quotlibet loca non communicantia" (p. 232 ; see also p. 149).

But it may be doubted whether Wyclif rightly apprehended the full teaching of Aquinas on this point. See the language of Aquinas in pars iii., quæs. lxxv., art. i. : "Dicendum, quod Corpus Christi non est eo modo in hoc sacramento, sicut Corpus in loco, quod suis dimensionibus loco commensuratur : sed quodam speciali modo, qui est proprius huic sacramento. Unde dicimus, quod Corpus Christi est in diversis altaribus non sicut in diversis locis, sed sicut in sacramento. Per quod non intelligimus, quod Christus sit ibi *solum sicut in signo*, licet sacramentum sit in genere signi : sed intelligimus Corpus Christi hic esse *secundum modum proprium huic sacramento*." See Bellarmine, "De Euch.," lib. i., ch. ii. ; "De Controv.," tom. iii., c. 460 ; Ingold., 1601.

For Wyclif's own view of "*Sacramental Presence*," see "De Eucharistiâ," pp. 83-87, 98, 104, 109, 111, 121, 123, 308, and especially p. 148. It is sometimes somewhat ambiguously expressed, and his language needs to be interpreted or cleared from misapprehension by such distinct utterances as the following : "Infinita sunt argumenta propter que dicit katholicus quod Corpus Christi est ibi virtualiter et in signo, non Corpus Christi ut est in celo, sed signum ejus vicarium" ("De Euchar-

of the Body and Blood as separated in the condition of death. But that the glorified Body of the Son of God (which was never to be suffered to see corruption) should be subjected to the

---

istiâ," p. 303, Wyclif Soc.). This is the expression of a very different notion from that of Aquinas, and of one in agreement with that of Jeremy Taylor.

It should be observed that the anathema of the Council of Trent lies against those who maintain that the Presence is only "ut in signo, vel figura, aut *virtute*" (Sess. xiii., canon i.).

Perhaps the seeming inconsistencies in Wyclif's language may have resulted from a certain indistinctness or hesitancy in his views on the subject. In his "De Apostasia" he speaks of Berengar's doctrine (which possibly he misunderstood; see "De Apostasia," p. 187) as an error to be condemned (pp. 68, 79, Wyclif Soc.). And Professor Lechler has maintained that he "believes and teaches a true and real objective presence." ("John Wiclif," vol. ii., p. 189, Lorimer's translation; see also pp. 186, 187, 202, 203). Yet one who has carefully studied the subject has said: "I think we may come to the conclusion that the Realist Wyclif and the Nominalist Berengarius held objectively the same views on the Eucharist, and only varied in their manner of expounding it" ("Tractatus de Apostasia," Wyclif Soc., Dziewicki's Introduction, pp. 35, 36).

What he says in condemnation of the Docetism of transubstantiation (Lechler, ii., pp. 187, 202, 203) would seem to apply with equal force to Aquinas' view of Real Presence, whether bread remained or not. It is true, indeed, that sometimes his language would seem to be almost an anticipation of Lutheran doctrine. See Lechler, ii., pp. 189, 190, 204.

Yet it is scarcely possible not to see that the difference between the views of Wyclif and Luther was deep and radical. Professor Lechler himself has said: "When it is affirmed with emphasis that the Body of Christ in the Supper can only be spiritually seen, received, and enjoyed, but not corporeally, because it is only present spiritually, and when, in consequence, it is only to believers that a real participation of the Body of Christ in the Supper is attributed, while to the unbelieving, on the contrary, such a participation is denied, it is at this point that the difference of Wyclif's Eucharistic doctrine and Luther's falls with the strongest light upon the eye" (vol. ii., pp. 194, 195).

We think it clear that Wyclif's sense of "sacramental" was very different from that of Aquinas (see especially "De Apostasia," p. 189, Wyclif Soc.). The question of participation by unbelievers is *the crucial test* of the doctrine of the Presence.

Mr. Matthew is quoted as saying: "Neither Lechler nor anyone else can get a satisfactory and clear exposition, for the simple reason that Wyclif did not know what it was, though he thought he knew what it was not" ("Apostasia," Wyclif Soc., Introd., p. xxxvi.). But whatever want of distinctness there may be in Wyclif's teaching of "what it was," we do not think there was any doubt at all in his mind as to what it was not. His "Sacramental Presence" was undoubtedly no merely figurative or symbolical presence, no presence of empty signs. It was a virtual and effectual presence—nay, a true Real Presence—to the faith of the soul. If it included (or sometimes seemed to include) more than this, it certainly excluded the "Sacramental Presence" of the Romish doctrine (see especially "De Apostasia," p. 185, Wyclif Soc.).

On the whole subject of this note, see Albertinus, "De Eucharistiâ," lib. i., cap. xxvii.; and Bishop Jewel's controversy with Harding, art. vi.; "Works," vol. i., pp. 480 *sqq.*, P. S. edit.

degradation of lesion[1] and mastication in the mouths of the faithful—this was an idea which was not to be endured. In fact, the later Romish theologians were entirely at one with Berengarius in his repudiation of the natural meaning of the "Ego Berengarius." The following words of his contain a truth to which *they* would have assented: "Qui affirmat, Corpus Christi vel pro parte, vel pro toto manibus sacerdotum tractari super altare, manibus frangi, dentibus atteri, excepto, quod ad sacramentum pertinet, contra veritatem loquitur et dignitatem doctrinæ Christi; qui affirmat, Corpus Christi, postquam ad dexteram patris sedit, vulnerari non posse, vel frangi, vel atteri, excepto, quod ad sacramentum pertinet, secundum veritatem loquitur" ("De Sacrâ Cœnâ," p. 289; Berlin, 1834). But this was in distinct opposition to the teaching of Lanfranc (see p. 283; see also pp. 118, 200, 201, 206).

And this teaching had to be maintained side by side with the condemnation of Berengarius and the defence of the literal sense of the words of institution.

In the teaching of this later development of Roman theology, the literal interpretation must still be maintained against Berengarius. A trope or a figure is not to be thought of. But the doctrine of those who condemned Berengarius—the language which they made him utter as expressive of the then orthodox faith—this is now to be condemned as more heretical (in its natural sense) than the doctrine of Berengar himself.[2]

N. DIMOCK.

*(To be continued.)*

---

[1] See Berengar, "De Sacrâ Cœnâ," pp. 118, 200, 201, 206. Guitmundus defends the language of the "Ego Berengarius" by distinguishing between *pressure* and *wounding*, understanding the *atteri* only in the sense of *touching* and *pressing*. He says: "Qui se palpandum et post resurrectionem manibus obtulit, dentes propter immunditiam non vitabit. . . . Tangi namque naturale est carni, lædi autem infirmitatis est. Ita ergo potest Christus et dentibus tangi, ut quacunque pressura dentium jam non valeat lædi" ("De Veritate Corporis Christi," ff. 9, 10; Friburg Brisg., 1529).

[2] Some later writers, however, still maintained that Christ's body is present in the Sacrament naturally and sensibly. (See Jewel's "Works," vol. i., p. 446, P. S. edit.; and Cranmer on "Lord's Supper," pp. 46, 380 *sqq.*).

The Thomists maintained that though the accidents remained without a *substantial* subject, they were not without an *accidental* subject—"quantitati inesse tamquam accidentali subjecto." (See Benedict XIV., "De Sacrif. Missæ," cccxxiv.)

## ART. V.—ABSOLUTION.

THERE are three forms of absolution in the Prayer-Book of the Church of England. (i.) That in the Morning and Evening Prayer is declaratory, *i.e.*, it is a formal declaration that God pardons for Jesus Christ's sake all them that truly repent and unfeignedly believe His holy Gospel; (ii.) that in the Communion Service is precatory, *i.e.*, it is prayer for God's pardon; while (iii.) the absolution in the Service for the Visitation of the Sick is a combination of the precatory form and the indicative form relating to ecclesiastical censures, *i.e.*, it commences with a prayer to the Lord Jesus Christ that He would forgive the sick man, and it ends with the indicative absolution from ecclesiastical censures. An examination of ecclesiastical history on these points is most instructive, and shows that as Paul and the Corinthians punished and expelled the offending Corinthian, as they forgave him on his repentance for the scandal done, so did the early Church act in the age following the Apostles. The Church forgave a sin against the Church, in so far as it was only against the Church, just as a man has a right to forgive sins against man, so far as the offence is against man. Beyond this the Church did not venture to go. Sins against God, or that part of sin which was a sin against God, was left to God alone. A *public* scandal against the Church had to be openly and publicly acknowledged or confessed before the whole Church, and certain penalties were imposed upon those who wished to be restored into the Christian Communion or Church; but all these penalties had no reference whatever to the guilt of the sinner in reference to Almighty God, or to the sin committed against Him.

The penalties or discipline imposed upon the offending members of the Christian Church did not in their character long preserve the simplicity of the punishment imposed upon the offending Corinthian. The penitents stood bareheaded and barefooted before the gates of the church; they were clothed in sackcloth, they prostrated themselves at the feet of the bishops and publicly acknowledged their offence, and thereupon received the public forgiveness of the Church for the sin done against the Church, but their sin as regards God, *and all the sins of the rest of the people who had committed no notorious sins, were left to the ordinary remedies for sin against God, confession to Him and acceptance of His mercy through Christ.* There was no private confession to a priest either by notorious offenders or by the people in general, and no "absolvo te" pronounced in secret by any officer of the

Church. But there is nothing that the advocates of "confession" to a priest would so ardently desire as to confound this public acknowledgment by notorious offenders of their sin or scandal against the Church—a public confession in which the vast body of Christians took no part whatever—with private or auricular confession and absolution, a practice which was then unknown to the Church.

"Secret confession" is spoken of by the editor of the Notes on Tertullian's "De Penitentiâ" in the "Library of the Fathers," who we may assume from the initials "E. B. P." to have been Dr. Pusey, as "unknown to the antients," and "wholly omitted in the earlier Church." But there always have been, and will be, people of weak natures who will crave to obtain the confidence of their fellow-mortals in the matter of sin even against God, and thus to unbosom themselves to the "president" of the congregation became the practice of some, but only with a view to obtaining advice, and not absolution. This "confidence" is not confession, nor should we for a moment allow it to be confounded with it—indeed, Maldonat admits it has nothing to do with sacramental confession; but it contains to us of this age a solemn warning of the danger of "confidence" sliding into and ending in confession.

The spurious Clemens and Origen are the earliest advocates of this occasional confidence, the object of which was not absolution—and this is most important to bear in mind—but that the penitent might be healed "by the Word of God." Gradually another morbid custom developed itself. As the energies of individual faith in God's promises waxed cold, people publicly and unnecessarily accused themselves of their own secret sins when of heinous character, in order to obtain the prayers of the people and the ceremonial pardon of the Church, *in so far as the sin thus voluntarily made public was an injury to the Church.* This now gradually fastened itself upon the more ancient public discipline for notorious sin, and it began to be encouraged as a meritorious act.

Gross and unnecessary scandals were thus produced, and about A.D. 300 it was thought necessary in Constantinople to appoint a special officer of the Church called Penitentiarius, whose duty it was to hear confessions, but not to forgive or absolve the penitent either of his sins against God or even against the Church (and thus wholly and utterly different from the modern confessional), but only to see if his sins or his case was such as required public discipline at all, and to instruct the penitent for this purpose. See "Bingham," vol. vi., pp. 490-493, wherein it is made plain that the Penitentiarius had nothing whatever to do with absolution or with the forgiveness of sin against God, but was only concerned to instruct

the penitent as to public penance and its suitability for his case. But the tendency of the office was to give a dignity and formal authorization to private confession, and was undoubtedly a downward step in the history of the Church. The office lasted for only eighty years, and was then, after a grave scandal, suppressed by Nectarius, Bishop of Constantinople.

But by the side of this we have about the same date an unbroken line of witnesses against confession to fallen man of sin against God. Chrysostom says, "Reveal thy way unto the Lord; confess thy sins before God; confess them before the Judge . . . and so look to obtain mercy." And again, "Dost thou confess them to thy fellow-servant? It is to thy Lord, to Him who careth for thee, thy Physician, thy Friend, that thou shewest thy wound, and He saith to thee, 'Confess thy sin in private to Me alone, that I may heal thy wound, and deliver thee from thy grief.'" The Greek of this faithful witness lies before me, and makes his golden voice live again and ring over the chasm of fourteen centuries, so that "he being dead yet speaketh." In like manner Basil and Hilary, and Ambrose and Augustine, the last-named of which illustrious band says, "What have I to do with men, that they should hear my confessions as though they could heal all my diseases?"

Such passages *could* not have been written if confession to a priest and absolution by him were the recognised method for remission of sins as against God. It is also to be noticed in connection with the abolition of the office of the Penitentiarius, or Public Confessor, in Constantinople that Nectarius contemplated permitting everyone to partake of the Communion on the witness of his own conscience: "A near approach to the system of our own Church, which would have got rid of the evils and scandals and the tyranny of public discipline," without substituting for them the more deadly evils and scandals of auricular confession and judicial absolution by a priest.

This, alas! is what *did* happen. Public discipline gradually withered and dropped, and the original object of that discipline, as a satisfaction to the Church, began to be forgotten, and the penance imposed began to be regarded as a condition of forgiveness by God of sins against Himself. So that according to the famous, though confused, rescript of Pope Leo I. in A.D. 440, "forgiveness from God cannot be obtained but through the supplication of the priest."

But note, however, that even yet the priest is to act not as judge, as the Council of Trent represents him, but simply as an intercessory "precator."

And, moreover, in spite of advancing error and the increasing use of private confession thus pressed in by Pope

Leo upon the Campanian bishops, there remained still burning brightly in the Church a great witness for the truth in the nature of the absolution used. Will it be believed that the indicative, "I absolve thee," was at this date absolutely unknown? "*God* give thee remission," was the form used. Unscriptural and darkly ominous as was the private confession then used, it was separated by this great gulf from its modern counterfeit.

We cannot dwell too strongly upon the significant fact that the public absolution pronounced in the Church of these and earlier times, whether as regards sins which were only sins against God, or as regards the sin against God which was involved in a public scandal against the Church, was only a prayer that God would forgive the penitent. The indicative, "I absolve thee," no one in the early Church ever dared to use for sins against God.

Dr. Marshall, in his work on the "Penitential Discipline of the Church," republished in the Anglo-Catholic Library, says that absolution as regards the conscience of the sinner for sins against God "was always in the form of prayer throughout the earliest ages," and the reader will hereafter find that it continued so for a thousand years.

I therefore append the "Absolution" to be found at the end of St. James's Liturgy, and which is entitled "The Prayer of Propitiation": "O Lord Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, thou Shepherd and Lamb, that takest away the sins of the world, that forgavest the debt to the two debtors, and grantedst remission of sins to the sinful woman, and gavest to the sick of the palsy both a cure and pardon of sins; remit, blot out, and pardon our sins, both voluntary and involuntary, whatsoever we have done willingly or unwillingly, by transgression and disobedience, which Thy Spirit knoweth better than ourselves. And whereinsoever Thy servants have erred from Thy commandments in word or deed, as men carrying flesh about them and living in the world, or seduced by the instigations of Satan or whatsoever curse or peculiar anathema they are fallen under; I pray and beseech Thy ineffable goodness to absolve them with Thy word, and remit their curse and anathema according to Thy mercy. O Lord and Master, hear my prayer for Thy servants; Thou that forgettest injuries, overlook all their failings, pardon their offences, both voluntary and involuntary, and deliver them from eternal punishment. For Thou art He that hast commanded us saying, 'Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.' Because Thou art our God, the God that canst have mercy and save and forgive sins; and

to Thee, with the eternal Father and the quickening Spirit, belongs glory now and for ever, world without end. Amen."

The Greek of this noble prayer, for prayer and nothing else this prayer for absolution is, which witnesses as truly as our Protestant Prayer-Book for the truth as it is in Jesus, is to be found in Bingham, vol. vi., p. 553, and as above at end of St. James's Liturgy. And a similar form was used for many ages in the Latin Church. See the form of absolution in the old Latin missal published by Illyricas and Cardinal Bona, where it is found as follows: "He that forgave the sinful woman all her sins for which she shed tears, and opened the gate of Paradise to the thief upon a single confession, make you partaker of His redemption and absolve you from all the bond of your sins, and heal those infirm members by the medicine of His mercy, and restore them to the body of His holy Church by His grace, and keep them whole and sound for ever."

And yet in the face of the fact that for centuries the early Church only prayed for or declared God's mercy for sinners who repented, there are Romanizers to be found who would lead us as slaves to the feet of the priest to receive from him his novel and unholy "I absolve thee" for sins committed against God.

Religiously it is a crime, and historically it is a blunder. Nor even for sins against the Church was the indicative "I absolve thee" used at this date, unless we except the case of Zephyrinus mentioned by Tertullian. The earliest use of the indicative "We absolve thee" is contained in the Pontifical of Egbert, Archbishop of York, A.D. 767; but this is in a service intended for public penitents, and refers to sins against the Church, and where remission of sins against God is spoken of the form becomes a prayer.

As we move onwards down the centuries, we find such degradation introduced as the penitent being allowed to commute his penance by a gift of money to the Church or other charitable purpose, or to discharge his penance vicariously by employing substitutes.

A rich grandee who had been enjoined a penance of fasting for seven years might discharge it by employing about 1,000 men, who would for a payment of money to them fast in his place, and accomplish as much fasting in three days as he could in seven years. But a poor person should, we are told, "with great diligence exact the penance in himself." And at last came the decree of the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, which took the memorable step of making confession and absolution by the priest necessary to retain communion with the Church. In previous times public confession and public absolution, as explained above, were only deemed necessary for a few notorious sinners, in order to regain communion when lost, but now by

this decree private confession and private absolution were made obligatory for sins against God upon every adult and for all his sins. Mark the radical difference between this and the ancient custom. And the top-stone was put on when it was ordained in 1268, at a council held in London by Cardinal Othobon, that absolution should be given only in the specially prescribed form, "I absolve thee from all thy sins."

But even in this thirteenth century, writers, such as Hablensis, quoted by Dr. Marshall, assert that this indicative "I absolve thee" only refers to the "reconciling the sinner to the Church. In token of this there is premised to the formulary of absolution a prayer, and then the absolution itself follows, which is pronounced indicatively." Upon this Marshall observes: "The indicative 'I absolve thee' was only at first understood to reconcile to the Church."

The bearing of all this upon the absolution in our own service for the Visitation of the Sick, to which I almost exclusively direct my remarks, is most important. It is impossible that our Reformers, who must have known the history of these facts I have laid before you, could have intended that "I absolve thee" in their service should refer to sin against God, or to anything but the burden of Church censures, *a weighty matter* in their days. Had the words in their opinion referred to sin against God, they would have probably regarded them as blasphemous, and they would certainly have considered them as contrary to the usage of the early Church and as repugnant to the Word of God.

They must have been aware of the well-known statement in Aquinas, of the thirteenth century, with reference to the introduction of the modern "I absolve thee," made by one who objected to its use on the ground that scarce thirty years had passed since all did use this form only: "Almighty God give thee remission and forgiveness"; and they must have known how that the words had gradually since the thirteenth century descended and been degraded from their original reference to Church censures to mean a Divine sentence for the remission of sin. Would the Reformers have followed that disastrous descent even to the depths of the decree of the Council of Trent? It is incredible that they could have applied the words to sin against God.

I am aware that the "I absolve thee" of the service for the Visitation of the Sick is explained by some as simply declaratory of God's remission of sin against Him, and this is supported by the authority of Jerome, quoted by Bingham (vi. 558), who says: "The priests under the old law were said to cleanse a leper or pollute him; not that they were the authors of his pollution, but that they *declared* him to be so"; and of Lombard, who says, speaking of the priests of the

Gospel: "These forgive sins or retain them, whilst they show or declare that they are forgiven or retained by God, for the priest of old put the name of the Lord upon the children of Israel, *but* it was He Himself that blessed them" (Numb. vi. 27).

Thus a sound distinction would be established between "forgiveness" and "absolution," "forgiveness" being in the hands of God alone, who alone can pardon *and* absolve, as in the "Absolution" in Morning Prayer: "He pardoneth and absolveth"; while the Church, though she cannot *pardon* sin, *can* set forth God's sweet promises in Christ as to that pardon, and thus by leading the sinner to faith in God's mercy through Christ looses the chains and shackles of unbelief and timidity or despair, and declares to the sinner that God *does* pardon him if he repents and believes this Gospel, and that so believing he *is* absolved. This sense of "absolve" in the Visitation Service is a good one, and is supported by Bingham, who says the words may reasonably be interpreted, according to the account given out of Jerome and others, as a "declaration of the sinner's pardon."

T. S. TREANOR.

(*To be continued.*)

## ART. VI.—SELF-DENIAL IN MINISTERIAL LIFE.

### AN ADDRESS TO CANDIDATES FOR ORDERS.

"Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister."—St. Matt. xx. 26.

IF ever there was a time when the officers of the Church of Christ seemed in a position to be like the princes of the Gentiles, exercising dominion over their parishes, or like the great ones of the earth, claiming authority over them, that time is certainly not now. Most of you, my brothers, when you go to your districts, will find practically only a small section who are ready to enter into direct relations with you as their spiritual friend. In a large number of parishes where the people are educated and wealthy, they are mostly too worldly to pay you any particular attention. In the parishes where the great majority of our fellow-citizens live—the working classes—the population is so large, it shifts so frequently, and owing to the neglect of older generations it is so materialized and indifferent, that the notion of an inherent spiritual authority, if asserted, would have to most of them no meaning at all. The claim of spiritual autocracy would in any case be bad for yourself, and contrary to the directions of Christ; men have to be persuaded, not commanded; but in the present day there is little opportunity for the temptation to occur. The majority of the parishioners among whom you are to work will not be in any real sense members of the congregation,

and those who do attend the church will know as well as you that Christ's words sweep away all possibility of spiritual domination. The authority of the minister must be shared by the congregation. The mere assertion of a right to teach, a right to govern, a right to decide, a right to pre-eminence, a right to be followed, a right to receive adherence and attention, will be entirely barren. The true attitude for you as you approach the people among whom you are to work is indicated to you by St. Paul: "By manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God."

The fact that you are not called upon to be a lord over God's heritage, still less over those who are indifferent to His Gospel, does not relieve you from a very close relation of responsibility both towards the members of the congregation and the general inhabitants of the parish. You have to be the servant of both sorts, though in different ways. To the first the relation is pastoral, to the second it has more of a missionary character. About the first you will ask yourself: "How can I best build them up in Christ?" About the second your question will be: "How can I best win them for Christ?" It does not absolutely follow that all the regular members of the congregation are already repentant; but you will be neglecting the example of the Apostles in their Epistles if you spend all your time every Sunday in calling them to repent. The fact of their coming to the House of God out of so large a number who do not come shows at any rate an inclination towards God's service which ought to be the sign of better things. You will gradually find out, from personal observation, who are the true servants of God among the congregation, and who are merely professional. But on the whole it is well that in a settled congregation the general aim should be teaching and instruction, always ending with an appeal to the heart, and a reminder of the necessity of a conviction of sin constantly renewed. It is for the most part the people outside the congregation who have to be won to the initial stages of repentance.

This attitude of ministerial service towards those within and without implies, first of all, duties towards yourself, in order that you may be able to commend the truth which you have to deliver.

1. *Remember that your work is spiritual.* All kinds of organizing machinery will come in your way, which would be enough to absorb the whole of your time, all kinds of entertainments, all kinds of clubs, all kinds of meetings and associations. You may be exceedingly busy from morning till night, and not altogether without usefulness, and you may be doing other people's work and not your own. You cannot imagine St. Paul singing a humorous song or a love ballad to attract the

people of Corinth, or St. John organizing the training of a Patmos boat against the crew of the neighbouring island of Samos, in order to provide healthy recreation for the young men. These secular organizations are the work of laymen, or, in some cases, of women. Your parish must be something of a failure if you have produced or attracted no persons capable of undertaking and conducting these useful and humble social operations. We are always talking of work for laymen; and such occupation may be found in committees and organizations. Your work is study, preaching, private prayer, personal exhortation.

2. *Do not indulge yourself in any eccentricity.* There is a clerical self-consciousness which delights in being peculiar. Eccentricity will only be impressive to the weakest minds amongst the people, and will simply be repulsive to the strong, the manly, and the sensible. Some men are led to it by what seems a good motive. "If I only adopt an eccentric costume, then I shall have broken altogether with the world, and shall show that my affections are set on things above." There is often more pride in walking about the streets in unusual garments, which must attract attention, than in submitting to the ordinary rules of custom. Or eccentricity is cultivated to satisfy some private theory. Then it is a sinister indication as to your humility of judgment, and as to your sense of proportion. No man with true Christian modesty would set up his own opinion against that of the Church at large; no man with ordinary common-sense would attribute the slightest importance to such matters. Clerical costume has only grown up in different ages by being a conservative survival of the general dress of some previous generation. In the early days of the Church there was no such costume at all. Cyprian, though a bishop, wore the ordinary dress of the cultivated gentleman of his day, only in sober colours, and discouraged any official garb as ostentatious. You are permitted, perhaps required, by custom to wear a kind of uniform; you are forbidden by common-sense to adopt anything eccentric or noticeable. You will have an opportunity of showing the bent of your mind in this matter, and whether you are a victim to the temptation to eccentricity at the ordination. As we are all amongst friends, and there is nobody present but clergy and candidates, you know we must plainly admit that the affectation of the very much curtailed surplice and the bloated or exaggerated hood is, as a simple matter of fact, neither more nor less than foolishness. The fact is that men of science tell us that this is an age peculiarly liable to nervous diseases and neurotic affections; and you may feel tolerably sure that if ever you should feel the temptation very strong upon you

to do something strange, queer, out of the way, remarkable, or notorious, and you should be unable to master it, and feel as if you must give way to it, what you would need would be to go to an able and kindly physician, who would prescribe to you a diet, a course of medicine, and a system of habits, which would restore you to a more manly and healthy frame of mind.

3. *Give yourself during some part of every day to study.* Do not be deluded by the tempter into thinking that because you have read a few books, or parts of books, for your two ordinations, therefore you know enough for the rest of your life. You must never let a day pass without reading some passage of the Word of God with a commentary. You must not be content with reading the Fifth Book of Hooker, but the whole treatise. You should not take little scraps of Clement, Justin, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Augustine, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerome, Gregory, at second-hand, but see what it is those men in old days really said and thought, and how many weeds are mixed up with the good herbs even in the best of them. You should know what Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer had to say for the Reformation and the Prayer-Book. You should be familiar with Jackson, Field, Pearson, and Paley, and know Butler's Sermons as well as his "Analogy." You would find great interest and value in looking into Bingham's "Christian Antiquities," and the "Dictionary of Christian Antiquities and Christian Biography." There are all the great ecclesiastical historians and the whole range of evidential literature. You cannot possibly be an instructor of your people unless you replenish your own mind. Besides that, the habit of quietness and of systematic thought which the daily hour of study will give you will be absolutely invaluable in the crowded, hurried, and bustling life on which you are entering.

4. Ask God specially to help you to check yourself in any kind of personal vanity. The temptation to this will be strong. A very large number of the people with whom you will have to deal are simple and foolish; not because they are Christians, but because it is the same in all walks of life, and wherever human nature is to be found. There are some unmarried women particularly who must have somebody to put on a pinnacle. They will be sure to make too much of you, to persuade you that your sermons ought to be published, and that you have many rare and extraordinary gifts. Do not spoil your ministry by connivance at any folly and delusions of this kind. Rebuke it and check it whenever it occurs. Remember that exemplary Archbishop of Canterbury who, after his enthronement, when some excited man in the crowd

asked him to pray for him, turned to him and said, "Brother, pray for me; I need it most." Never talk about yourself or your own performances. Never ask people's opinions about your sermons. Try to make as little use as you possibly can for the present of the capital letter I. Think only of God's glory and the good of souls. Among your greatest recommendations will be your own personal modesty, humility, self-forgetfulness, self-abnegation.

5. Closely allied to this is *the duty of putting aside all ambition, whether for place or esteem.* Do not look out for the most advantageous curacies, or those that are most likely to lead to preferment. Look for those only where you are most needed, and your work is most required. Do not be unhappy if you do not get a parish of your own. According to our present system there is a larger number of assistant curates in full orders than there is of parishes for them to fill. Remember always that it is pre-eminently our duty as ministers to seek the lowest room, to put others forward instead of ourselves. Remember how our Lord reproached those who received honour one of another, and sought not the honour that cometh of God only. Remember how He said: "Be not ye called Rabbi, for one is your Master which is in heaven: call no man your master on the earth, for one is your Master which is in heaven." Self-seeking, pushing, boasting, human distinctions, secret canvassing for promotion, all these are flagrant contradictions of the character of the servant of Christ, especially of the Christian minister.

6. Once more, let me urge you, from my experience of London, to the humble, but necessary, duty of *taking care of your health.* There are a few who have constitutions of iron, and who need neither rest nor relaxation; but they are not many. Most of you also will be living in crowded neighbourhoods, breathing exhausted air, spending most of your time indoors, and in the fatiguing employment of visiting a succession of small rooms and people who claim your sympathy. Unless you make it a solemn religious duty to take a regular weekly rest, and to get a thorough break and change, you cannot give your work its full value. Do not make the mistake of taking the round back, the high shoulders, and the hollow chest as signs of superior sanctity. Whatever it be, a walk in the country, or a run on a cycle, or an athletic practice, some regular exercise, fresh air, and change you must obtain if you are to be fit and ready to endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ.

7. The last personal recommendation I wish to give you is *to be more earnest in prayer.* It is only when it is born and fostered in the spirit of prayer that what you do can be

successful. I do not mean merely the running through certain forms at fixed hours; rather the feeling that in God alone we can do anything at all, and that unless we ask Him consciously, intelligently, spontaneously, earnestly, for His help in our undertakings, there will be no growth or vitality about them at all—"Casting all your care upon Him, for He careth for you." We are taught to think of Him not as a deity to be propitiated by fixed tributes of formal devotion, but as a Father with whom we can converse, and before whom we must bring all our plans and hopes if they are to come to anything. Like the Apostolic Christians, we must exercise ourselves in the constant habit of extemporaneous prayer both in public and in private. Anybody can say a collect, and it may mean absolutely nothing at all; but the outpouring of the heart in sincere, unaffected, earnest, extemporaneous prayer means a great deal: it means that Christianity is to you not a form, but a reality; it means that you have broken with worldly reserve and academic shyness; it means that you are face to face with God, wrestling as Jacob wrestled with the angel, as all men of faith will have to wrestle till the end of time.

II. I must say a few words on your duty to the Church.

1. The first is a word of *loyalty*. Remember that there is no ambiguity whatever about your sailing orders. You receive them on Sunday at your ordination as distinctly as they can be put in words. They are the instructions of the Book of Common Prayer under the supreme authority of Holy Scripture. You have nothing whatever to do with Rome or Geneva; in Sarum, as in the Prayer-Book of 1549, you can have only an antiquarian interest. Your Church has a distinct history of its own, a distinct organization and life of its own, a distinct code of its own, a distinct appeal of its own. Your duty as a faithful Christian is clear: to order your religious life and your devotional habits and your work and practice on the lines of the Prayer-Book, and of that alone. If you are not content with that, you had far better not take orders, for you cannot take orders with a clear conscience. And just as one of the reasons why you are given Hooker to read is his admirable principle that individual common-sense is to be used in the understanding and interpretation of the Bible, so individual common-sense must be used in the understanding and interpretation of the Prayer-Book. Where choice or doubt occurs, you must be guided by long-prevailing custom. The Church of England leaves a great deal to common-sense, and only inserts directions when they are absolutely necessary. A curious instance of a different principle of action is given by the people who insist upon kneeling during the reading of the

Epistle. They adopt this habit because Lord Cairns, in an ecclesiastical decision, declared that where no alteration of attitude was prescribed, the previous attitude must be maintained. Some people did not like the judgment, so by way of protest they adopted kneeling during the Epistle because there was no direction to be seated after the collect. The Church of England left that to common-sense, and common-sense had the witness of universal custom in seating the worshippers during the Epistle. The spirit that kneels by way of protest is not the spirit to bring into the worship of the sanctuary. Be as loyal to the Prayer-Book as you can. Try and carry out its details in the spirit as well as in the letter, and sanctify all with the spirit of humility, faith, prayer, and common-sense. Within the limits of its directions is abundant scope for every possible energy and aspiration of devotion. You are starting fresh, a new generation of priests and deacons. You are tied by no promises, obligations, or traditions other than those to which in the most awful and solemn manner on Sunday you swear your sincere, unreserved, and unswerving obedience. Cast aside, by God's help, all mischievous, perverting, and sectional influence towards one side or another, and be genuinely faithful to the authorized documents of that distinct and independent communion of which God has called you to be a minister.

2. Secondly, *do all you possibly can to promote the unity of the Church within her own borders.* You need not trouble your head about union with Rome or union with Nonconformists. What we have to strive for is *the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace amongst ourselves.* As long as the Church of England is as divided as she is by the wanton wilfulness of her own sons and daughters, we cannot exercise that power for good which we are called upon as a national body to wield, nor have we much right to speak to others about union. The plague and the weakness of the Church are found at the present day in party spirit, party associations, party pursuit of this or that object which stands quite apart from the broad simple truths of the Gospel of Christ. Whenever you are tempted to say to yourself, "I should like to adopt this or that practice, this or that garment, this or that shibboleth; no bishop will prosecute me for it; it is perfectly innocent; it seems to me supremely desirable," you should answer to yourself by God's grace helping you: "No. It will increase the divisions of the Church; it will offend brethren whom perhaps I consider weak; it will widen the gulf between me and other good Christians: all things may be lawful, but all things are not expedient; for the sake of peace and union I will restrain this burning wish of my heart."

III. Lastly, *you have a special duty towards your people.* You have to put yourself on a level with them, and throw off all worldly superiority. Any advantage you have over them must be one of character and of duty, not of privilege. You have to treat them in reality as brothers and sisters, not merely by a convenient and meaningless conventionality. If you wish to win their hearts you must give them your own. However uninteresting and unprepossessing they may be, you must make them feel that they have, not your condescending notice, but your genuine sympathy. They must feel that you have real affection and friendship for them, not merely lumps of advice when they seem to require it. And that affection must be disciplined, wise, and Christian. Nothing is more sickening than spiritual flirtations, ministerial philandering, or doting favouritism. Such blemishes are frequently met in instances of unwise ministerial life, and as they are an indication of a nature only partly regenerate, so they are terrible hindrances to ministerial usefulness. It is nothing of that kind that St. Paul meant when he said, "I became all things to all men, if by any means I might save some." The kindly spirit towards all needs to be restrained and guided by discretion. But remember that it is your prerogative to exercise it towards all. As far as your duties are concerned, "do not forget," as old Bishop Lonsdale, of Lichfield, used to say to his beneficed clergy, "that you are the vicar of everybody. Remember that you have duties to Dissenters as well as to Churchmen. Try to bring men together."

Well, you are going forth in God's name to this new and responsible life. On you and such as you will depend very largely the character of the English Church in future years. Eight of you are going well-equipped and prepared to preach the everlasting Gospel, like the Apostles themselves, to pagans and heathen. You take your lives in your hands, and encounter difficulties and privations enormously greater than those which surround us at home. Some of those who have sat here within the last few years, bright with hope, have already left their bones beneath the blazing pestilential sun of Africa. We like to have you with us on these occasions: it gives reality and point to our own resolves for work. We are glad that one of you has had the honour so many times in succession of heading the list, and reading the Gospel in the cathedral. I am sure that all those who are ordained with you will give you their constant prayers that your lives may be spared, and that you may be permitted to do much for the extension of the kingdom of Christ. That will be a bond of union, and will give you a sense of support when you are far away from home, and scattered into all the quarters of the earth—by the dreamy

lakes of Uganda, or the busy markets of Hindustân, or the unknown towns of many-peopled China. In that way the others can share your severer labours, and keener disappointments, and more imminent risks. But on all let me urge the same spirit of complete self-devotion: "Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister." Humility, that is the privilege of the Christian, especially of the Christian officer. Self-sacrifice, that is the watchword of the Christian life, above all of him who is called to serve in holy things. Self-will, self-importance, self-conceit, self-seeking, ambition, those are the sacrifices that we of all men are called upon to make. God grant that this may be the spirit in which you receive your commission! At this great festival of the gifts of His Spirit, may you be impressed and animated by this ideal! "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow Me. For whosoever will save his life shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his life for My sake shall find it."

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

## Notes and Queries.

### NOTE ON 1 PETER V. 13.

ALFORD and, I believe, most modern commentators dismiss very decisively the idea that the Babylon from which St. Peter wrote his first epistle was the Egyptian Babylon which occupied the site of Fostat, or old Cairo. Alford admits that this view is "the tradition of the Coptic Church, and it is supported," he says, "by Le Clerc, Mill, Pearson, Calov, Pott, Buston, and Graswell." W. B. D. (William Bodham Donne), in Smith's "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography," tells us that this Babylon was a fortress or castle in the Delta of Egypt, upon the right bank of the Nile, in lat. 31° N. (? 30° N.), and near the commencement of the Pharaonic Canal, from that river to the Red Sea; and that it was the boundary town between Lower and Middle Egypt, where the river craft paid toll, ascending or descending the Nile. Diodorus ascribes its erection to revolted Assyrian captives in the reign of Sesostris, and Ctesias carries its date back to the times of Semiramis; but Josephus, with greater probability, attributes its structure to some Babylonian followers of Cambyses in B.C. 525. In the age of Augustus the Deltaic Babylon *became a town of some importance*, and was the headquarters of the three legions which ensured the obedience of Egypt. In the "Notitia Imperii" Babylon is mentioned as the quarters of Legio XIII. Gemina.

Is, then, Alford right when he speaks of "an insignificant fort in Egypt called Babylon"? When we remember that St. Mark is universally believed to have preached in Alexandria and the neighbourhood; that he was with St. Paul *at Rome* when he wrote his Epistle to the Colossians (chap. iv. 10), and in Asia Minor when St. Paul wrote his Second Epistle to Timothy, and that, therefore, it would seem most improbable that he was so far east as the Assyrian Babylon; when we remember

also that we have no evidence that St. Peter himself was ever in the Assyrian Babylon (which was at that time in a very decayed condition); but that, as tradition says, he probably did ultimately travel westward to Rome—what more likely than that on his way he visited Egypt, and from Babylon in Egypt wrote the epistle which bears his name? The very ancient Coptic Churches in old Cairo show that Christianity was introduced into Egypt in very early times.

The only argument which is urged by Alford against the view that the Egyptian Babylon is intended is the order in which the countries mentioned in 1 Peter i. 1 are enumerated. I cannot think this is an argument of much value.

Ever since a visit I paid last year to Old Cairo, the impression has become stronger and stronger in my mind that the Egyptian Babylon is the place referred to by St. Peter, and I should like to hear what arguments there are against this view. Plumptre, in the Cambridge Bible for Schools, dismisses it in two lines (p. 161); but it surely deserves a far more careful consideration.

Of course I have assumed as utterly untenable, the theory that by Babylon St. Peter meant Rome; such a view and would never have been propounded, had it not been for Papal claims.

C. ALFRED JONES.

---

## NOTE ON PSALM CIV.

In the June number of THE CHURCHMAN a writer revives the old theory that the "ships" of Ps. civ. 26 were "nautiluses." He points out, amongst other reasons, that the word "go" (*lit.*, walk) is hardly applicable to ships. But in 2 Chron. ix. 21 the ships (אֳנִיּוֹת) are also said to walk, and a kindred expression is used of Noah's ark (Gen. vii. 18); whilst we English people do not hesitate to make steamers "run." With reference to Prov. xxx. 19, "the heart of the sea" by no means signifies "the depth of the sea" in all passages. It indicates a central maritime position in several notable verses in Ezekiel. Another objection may be raised against the nautilus theory, namely, that this beautiful creature only inhabits tropical waters. On the whole, we may be thankful that our revisers did not put "here walk the nautiluses."

## NOTE ON PSALM LXXVIII.

Turning to the writer's remarks on Ps. lxxviii., he seems to suppose that the Psalmist "happened to have a copy of the law beside him" when composing the Psalm, and that he felt bound to make a complete catalogue of the plagues which were in his copy of the law. Both of these suggestions are open to question. It is clear that he did not follow the order of J.; and if he might take poetic license in this respect, why might he not have felt at liberty to select special plagues? Besides, in other parts of the poem we find reference to quails, manna, the pillar of the cloud and the fire, and the water standing in a heap; so that his copy of the law must have contained not only the materials assigned to J., but also those usually appropriated by the critics to J.E., P., and E.; in other words, "the copy of the law which he happened to have by his side" was the same as our own.

The cast-iron theory which restricts a sacred writer to one method of treatment, and which holds that variation of style involves difference of authorship—distributing the plagues, for example, among three authors—has been before the reading public for some time, but hardly commends itself to common-sense, and often leads to ridiculous conclusions.

G.

# Short Notices.

*The Scottish Songstress.* By MARGARET SIMPSON. Pp. 63. Oliphant and Co., Edinburgh.

Caroline, Baroness Nairn, authoress of "The Auld House," "The Land of the Leal," and other beautiful Scotch songs, will for ever live in the memory of the Scottish people. Mrs. Simpson is her great grand-niece, and has written a charming little memoir of recollections.

*Cook's Handbook to Switzerland.* Pp. 328. *Cook's Handbook to Holland, Belgium, and the Rhine.* Pp. 376. Cook and Son, Ludgate Circus, E.C.

When so much of our foreign travelling is placed in the hands of these enterprising benefactors and pioneers, it is very desirable to have guide-books provided under the same auspices. These are drawn up with great care and experience, and form a sort of English Baedeker with beautiful maps and illustrations.

*Ministering Children.* By Mrs. CHARLESWORTH. Pp. 443. Cloth, 1s. 6d. Paper, 1s. Seeley and Co.

Mrs. Charlesworth's delightful story, which has made an epoch in so many a life, has been reproduced by Messrs. Seeley in these cheap forms, and we feel sure that the announcement will be very popular throughout the country. "Ministering Children" has taught many an invaluable lesson in unselfishness and consideration for others.

The three new volumes of the S.P.C.K. series of Mrs. EWING'S works are: *Jan and the Windmill*, pp. 384, *Six to Sixteen*, pp. 296, and *Lob-Lie-by-the-Fire*, Pp. 219.

*Stories of the Fire Brigade.* By FRANK MUNDELL. Pp. 160. Price 1s. 6d. Sunday-School Union.

There are few greater acts of heroism than those which are constantly performed by our modern fire brigades, especially that of London, where fires are constant and houses difficult of access. A book like this will stimulate young men all over the country to larger ideas of duty and to the active practice of unselfishness.

*The History of the Councils of the Church.* By Bishop HEFELY. Vol. IV. Translated by W. R. CLARK. Pp. 492. T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh.

The fourth volume of this important work extends from the year 451 to 680. Nothing could be more instructive as to the inner history of the Church. Many an amusing and interesting article might be written on the subjects here handled, the chief of which is the Controversy of the Three Chapters. Much light is thrown by the decisions of the various Councils on life and manners.

*Studies in Biblical and Ecclesiastical Subjects.* By the late Dean CAMPBELL of Dromore. Pp. 275. Elliot Stock.

The late Dean of Dromore was a well-known contributor to this Review, and a writer of originality, independence, learning, and moderation. His son has done well to collect his father's principal papers, and they are on subjects which cannot fail to interest our readers. They are such as these: "Inspiration," "The Church as a Witness and Keeper of Holy Writ," "The Rock of the Church," "The Covenant Obligation of the Lord's Day," "The Transfiguration," "The Hand of a Mediator," "We have an Altar," "Hades," "The Spirits in Prison," "Universalism," "Episcopacy—Scriptural," "The Church, What is it?" "Baptismal Regeneration," "St. Patrick and the Early Irish Church."

We quote a sentence from the paper on "The Church": "Claiming

to be the Catholic Church, the Roman Church asserts that she is the Body of Christ, and that all her members and none others shall be saved. We should be cautious lest any Protestant Church should be guilty of the same terrible and unscriptural error, and claim the exclusive right to Christ as its Head, to the exclusion of all others." The views of the Dean are throughout founded on learning, wisdom, sound sense, and loyalty to the New Testament.

*The Religion of the Crescent.* By the Rev. W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL. Pp. 251. Price 4s. S.P.C.K.

This is one of "The Non-Christian Religious Systems," and the writer has had the advantage of being secretary to the C.M.S. Mission at Julfâ and Isfahân.

The book is full of most interesting information.

The result is thus summed up: "The effect of Islâm upon the family, the State, and upon the human intellect has been glanced at, and we have seen how that fell system of religion blasts all that is true and noble, all that is pure and elevated in the nature of man and woman alike. Islâm, as a religion, is not true; it has not come from God. It does not and cannot satisfy the needs of the human heart. It does not reveal God in His Divine Fatherhood. . . . Islâm is an anti-Christian creed, it is opposed to all true progress, whether moral or intellectual, political or religious."

*Can She Forgive?* By E. S. CURRY. Pp. 160. Price 1s. 6d. S.P.C.K.

This story—less sensational than its title—is still full of incident, and gives a life-like picture of the sayings and doings of East London folk.

*The Story of Charles Ogilvie.* By G. E. SERGEANT. Pp. 190. Price 6d. R.T.S.

This story—somewhat old-fashioned in style and tone—contains some excellent lessons for boys, and is remarkably cheap.

*Guide to the Study of the Book of Common Prayer.* By the Rev. A. R. FAUSSETT, D.D. Pp. 268. London: Thynne.

Such strange and unhistorical theories are now promulgated about the Prayer-Book that this admirable book, placing it in its true relation to the circumstances and opinions of its day, will be warmly welcomed. Where all parts are good and sound, it is difficult to select any particular passage; but there is special value in the chapter called "Priests, not Sacrificers," in that on "Baptismal Regeneration," that on "The Communion," that on "The Validity of Presbyterian Orders," and that on "True Church Principles." Inquiries are often made for such a book as this; here it is, if people will only possess themselves of it.

## MAGAZINES.

We have received the following (July) magazines:

*The Thinker, The Expository Times, The Religious Review of Reviews, The Anglican Church Magazine, The Church Missionary Intelligencer, The National Church, The Foreign Church Chronicle, The Evangelical Churchman, The Gospel Magazine, The Church Magazine, Sunday-School Magazine, Blackwood, The Cornhill, Sunday Magazine, The Fireside, Cassell's Family Magazine, The Quiver, 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 Queen has approved of the appointment of the Rev. Canon Awdry, Vicar of Amport, Hampshire, to be Suffragan Bishop of Southampton, for the diocese of Winchester. Canon Awdry was formerly Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, second master at Winchester College, and Principal of Chichester Theological College. It will be remembered that the Suffragan Bishop of Guildford (Dr. Sumner), who was appointed by the late Bishop Harold Browne, tendered his resignation to the Bishop of Winchester some months ago on the ground of ill-health. Bishop Thorold's new Suffragan is a High Churchman.

---

At the annual meeting of the National Society, the Archbishop of Canterbury rapidly outlined the eighty-fourth annual report, which showed that from 1811 to 1870 a sum of £15,149,938 had been paid for the building and maintenance of schools and training colleges; while, since 1870, not less than £22,978,674 have been expended on the same objects, making a total of £38,128,612. The general statistics showed that out of 5,832,944 places in elementary schools, 2,702,978 were provided by Church schools; and of 4,225,834 children in average attendance throughout England, 1,847,660 were attending Church schools. Both these sets of figures exhibit an increase in favour of Church schools. Voluntary contributions towards their support had also increased from £795,127 in 1892 to £806,747 in 1894.

---

The report of the Additional Curates' Society for the year 1894 deals with what is spoken of as "a very distressing chapter in the society's history." The notices given in March of last year that 170 grants would have to be withdrawn and most of the others seriously reduced took effect at Michaelmas. The results have been of different kinds. In some parishes the curacy has been given up, or a deacon engaged instead of a priest, while in others the incumbents have, with exemplary self-denial, paid the additional sum out of their own small stipends. On the other hand, in some cases the assistant clergy have been found willing to continue their efforts for smaller remuneration. In the early part of 1894 there was some hope that a partial restoration of grants might be effected in the spring of 1895. This depended upon the amount which might be received in special contributions during 1894. The committee thankfully acknowledge the receipt during the year of donations amounting to over £8,000; but, even including these in the accounts, the year closed with a deficit of £4,200, which, added to the deficit of £10,500 in the previous year, makes the total expenditure for the two years 1893 and 1894 £15,000 in excess of the receipts during the same period. The expenditure for 1894 amounted to £80,457, while the income was only £76,191.

---

The statistical returns of membership to be presented to the forthcoming conference of the United Methodist Free Churches will show the largest increase which has been reported for some years—viz., 1,218 in Church membership, 134 on trial, and 1,168 in junior Church members. Of this increase, two-thirds is in the home churches, and one-third in the foreign stations. The total membership at home and abroad is 80,131. Of the home districts, only three—Leeds and Bradford, Sheffield, and Manchester—report a decrease, and in the foreign districts only Jamaica.

---

The returns of the Established (Presbyterian) Church of Scotland give 620,376 as the number of communicants, an increase for the past year of 7,965. The contributions show an advance of £3,939, the total amount raised being £363,250.