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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

AUGUST, 1895.

ART. I.—OXFORD BEFORE THE REFORMATION.

IT may with truth be affirmed that the inventor of the printing-press was the first reformer, and that the University was the first arena of conflict between the old and the new opinions. The struggle commenced in the University of Prague, while in the sixteenth century Wittenberg in North Germany, and Ingolstadt in South Germany, became the centres from which issued the hosts that did battle for reform and reaction. The first notes of the Reformation in France were heard in the halls of the University of Paris, where Lefèbre expounded the doctrine of justification by faith only to a crowd of wondering auditors. And even in those countries where the Reformation failed to maintain its ground, such as Italy itself, we find the University of Turin thoroughly stirred by the controversies then in progress on the northern side of the Alps, and the works of Luther, Melancthon and Zwingli eagerly read by the students.

It will hereafter be shown in detail that Oxford has played a leading part in the various religious movements that have passed over England ever since the Reformation. Here the Oxford reformers—Colet, Erasmus, and More—inaugurated the literary reformation which ushered in the reign of Henry VIII. Here the first Protestant graduates found a home in the newly-established college of Christ Church. Here the three bishops of the reformed Church of England, Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, laid down their lives.

From Oxford came George Abbot, the "Puritan," and William Laud, the "Anglican," Archbishop. From Oxford came the sharpest resistance to the Romanizing policy of James II. At Oxford, Whitfield, Romaine and the brothers Wesley spent the most critical years of their lives, and laid the

foundations of the Evangelical Revival, while from Oxford have sprung both the High Church and the Latitudinarian movements of the nineteenth century. But in the present paper we shall be concerned with none of these, but with events which took place at a still earlier epoch than the Reformation itself. Our task will be to show that Oxford played as equally important a part in nurturing the long preparatory train of events which led up to the actual beginning of the conflict in the sixteenth century, as it was destined to do when the actual hour arrived. It must not be forgotten that the fourteenth century had a reformation as well as a renaissance of its own, a reformation which was quite as remarkable in its features as that of Luther or Calvin, and which bid fair to be in every respect as complete and as successful. It will be our duty to investigate the part which Oxford played in that earlier, and perchance too much neglected, Reformation.

We will begin by glancing at the condition of the University in the Middle Ages.

The Oxford of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries was very different from the Oxford of the sixteenth. The collegiate system was as yet in its infancy, hardly more than six colleges having been founded. Although the supposed foundation of University College by Alfred the Great must be rejected as apocryphal, yet University was probably the oldest collegiate institution in Oxford, preceding Merton College, however, by a very few years. The great majority of the students were members of the University simply, were attached to no college or hall, and lived in "hostelries," often under circumstances of great penury and hardship. The better-class students were those who were strictly collegiate, and from 1230 to 1430 the college system was gradually gaining ground, until in 1432 the statute was passed making residence in private lodgings illegal. During this epoch chronic outbreaks of lawlessness between townsmen and gownsmen were perpetually occurring, culminating in the great riot of 1354, which placed the town completely under the control of the University down to the present century.

The number of students resident in Oxford during the Middle Ages is a much-disputed question. Doubts are naturally entertained as to the correctness of Richard of Armagh's statement that in his day the members had diminished from 30,000 to 6,000. We shall have occasion later on to speak of the document in which the assertion is contained. That the University declined in the fifteenth century, partly owing to its complete subjection to the hierarchy, partly to the Wars of the Roses, is an admitted fact, though by the foundation of All Souls and Magdalen College it was even then silently

maturing its strength. But that at any time there were 30,000 students in Oxford is wellnigh incredible. Two points, however, have to be borne in mind: first, that the University in the Middle Ages admitted to its ranks many who at the present day would at the corresponding period of their lives be members of our large public schools; and, secondly, that very many scholars wandered from one University to another, residing in Oxford but for a short time, and completing their studies elsewhere. The University of Oxford occupied a peculiar position ecclesiastically. There was no Bishop of Oxford till the time of the Reformation. It was subject, therefore, to the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Lincoln, a diocese which then embraced a considerable part of England. This distant diocesan would sometimes be the protector, and sometimes the over-rider, of its liberties. As regards the Pope, both Oxford and Paris had constantly asserted their freedom against Papal interference, but when Paris submitted to John XXII. in 1316, by soliciting his patronage, its influence in European estimation considerably declined. For two or three generations Oxford took the lead in its protest against Papal exactions, until the reaction from the Lollard movement again transferred the centre of anti-Papal University sentiment from Oxford to Paris, which period coincided with Oxford's comparative decline.

An instance of anti-Papal resoluteness on the part of the University occurred as early as 1238. The servants of Otho the Papal Legate, had come into conflict with a body of Oxford students near Osney Abbey. This affair, insignificant in itself, led to very serious results. The Legate laid the University under a Papal curse, and many of the students retired to Northampton and to Salisbury. Upon this a conflict ensued, in which Grossetête, Bishop of Lincoln, and other bishops, defended the rights of the University for a long time. They were worsted in the end: the authorities went from Oxford to London, and humiliated themselves before Otho, that the interdict might be withdrawn. But about this time the English nobility addressed a solemn protest to Gregory IX. on the subject of Roman interference. The rise of the Mendicant Orders in the early part of the thirteenth century was an event which at first tended considerably to strengthen the Papacy, although in their later corruption and declension they materially helped to precipitate its downfall. The Mendicant Friars were not long in finding their way to Oxford. The Dominicans appeared in 1221, and the Franciscans a little later. In 1261 we find the Dominicans permanently established in what is now the district of St. Ebbes. The Augustinian Friars settled on the site of Wadham College in 1251.

The Carmelites were located near the Castle in 1254; at the end of the century the Cistercians organized the community of Rewley, and the Benedictines had converted Gloucester Hall (now Worcester College) into a school for their younger members. The immediate advantages of these monastic bodies were immense. While the college system was in its infancy their establishments could attract students much more powerfully than the University system itself. Robert Grossetête was their resolute champion, while Adam Marsh and Roger Bacon both belonged to the Franciscan Order. In 1326 every Bachelor of Arts had to sustain a disputation once each year before the Augustinians.

But as time went on, a rivalry between the University and the Orders would be inevitable. As the colleges multiplied, the University authorities would more and more resent the influence of the Orders over the students. In 1358 we find an emphatic protest on their part against the enticing of the junior students from the colleges to the monastic schools. The English nobility were reluctant to send their sons to Oxford, lest they should be induced to become friars, and to take monastic vows before they were old enough to know their own minds. Penalties were enacted against such enticement if the neophyte were under eighteen. In fact, all through the fourteenth century the University was gradually passing from the monastic to the clerical influence, and the rise of the colleges involved the supremacy of the secular clergy over the regular. In this respect the Oxford of 1350 resembles the Oxford of 1850; as in the fourteenth century the clerics were gradually supplanting the monks, so in the nineteenth the purely secular element is (whether for good or evil we do not here attempt to decide) gradually supplanting the ecclesiastical.

The fourteenth century transition was accompanied by severe and protracted conflicts. By 1365 the Papal Court was aroused and alarmed, and the Pope commanded the Archbishop of Canterbury to procure the repeal of the anti-monastic measures. The result was a compromise, the measures were relaxed, but the friars were prohibited from making any attack upon the University before the Papal Curia. It was in 1274 that Walter de Merton finally edited his statutes for the regulation of Merton College. In the spirit of these statutes we discern a very strong tendency to withdraw the University from the control of the monastic Orders, and therefore, although this would not be directly, nor, indeed, indirectly, intended, it would weaken the Papal supremacy itself It aimed at the concentration in Oxford of a permanent body of clergy as distinct from monks and friars. The students of Merton College were not to be shackled by monastic vows; they were

to resist, in the interests of their body, all foreign interference; they were to apply themselves to philosophy before they approached theology. Special chaplains were to undertake in their stead the performance of the ceremonies of religion, so that the students themselves might be left free to pursue their studies. It is remarkable that such statutes should have been promulgated, when as yet the Mendicant Orders had not entered upon their period of decline; indeed, they had not long been established in Oxford, for the statutes, though finally edited in 1274, had been in existence some years earlier in a less perfect form.

We may now pass on from general considerations to give a sketch of several prominent Oxford men in the period under review. The first of these is Bishop Grossetête. Robert Grossetête, Bishop of Lincoln from 1235 to 1253, is one of the most remarkable figures that rise before us out of the distance of the thirteenth century. He was an energetic Church Reformer of the practical type, and he was regarded with veneration by Englishmen of his own and of the next century. Grossetête was intimately connected with Oxford. There he was educated—at least, in great part. From 1200 to 1235 he resided permanently in Oxford, where he became Doctor of Theology and Chancellor. In 1232 he was attacked by a dangerous illness, and on his sick-bed he passed through a great spiritual crisis. He wrote to the Pope to know whether it was right that he should hold a number of sinecure offices in the Church which he could not personally discharge while remaining at Oxford. The Pope told him that a Papal dispensation would overcome the difficulty. But this did not satisfy Grossetête, and in that year he parted with all his Church emoluments except one, a prebend's stall in Lincoln Cathedral, Oxford being then in that diocese. In doing this he had to encounter opposition from his own sister, though she was a nun.

To Grossetête, in conjunction with Edmund Rich, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, the introduction of Aristotelian philosophy in Oxford was largely due, and he was one of the first to graduate in divinity. He belonged to the Franciscan Order, and was their first theological lecturer in Oxford. He cannot justly be blamed for his steady support of the Franciscans, for he only lived to witness their first enthusiasm and zeal, and could not have foreseen the injury which their subsequent corruption was to inflict.

Grossetête became Bishop of Lincoln in 1235, but his connection with the University would not be thereby dissolved. It is very probable that his commentaries on Aristotle and Boethius, and other works of a more strictly theological character, had their origin in his academical lectures.

His episcopate was a very troubled one. England was in a distracted condition, owing to the weakness of Henry III. and the incessant strife between the Crown and the nobility. In 1239 Grossetête had to travel to Lyons to obtain a personal interview with the Pope, in consequence of a serious dispute between himself and the Chapter of Lincoln. By his unwavering zeal for reform he had raised up a host of enemies, chiefly clerical, but in the main he triumphed over them. In the first year of his episcopate he visited every monastery in his diocese, with the result that seven abbots and three priors were at once deposed. He made it a practice to gather round him on stated occasions the clergy of the different divisions of his diocese, and would preach to them out of the Scriptures, in order that they might convey the instruction given to them to the people entrusted to their charge. This was a very remarkable step to take as early as 1240. The one object of his life was the reform of the pastoral office—in other words, the good of souls. A professor was once appointed to a benefice, but he delayed to come over to England to reside in it, preferring rather to lecture in the University of Paris. Grossetête wrote a letter of rebuke, telling him that he should choose rather to feed the sheep of Christ in his own parish than instruct other pastors. All his visitation sermons were appeals to under-shepherds to quicken their consciences to the performance of duty.

In 1250 we find him again at Lyons, presenting a written memorial to the Pope, in which he deplores the corruptions of the Church, and appeals to the Roman Curia to set its own house in order. This time he met with a very chilling reception, and after waiting many fruitless months at Lyons, he returned home weary and disheartened.

In 1253 Innocent IV. nominated one of his grandsons to a canonry in Lincoln Cathedral. The Papal brief was addressed not to Grossetête, but to an Archdeacon of Canterbury and to the resident Papal commissioner. If anyone objected, the intruding Canon was to cite his opponent to appear before the Pope. Grossetête, though eighty years of age, stood firm. He addressed a solemn appeal to the two commissioners, which was at once forwarded to Italy. The Pope is said to have been so enraged that he coarsely reviled Grossetête, but one of the Cardinals told him to his face that the Bishop was in the right. After this the appointment was withdrawn, and the last months of the prelate's life were passed in peace.

Such was Robert Grossetête, a reformer before the Reformation. While perfectly loyal to the Church of his day, he held principles that must have sooner or later brought him into conflict with the Papacy.

The next great character we select is Richard of Armagh.

Richard Fitzralph was educated at Oxford under Blakenthorpe, who seems to have been an opponent of the Mendicant Orders. Fitzralph rose to high eminence. He was some time Fellow of Balliol, in 1333 he was Chancellor of the University, and in 1347 Archbishop of Armagh. He was thus Wycliffe's older contemporary. Like Grossetête, he based his literary work upon the lectures he had delivered at Oxford, but, unlike him, he was a theologian exclusively, not a writer of philosophical treatises. He wrote against the errors of Judaism, while in his master work he exposed the heresies of the Armenian Church, largely contributing to an attempt on the part of the latter in 1346 to effect a union with Rome. It has been also thought that he edited an Irish translation of the Bible, but this is by no means certain.

But the most celebrated controversy in which Fitzralph was engaged was the famous question, which agitated the mediæval Church after the rise of the Mendicants, as to whether Christ Himself had been during His earthly life a mendicant. The Franciscans claimed the right to be supported by alms voluntarily given, and in defence of this they pleaded the supposed example of Christ. It was in 1324 that the Dominicans had tried to brand as heretical the doctrine that neither Christ nor yet His Apostles possessed property. The Franciscans stoutly maintaining it, both parties appealed to the Pope, and John XXII. decided in favour of the Dominicans. This was not remarkable, as twenty-five millions of gold crowns were found in that Pontiff's treasury on his decease. Some of the Franciscans yielded; the leaders, who remained obdurate, left Avignon, and withdrew to Bavaria.

Fitzralph, at the request of the Archbishop of Canterbury, preached eight sermons in English at St. Paul's, London, in which he argued that, though Christ was poor, yet He never chose mendicancy nor taught anyone to practise it, that such a life is neither prudent nor holy, and that the parish priest is far superior to the Mendicant Friar. Fitzralph was in a very peculiar position. He was supporting a Papal decision against unruly Franciscans; he could not, therefore, be censured by the Papal Court. But he was undermining the influence of the most useful allies of Rome, and therefore he stirred up a violent hostility against himself on the part of both Orders, and not one only. The result was that he had to appear in person at Avignon in 1357, and justify himself before Innocent VI. and his Cardinals. This led to a most important address, delivered in the presence of the Pope and the Curia, in which he strongly defended the rights of the clergy against the monastic Orders. In the course of this he stated that an

English gentleman had been obliged to go to Avignon to obtain from the Cardinals an order for the release of his son, whom the friars had inveigled into their society at the age of thirteen at Oxford. He said that English laymen preferred to make farmers of their sons rather than allow them to be taken away in such a manner. The Mendicants had bought up all the valuable books at Oxford for their own libraries. He instanced the cases of several parish priests who had to leave Oxford and abandon their studies because neither a Bible nor any theological books could be procured. It is in this address that he alludes to the once enormous number of Oxford students, for the diminution of which number he holds the friars responsible.

Richard Fitzralph died at Avignon in December, 1359. He had the same practical piety and reforming zeal as Grossetête, and the difference of his attitude towards the friars from that of the Bishop was due to the altered condition of the Orders themselves. In 1250 they were in the fervour of their early enthusiasm, but in 1350 a century of Papal and Episcopal patronage had done its work. Fitzralph's position was that of Walter de Merton, with this one difference, that the former resisted a present evil, while the latter sought to guard against one that was mainly future.

A greater name than that of Fitzralph now comes before us. Thomas of Bradwardine (supposed to be identical with a small village in Herefordshire, near the Welsh border), born about 1290, came to Oxford as a student, entered Merton College, and became Proctor in 1325. As Doctor of Theology he lectured to large and admiring audiences, and, after many years of sojourn in the University, he was made Chancellor of St. Paul's in London. This brought him into close connection with the Court, and on the breaking out of the French wars of Edward III., he accompanied the King all through the memorable campaign of Crecy. When Stratford, Archbishop of Canterbury, died in 1348, the Chapter elected Bradwardine, but Edward refused to part with him, for it was a common opinion in the English army that its successes in the battle-field were largely due to his piety and prayers. Delays therefore followed; another candidate was chosen, but died before he could be consecrated. The Chapter renewed their entreaties for Bradwardine, and Edward consented. The Archbishop-elect went to Avignon, and was consecrated by the Pope in July, 1349. He received a gross insult at the Papal Court. A jester mounted an ass, rode into the hall, and asked of the Pope to be enthroned in Bradwardine's place, because the new Primate was more imbecile than himself.

Bradwardine at once set out for his own country to take

possession of his see, but he died a few weeks later, in August, 1349.

Wycliffe, though he could hardly have known him personally, everywhere speaks of him with admiration and respect. His writings must have had a great influence upon the English reformers, for Bradwardine was the constant champion of the Augustinian doctrine of grace against the Pelagian tendencies of mediæval theology; he did not hesitate to defend Augustine against Peter Lombard himself. Bradwardine tells us that, when a young student of philosophy, he was a Pelagian, and the doctrines of Divine grace were utterly distasteful to him. When he heard passages from St. Paul's Epistles read in church, they only excited his repugnance, and he even accused St. Paul in his own mind of holding erroneous doctrine. This latter point gives a striking proof of how much latent unbelief there was even in the Middle Ages, a fact to which St. Anselm's "Cur Deus homo?" bears remarkable testimony. But when he began to apply himself to theology, his objections vanished. "The truth," he says, "struck upon me like a beam of grace, and it seemed to me as if I beheld in the distance, under a transparent image of truth, the grace of God, as it is prevenient both in time and nature to all good deeds." His work "On the Cause of God," against the Pelagian views of his time, is pervaded by a deep current of piety, though accompanied, as was inevitable, by some of the defects of the scholastic system. In it he expressly refutes the Roman doctrine that a man can acquire merit before God. Towards the close of his work, he thus addresses the Redeemer: "Thou who hast led me into the profoundest depths, lead me also up to the mountain height of this inaccessible truth. Thou who hast brought me into this great and wide sea, bring me also into the haven. Thou who hast conducted me into this wide and pathless desert, lead me also unto the end. . . . When Thou liftest the light of Thy countenance upon Thy servant, I believe I see the right understanding of Thy Word."

It has been suggested that he was called "the Profound Doctor" because this particular epithet "profound" was so often applied by him to Divine grace.

Another Oxford scholar of the period was Robert Longland. He was born at Cleobury Mortimer, in Shropshire, and after the completion of his Oxford studies he became a member of the Benedictine priory of Great Malvern, in Worcestershire.

From internal evidence it appears that the date of his famous work, "The Vision of Piers Plowman," was 1362. In this work, written in the dialect of the people at the time when the English language was fast assuming a definite form, Longland embodies the popular yearning after a better con-

dition of things both in Church and State. His poem is allegorical, and betrays a considerable acquaintance with classical literature. The writer accepts all the doctrines of the Church, but severely satirizes the lives and morals of the clergy. Thus, he introduces a priest who knows nothing of the cardinal virtues, but owns that the only cardinals he has heard of are those who are created by the Pope. The Pope has an official at Avignon whose office it is to seal the Papal Bulls, and his name is Simony. There is one very remarkable fact in the work. If Huss is said to have predicted Luther, Robert Longland certainly predicted King Henry VIII., for he tells all unruly monks, nuns, and canons that a king will arise who, in concert with his nobles, will reduce them to order by force.

One name stands out pre-eminent, that of John Wycliffe, the incidents of whose life, even of whose Oxford life as Fellow and Master of Balliol, cannot be detailed in this paper, but of whom a few words must be said as to the importance of the man himself and of his mission.

Wycliffe is essentially England's great reformer. In the actual period of the Reformation there did not arise any one commanding personality. The *work* of Tyndale as the giver of the English Bible to the English nation was of incalculable value, but the *man* was hidden from view in obscurity and exile. And even as a Bible translator Tyndale only trod in the footsteps of Wycliffe. But the latter is chiefly remarkable in his solitariness. He has been called the English Elijah or John the Baptist, and the comparison is so far true that he stood alone among his contemporaries from the moment that he aroused the hatred of the hierarchy. He had no Elector of Saxony to stand by him, no Melancthon to share his literary labours or systematize his views. Even at Worms, Luther was never so absolutely unbefriended as was Wycliffe when he became a thorough-going reformer. Not till he was forty did he appear on a public arena and become known to the world of action as opposed to that of thought. The next period was from 1360 to 1376. In this period he was a political and moral reformer. Here, indeed, he did not lack patrons; but when in 1378 he ventured to assail the prevailing doctrinal errors, John of Gaunt and the nobility fell away from him. He stood opposed to the hostility of Archbishop Courtenay, one of the most skilful, implacable, and persevering of adversaries, and his supporters in the University either maintained his views unwisely or recanted them faintheartedly. One by one, Repyngdon, Aston, the Chancellor himself, made submission to the ruling powers. Nicholas Hereford had the boldness to appeal to the Pope, and went to

Rome, where he was imprisoned, afterwards escaping in a popular Roman tumult, for the Romans were perpetually banishing the Pope and then recalling him. When, in 1382, the heresiarch himself appeared at Oxford, his fate seemed inevitable. In short, it is one of the most perplexing problems in his career how it was that, while his followers were reduced to silence, he himself was allowed to die in peace in his Lutterworth retreat in 1384. May not this have arisen from the knowledge that he had a far greater hold on the affections of the English people than many in later times have been ready to admit?

Indeed, the struggle at Oxford was more severe than is generally imagined. Rigge, the Chancellor, had the boldness to invite Repyngdon, a Bachelor of Theology, and a known partisan of the reformer, to preach before the University on Corpus Christi Day, though it was certain that he would defend Wycliffe's views on the Real Presence. When Courtenay sent down Dr. Stokes to intimidate, the Chancellor resisted, and Repyngdon preached, openly defending the orthodoxy of Wycliffe. Not until the Chancellor had been cited to London did he give way. But at the end of 1382 Wycliffe's voice was silenced at Oxford.

We may close with a brief mention of two events that happened in the University in the course of the years that followed Wycliffe's death.

There is a very remarkable document, dated October 6, 1406, which professes to be a declaration on the part of the University in favour of Wycliffe. The Hussite movement was already commencing at Prague, and Huss had openly advocated many of the English reformer's opinions, though he did not agree with his views on the Real Presence. A report was soon circulated in Bohemia that Wycliffe was, by the deliberate verdict of the English Church, an excommunicated heretic. The document in question solemnly affirms the orthodoxy of Wycliffe. It was signed by the Chancellor and doctors, and sealed with the University seal. For several years the document passed unchallenged, but in 1411 it was denounced by the Convocation of Canterbury, and was branded as a forgery in 1415 by the Council of Constance.

The forgery was attributed to one of Wycliffe's friends—Peter Payne. Peter Payne was a noted Oxford figure. From 1410 to 1415 he was Principal of St. Edmund's Hall. He afterwards settled in Bohemia, was appointed one of the Hussite delegates at the Council of Basle in 1433, and died at Prague in 1455.

It is not at all certain that the Convocation of Canterbury affirmed the *falsity* of the document, but only that they stig-

matized its *contents* as heretical. And it is a curious coincidence, that the second event to which we have alluded occurred in this very year (1411). Arundel, who had succeeded Courtenay as Archbishop, was a vigorous champion of Rome, and had largely contributed by his political machinations to the triumph of the House of Lancaster in the revolution which dethroned Richard II. in 1399. The Wycliffe party seemed to have much cause for hope in the accession of the son of Wycliffe's former patron, but Henry IV. owed his crown very largely to the Church, and Arundel urged him to repay the debt by the repression of heresy. In 1408 Arundel held a visitation at Oxford for the repression of Wycliffe's partisans. Heads of colleges and halls were ordered every month to ascertain whether the students under their care had imbibed erroneous doctrines, and every recalcitrant offender was to be excommunicated and expelled. These arbitrary mandates were disregarded. In 1411 Arundel appeared again. Seated under a canopy, he halted before the gates of Oxford, where he was met by the Chancellor at the head of a University deputation. The Chancellor told him that as a visitor in the ordinary sense he was welcome, but that if he were a visitor in the ecclesiastical sense he was an intruder, as, by the declaration of a Papal Bull, Oxford was exempt from such visitations. Arundel went away in a rage. He appealed to the Crown, and in consequence the Chancellor and proctors were expelled from their offices. Upon this the students refused to attend any more lectures, and threatened in a body to dissolve. After a severe struggle, however, the Papal policy triumphed, and Pope John XXIII. revoked the exemption granted by his predecessor.

Arundel had triumphed. It was the beginning of the end. In 1412 the governing body had been so far changed that the Papal influence predominated. And in 1414, on the accession of Henry V., the University presented a memorial to the King promising to correct and punish Wycliffe's followers with the utmost rigour. So quickly had resistance been followed by reaction.

That the work attributed to Peter Payne was largely instrumental in accelerating the final conflict can hardly be doubted. But the violent measures which were taken both by Church and State to overawe the University go far to prove that the memorial was genuine. And in any case the hold that Wycliffe's opinions maintained over Oxford for exactly thirty years after his death witnessed to their power and intensity.

Our task is completed. The annals of the fifteenth century after 1414 offer very little additional material as far as Oxford

is concerned. When the century is nearing its close, when "Greece has awaked to life holding the New Testament in her hand," a small group of scholars fresh from the schools of Italy will make their appearance at Oxford, revive the buried Reformation of the fourteenth century, and lay the literary foundations of the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

C. J. CASHER.

ART. II.—SOME CURIOSITIES OF PATRISTIC AND MEDIÆVAL LITERATURE.

PART II.—DOCTRINAL (*continued*).

WE need do no more here than refer to the logical subtleties by which scholastic divines sought to succour and support the theology of mediæval superstition, bidding men to believe in properties from which substance had been withdrawn, in accidents remaining when their subject had ceased to exist.

The question whether or not these accidents (remaining by miracle without a subject) are capable of nourishing was answered by some of the earlier transubstantiationists, and perhaps by the earlier scholastics generally,[1] in the negative; but by the Tridentine Catechism (it would appear) in the

[1] Dr. Pusey says: "The Schoolmen thought that with the 'change of substance' that power of nourishing ceased" ("Eirenicon," p. 24). But this statement needs qualification. Thomas Aquinas maintains the contrary. He says: "Homo diu sustentari posset, si hostias et vinum consecratum sumeret in magnâ quantitate." And he concludes: "Quod species sacramentales, quamvis non sint substantia, habent tamen virtutem substantiæ" ("Summa," pars iii., vol. ii., quæs. lxxvii., art. vi.).

Nicolaus de Niisse also says distinctly: "Per sumptionem istarum specierum homo nutritur" (Tract. V., pars iii., "De Eucharistia," quæst. x.; "Resol. Theol.," f. 509; Paris, 1574).

And the author of the "Fortalitium Fidei" not only contends for *nourishment*, but argues from 1 Cor. xi.: "Vino etiam inebriari." And he adds: "Mirandum videtur cur negent homines hoc sacramentali cibo posse nutriri; refugientes hoc sacramentum in carnem et sanguinem posse converti." He supposes that the accidents have conferred upon them certain properties of substance (lib. iii., consid. vi., imposs. xvii.). He says also: "Remanent accidentia panis et vini inter quæ sunt qualitates sensibiles" (*ibid.*).

Bonaventura says: "Communior est opinio, quod percipiens sacramentum alitur et nutritur." "Concedendum est, quod recipiens hoc sacramentum alitur, et nutritur, non quia accidentia in substantiam convertantur, sed quia aliquid convertitur in substantiam comedentis, non inquam accidens, sed substantia" ("In Sent.," lib. iv., dist. xii., art. ii., quæs. i.; Op., tom. v., p. 139; Lugduni, 1668).

Thomas Waldensis (himself an Essex man) relates: "In parte Aquilonari Angliæ, dicta Norfolchia, revera opulentissima rerum et spiritualium

affirmative (pars ii., cap. iv., § xxxviii.). And this difference seems to imply of necessity some difference in the conception of "transubstantiation"—a difference as to the position of the *dividing line* between subject and accidents. In the one

---

et temporalium jam tarde, superstes erat devota quædam in Christo puella, dicta vulgariter Joanna Metles, id est, sine cibo : quia nunquam cibum gustasse, vel potum per tempus annorum 15 experta est : sed solo sacramento dominici Corporis diebus dominicis cum devotissimæ mentis gaudio vescebatur" ("De Sacr. Euch.," cap. lxii., f. 105 ; Venice, 1571). His conjecture as to the way in which qualities may nourish without a subject is very curious (*ibid.*).

Gaspar Contarini likewise wrote : "Ex hoc sequitur nullam substantiam subjectam esse illis accedentibus. Verum animadvertendum est non esse eandem rationem omnium illorum accedentium, nam quantitas procul-dubio subjectum est figuræ albedinis, saporis, odoris, omniumque aliorum, quippe, quæ substantiæ inesse non queunt, nisi media quantitate, in hisce igitur nullum est mirum : sed omne quod mirari jure possumns, redigitur ad quantitatem, quæ in hoc sacramento per se est, et *habet modum substantiæ*" ("De Sacr.," lib. ii., cap. iii. ; Op., p. 353 ; Paris, 1571).

Lanfranc had taught that the change of the elemental substances was made "reservatis ipsarum rerum speciebus et quibusdam *aliis qualitatibus*." (See Hagenbach's "Hist. of Doctrines," vol. ii., p. 95 ; Clark.)

In the "Theologia Germanica" of 1531 (to be carefully distinguished from the earlier work of the same name), it is said : "Panis et vini accidentia nobilitantnr super universa cœtera accidentia : nam acquirunt *vim substantialem* et fiunt tegumenta, sub quibus Corpus et anima ac Deitas Christi latet. Quapropter in sacramento altaris colere debemus non solum præsentem Carnem et Sanguinem Christi, potissime suam humanitatem et sanctissimam Deitatem : sed etiam panis et vini formam tanquam vestem et signum veri Corporis et Sanguinis Christi. Non quia eadem accidentia inhæreant præsenti Corpori et Sanguini Christi : sed quia per se snbsistunt absque omni substantia. *Vim* denique *substantialem* operantnr utpote realiter *nutriendi* seu *reficiendi* corpus hominis : in signum spiritualis nutritionis et refectionis per eucharistiam fiendæ" (cap. lxvi.).

So, again, it was asserted by one, whose ridiculous *quodlibets* seem to have been highly esteemed, that the accidents had all the same operations as if the substance remained ("ac si esset ibi substantia panis et vini"), "Possunt corrumpi, et generari ex eis substantia : et potest homo ex eis ali, augeri, nutriri, saturari ei inebriari . . . hoc etiam fit miraculose, quia ex accidente non potest naturaliter et de per se generari substantia" ("De Sacrosancto Euchar. Sacr. . . . nova admodum et facillima quodlibeta per Cyprianum Beneti . . . Doctorem Parisiensem," qu. xiv. ; Holtzel, Nuremberg, 1516).

And Suarez declares that the opinion that the consecrated bread does not nourish, "antiquata jam est, et ut improbabilis omnino a Scholis rejecta" (Disput. lvii., § 3). Various opinions of the Schoolmen on the subject will be found in the works of J. Forbes of Corse, vol. ii., pp. 541 *sqq.* ; Amst., 1702. See also especially Valckenier's "Roma Paganizans," pp. 382 *sqq.*, 1656.

Even Innocent III. wrote : "Non solum accidentales, verum etiam naturales proprietates remanere videntur, ut paneitas, quæ saturando famem expellit, et vinitas quæ satiando sitim extinguit. Dicamus ergo, quod forma panis frangitur et atteritur, sed Corpus Christi sumitur et comeditur" ("Myst. Miss.," lib. iv., cap. ix. ; Op., tom. i., p. 379; Colon,

case, *paneity* (in some sense) would naturally seem to be on the side of the subject which is *gone*. In the other case, "paneitas" or "aliquitas panis" (see "Apostasia," Wyclif Soc., Introd., p. xvi.), but without the *substance* of bread (see

---

1675). And to this sense he would reduce the "Ego Berengarius" (cap. x., p. 380). And Innocent V. wrote: "Communiter dicitur quod nutriunt, sicut patet ad sensum." And in answer to objection, "Accidens non potest converti in substantiam," he said: "Hoc verum est de eo quod est accidens, et retinet modum accidentis, sed species hæc habent modum substantiæ" (Op., tom. iv., p. 135; Tolos, 1651).

Ludovicus Pius is said to have received nothing but the Eucharist for forty days together. We are told of "some holy men" who would feed on nothing but the Eucharist. (See "Plain Representation of Transubstantiation," p. 6; London, 1687).

There was difference of opinion on the subject after the Council of Trent as well as before.

Albertinus ("De Eucharistia," lib. i., cap. xix., pp. 120, 121) names Algerus, Guitmundus, and Waldensis as denying that the consecrated elements *do* nourish; and Thomas, Ægidius, Ferrariensis, and Bellarmine as maintaining that *the accidents* can nourish; but Suarez, Vasques, Becanus, Gamachæus, and Ysambertus as denying, indeed, that accidents alone can nourish, but maintaining, "Eucharistiam alere, quia eo ipso momento quo species panis et vini corrumpantur, producit Deus de novo substantiam, aut materiam aliquam." But Thomas declares: "Non rationabiliter videtur dici quod miraculose aliquod accidat in hoc sacramento nisi ex ipsa consecratione." "Non potest substantia panis et vini redire, nisi Corpore aut Sanguine Christi iterum converso in substantiam panis et vini, quod est impossibile." (See Wyclif, "De Eucharistiâ," p. 145.)

Cardinal Alan says: "Solebant accidentia panis relicta propter officium pascendi, communi nomine cibi, panis, vel terrestris alimenti appellari" ("De Euch. Sacr.," lib. i., cap. xxxvi.; "Lib. Tres.," p. 430; Antwerp, 1576).

Campion the Jesuit maintained, as against Fulke, that accidents "do feede" (Third Day's Conference, arg. iii., "True Report of Disputation"; London, 1583).

Gregory de Valentia holds that "Sacramentum ipsum, secundum panis et vini species in alimentum Corporis transit" ("Exam. Myst. Calv.," lib. iii., cap. v., arg. ii.; Op., p. 629; Paris, 1610).

The doctrine of the "Ego Berengarius" may doubtless have had its survivals. And some few among the scholastics and later divines may not only have defended its language, but made some sort of approach to its natural sense. It is a mistake, however, to argue—as has been argued—that the transubstantiation which was so strongly opposed by our Reformers and subsequent English divines was only the gross conception of the doctrine. The language of Cranmer ("On Lord's Supper," p. 112, P. S. edit.) might suffice to make it clear that it was quite well understood by our Reformers that anything like *that* doctrine had been generally rejected in favour of what may be called the scholastic spiritual doctrine (see papers on the "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 17-19. See also Forbes, "Consid. Mod.," A. C. L., vol. ii., p. 503), which Bellarmine affirms to be the "Sententia Theologorum communis" ("De Sacr. Euch.," lib. i., cap. ii.; "De Controv.," tom. iii., c. 462).

It may be going perhaps somewhat too far to say, with Bishop Thirlwall, that, "according to the interpretation of Sancta Clara, the object of

§ xxxvii.), is on the side of that which remains, and that which remains can hardly be confined within the limits of the stricter definition of "accidents." On this account, probably, some preferred to speak of *qualities* as well as *accidents* remaining without a subject (see Occam, "De Sacramento Altaris," cap. xvi. and xxi.). So the "Fortalitium Fidei": "In hoc sacramento remanent accidentia panis et vini inter quæ sunt qualitates sensibiles" (lib. iii., consid. vi., imposs. xvii.).

Dr. Pusey has endeavoured out of this distinction to make a reconciliation between the doctrines of the Church of England and the Church of Rome ("Eirenicon," p. 24, and

---

the Article (Art. xxviii.) was to gainsay that which *nobody ever* affirmed" ("Remains," vol. i., p. 241). But it may, we believe, be safely asserted that there is no sufficient evidence that such a carnal presence of Christ —"id est, quasi Christus modo naturali seu carnali hic existeret, et dentibus nostris masticetur"—had any defenders, considerable in numbers or weight, at the date of the Reformation.

Thomas Waldensis is one, and Cardinal Alan is another, of those who inclined to the more materialistic views. Cardinal Alan, in particular, thinks that in this matter "multi Catholici male dicunt." He professes his dissent from Aquinas. And of the scholastic teaching he says: "Aliorum quorundam scholasticorum de motu, tactu, visu, loco, fractione et comestione, doctrina est plena curiositatis et periculi." He considers that this doctrine "plurimum juvat hæreticos." He defends the "Ego Berengarius." He says of it: "Quam confessionem non solum vulgares scioli, sed doctiores quidam Scriptores putarunt (sed male) improprie, et vehementius quam oportuit, fuisse conceptum. Sed retinenda est ad amussim, ut vera fidei Catholicæ explicatio."

He himself prefers to say: "Horum accidentium medio et ministerio, sicut per eadem ante panis, ita nunc Corpus ac Sanguinem vere a nobis contrectari, manducari, circumgestari, carni nostræ immisceri, dentibus teri, in hoc vel illo loco aut vase collocari, ibidemque per particulas *hic* et *nunc* indicari, communiter cum ipsis accidentibus, sensibiliter sacrificari, et oculis visibiliter ad adorationem proponi ac elevari," etc.

He claims the support of "Paschasius, Hugo Victorinus, Guitmundus, doctissimi viri," and among scholastics, "celebris Carmelita Joannes Baconus, quem Thomas Waldensis mirè probat et sequitur in hac materiâ" ("De Euch. Sacr.," lib. i., cap. xxxvii.; "Lib. Tres.," p. 435; Antwerp, 1576).

It may be questioned, however, whether the views of Hugo would be altogether in accord with those of Alan. But it must by no means be too hastily assumed that even this teaching of Alan, as connected with his doctrine of a "communicatio idiomatum"—so divergent from the accepted teaching of later Romanism—while shielding the "Ego Berengarius," can avail to save it from the charge of being perilously near to blasphemy. Its original meaning can hardly have been that which Alan attributes to it. Its language, understood in the sense which is not only the most obvious and natural, but also the most accurate interpretation of its terms, will still be (from the standpoint of Roman orthodoxy) more heretical than the doctrine of Berengarius himself. The words "verum Corpus . . . sensualiter . . . in veritate . . . atteri," seem certainly to go beyond, in their definiteness, what could be warranted by any "communicatio idiomatum." (See "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 55-57.)

part iii., pp. 80 *sqq.*). It is true that this teaching of the Tridentine Catechism may be said to make the presence *spiritual;* but there is a vast difference between the *spiritual* of the Church of Rome and the *spiritual* of the Church of England (see Cosin's "Hist. Trans.," ch. iii.). The distinction is admirably stated by Bishop Jeremy Taylor: "We say that Christ's body is in the Sacrament really, but spiritually. They say it is there really, but spiritually. For so Bellarmine is bold to say that the word may be allowed in this question. Where now is the difference? Here: by 'spiritually' they mean 'present after the manner of a spirit'; by 'spiritually' we mean 'present to our spirits only'—that is, so as Christ is not present to any other sense but that of faith or spiritual susception; but their way makes His Body to be present no way but that which is impossible, and implies a contradiction—a body not after the manner of a body, a body like a spirit, a body without a body, and a sacrifice of body and blood without blood: *corpus incorporeum, cruor incruentus*" ("Real Presence," sect. i., § 8; "Works," vol. vi., p. 17, edit. Eden; see also pp. 105, 106. See Bellarmine, "De Euch.," lib. i., ch. ii.; "De Contr.," tom. iii., c. 461; and Cornelius a Lapide, "Com. in 1 Cor. xi. 24"). The opinion had been maintained in the treatise "De Sacramento Altaris," in the "Works" of Hildebert (c. 1103, 1104; Paris, 1708), and by Pope Innocent V. (Op., tom. iv., p. 120).

But whether the term "accidents" be understood in the wider or narrower sense, it is certain that the "Ego Berengarius" can never be reconciled in its natural and obvious sense with the Romish doctrine in its developed form. By the doctrine of transubstantiation, the Body of Christ, though present, is not the object of any natural sense.

All that is subject to the senses in the Eucharist—all that is seen, felt, touched[1]—all this is to be regarded as not the

[1] It will, indeed, be found that transubstantiationists sometimes, in the use of incautious or inaccurate language, speak of seeing, touching, etc., as when Pope Innocent III. wrote: "Cum sacramentum tenetur, comeditur et gustatur, Christus corporaliter adest in visu, in tactu, et in sapore" ("Myst. Miss.," lib. iv., cap. xv.; Op., tom. i., p. 383; Colon, 1575. Compare Hugo de Sancto Victore, Op., tom. iii., ff. 155, 290; Venice, 1588). But such language has its explanation in the words of Gerson: "Dicimus, nos videre Corpus Christi, dum videmus accidentia panis illius, qui in ipsum transubstantialiter conversus est" ("Tract. nonus super Magnificat," Op., tom. iv., c. 405; Antw., 1706). And so the use of such language is sometimes defended by maintaining that Christ is seen "ut est in sacramento," meaning that the species is seen under which He is veiled. "Quamvis Corpus Christi non cadat sub sensu, tamen species quæ ipsum significat et continet cadit sub sensu" (Innocent V., in iv. sentent., dist. x., quæs. iii., art. ii.; Op., tom. iv., p. 113; Tolos, 1651).

So Peter de Alliaco: "Vulgo dicitur hodie *vidi Corpus Christi*, etc. Hic

Body of Christ, but only the accidents of a substance, which has been changed by consecration into another substance—a substance unfelt, unseen, untouched, but really a substance present under the forms of the elements.[1]

---

dico quod istæ propositiones *video Corpus Christi*, vel *tango*, etc., non sunt veræ nisi ad istum sensum *video et tango species sub quibus est Corpus Christi*, et sic intelligitur illud capitulum" [*i.e.*, "Ego Berengarius"] ("Quarti Sententiarum," questio quinta, U.U.). "Corpus Christi, ut est hic, non potest tangi, nec approximari, nec est coloratum" (Faber, i. 178). "Oculi sunt in manibus, manus in pedibus" (*ibid.*, 137). See Edgar's "Variations of Popery," p. 350.

So Thomas Aquinas: "Hoc modo intelligenda est Confessio Berengarii, ut fractio et attritio dentium referatur ad speciem sacramentalem, sub qua vere est Corpus Christi" (pars iii., quæs. lxxvii., art. vii.).

Thomas Waldensis holds that the Body is broken "in sua essentia," but not "secundum essentiam." He adds: "Concedi debet etiam substantiam Corporis Christi ibi teneri, et frangi: sed hoc per medium sacramenti" ("De Sacr. Euch.," cap. lvi., f. 94; Venice, 1571).

Juveninus has said: "Propter intimam et mirabilem specierum cum Corpore Christi conjunctionem communicatio idiomatum aliquo modo locum habet in Eucharistia" ("De Sacr.," diss. iv., quæs. iv.). And this "communicatio idiomatum" was strongly maintained by Cardinal Alan ("De Euch. Sacr.," cap. xxxvii.).

And so Pope Benedict XIV. declares: "Si accurate et Theologice loquamur, non est dicendum: *Frangitur Corpus Christi*, sed *franguntur species*: quanquam Theologice etiam dici potest: *frangitur Corpus Christi*; nam etiam in Eucharistia idiomatum communicationi locus esse potest" ("De Sacrificio Missæ," cccxxvi.; Op., pars ii., p. 124; Patav., 1745).

This notion, however, of the "communicatio idiomatum" was *generally* disallowed by later theologians. It was strongly opposed and ably refuted by Bellarmine ("De Euch.," lib. i., cap. ii., c. 462, 463; see also c. 499), who gives his own explanation thus: "Quamvis Corpus Christi in Eucharistia per se non videatur, nec tangatur, nec moveatur; tamen ratione specierum, sive accidentium, quibus conjunctum est, potest dici, videri, tangi, moveri, etc. Id patet, quia species illæ vere videntur, tanguntur, moventur; et quod eis convenit, usitate etiam tribuitur ei, quod est cum illis conjunctum" ("De Sacr. Euch.," lib. i., cap. ii.; "De Controv.," tom. iii., c. 461; Ingold., 1601).

Gregory de Valentia says: "Nulla est de hâc quæstione controversia inter Scholasticos et Pontificios doctores. Nam quando dicunt, *non frangi*, intelligunt Corpus ipsum secundum se. Quando dicunt *frangi*, intelligunt secundum species intime ipsi Corpori Christi conjunctas" ("Ex. Myst. Calv.," lib. ii., cap. x., § 3; "De Rebus Fid.," p. 608; Paris, 1610).

[1] It should, however, be noted that there were not inconsiderable varieties of opinion among the Schoolmen (especially among the Scotists) on the subject, and that (notwithstanding the definition of Innocent III. in 1215) the doctrine of transubstantiation was not strictly *de fide* before the Council of Trent. See especially the Preface of P.A.E.A.P. (Pet. Allix, Eccles. Angli. Presbyter) to his edition of the "Determinatio Joannis Parisiensis de modo existendi Corpus Christi"; London, 1686; and Morton on "Eucharist," book iii., ch. ii., § 4, p. 152. And even since, some Romish Minimisers have by tension aimed at making the doctrine elastic enough to cover a somewhat wide diversity of opinion, and the net has sometimes broken. See Picherellus, Opuscula, pp. 13 *sqq.*, and Archbishop Wake in Gibson's "Preservative," vol. x., pp. 8-20; London,

The doctrine can hardly be better expressed than in the words of Archbishop Cranmer: "The Papists say that in the Supper of the Lord, after the words of consecration (as they call it), there is none other substance remaining, but the substance of Christ's flesh and blood. . . . And although all the accidents, both of the bread and wine, remain still, yet, say they, the same accidents be in no manner of thing, but hang alone in the air, without anything to stay them upon. . . . Nor in the bread and wine, say they, these accidents cannot be, for the substance of bread and wine, as they affirm, be clean gone. And so there remaineth whiteness, but nothing is white; there remaineth colours, but nothing is coloured therewith; there remaineth roundness, but nothing is round; and there is bigness, and yet nothing is big; there is sweetness without any sweet thing; softness without any soft thing; breaking without anything broken; division without anything divided; and so other qualities and quantities without anything to receive them. And this doctrine they teach as a necessary article of our faith" ("On the Lord's Supper," p. 45, P. S. edit.; see also pp. 254, 256, 324, 326; and Jewel's "Works," vol. ii., pp. 562 *sqq.*).

The Tridentine Catechism distinctly teaches, "panis et vini species in hoc sacramento sine aliquâ re subjectâ constare." It

---

1848; and Pusey's "Eirenicon," part iii., pp. 79-88. For an account of the different views maintained by Dominicans and Franciscans at the Council of Trent, see Sarpi's "Historia Conc. Trid.," lib. iv., p. 309. For an account of the very discordant opinions on transubstantiation held by Romish divines, see Albertinus, "De Eucharistia," lib. i., cap. xxiii.; and Morton on "Eucharist," book iii., ch. iii., § 1; and Edgar's "Variations of Popery," ch. xii., especially pp. 379, 380.

The Reformers frequently appealed to the testimony of pre-Tridentine divines who had asserted that the doctrine of transubstantiation could not be made to rest on the words of institution, nor on any other sufficient Scriptural warrant, that it would have been possible, or easy (some would have said easier), to understand the words of Scripture otherwise, but for the determination of the Roman Church. Quotations to this effect will be found in Bishop Cosin's "History of Transubstantiation" (ch. v., § 3), from Scotus, Durandus, Biel, Occam, Peter d'Alliaco, Cajetanus, and Fisher, Bishop of Rochester (see the notes in A. C. L. edit., pp. 55, 56). Even Bellarmine declares: "Etiamsi Scriptura . . . videatur nobis tam clara, ut possit cogere quæ mihi satis clara ad hominem non protervum: tamen, an ita sit, merito dubitari potest, cum homines doctissimi et acutissimi, qualis imprimis Scotus fuit, contrarium sentiant" ("De Euch.," lib. iii., c. xxiii.; "De Controv.," tom. iii., c. 752; Ingold., 1601). See also Cosin, "Hist. Transubs.," ch. vii., § 26, and Forbes, "Consid. Mod.," A. C. L., vol. ii., pp. 462 *sqq.*

Cajetan's admission that "transubstantiation is not expressly taught in the Gospel" was so pointed that Pius V. ordered it to be expunged from the Roman edition of the Cardinal's works. See Edgar's "Variations of Popery," p. 362.

adds: "Quoniam ea accidentia Christi corpori et sanguini inhærere non possunt: relinquitur, ut supra omnem naturæ ordinem ipsa se nullâ alia re nisa sustentent." And this, it assures us, "perpetua et constans fuit catholicæ Ecclesiæ doctrina" (pars ii., cap. iv., § xliv.). For a refutation of this astounding assertion we may refer to Morton, "On Eucharist," book iii., ch. iii., §§ 11-14, and ch. iv., § 9; and Albertinus, "De Eucharistia," lib. ii.; "Examen, August.," cap. xii., pp. 741 *sqq.*

It was well said by Wyclif: "Certum est quod omne simpliciter impossibile est summe hereticum; et iterum certum est quod summe impossibile est, quod quantitas, qualitas vel aliquod accidens potest esse sine subjecto" ("De Eucharistiâ," p. 150; Wyclif Soc.).

Des Cartes, seeing that it is of the essence of an accident to subsist in a subject, and that, therefore, to suppose accidents made by omnipotence to subsist of themselves without a subject, is to suppose the same things to be what they are, and to be not what they are, gave utterance to language which caused much uneasiness to the upholders of transubstantiation. His philosophy accordingly was attacked by Arnault, as destructive of the true doctrine of the Sacrament. Des Cartes met the force of the opposition by "A New Hypothesis of the Superficies," saying that he hoped the time would come when the divines of the Church of Rome would hiss the doctrine of real accidents out of the world as an unreasonable, incomprehensible, and unsafe doctrine to be believed (see "The Absolute Impossibility of Transubstantiation Demonstrated," p. 38; London, 1688).

But the existence of accidents apart from their subject was quite unknown and unheard of in the early ages of Christianity. Evidence of this may be seen in Stillingfleet's "Doctrine of the Trinity and Transubstantiation Compared" (pp. 25-27; London, 1687). Anyone questioning this should read the long quotation from Maximus which is found in the "Præp. Evangel." of Eusebius (lib. vii., cap. xxii., pp. 337 *sqq.*; edit. Viger; Paris, 1628).

Stillingfleet says: "That no accidents can be without their subject is in general affirmed by Isidore Hispalensis, Boethius, Damascen, and others" (p. 26). And again: "The Fathers do not only assert that accidents cannot be without their subject, but they confute hæretics on that supposition; which showed their assurance of the truth of it" (p. 27).

See now how literalism has gone to seed, and mark well the seed it has produced. See rather how literalism, having attained to its full growth, has committed self-destruction. See how it has fallen into the pit which it made for others.

See how literalism in its perfection has become the very perfection of all that is forced and unnatural in interpretation.[1]

See how the words of institution have come now to be interpreted: "Take, eat. This is My Body. Take, but don't think that *this* is what you see Me give. Take, but don't think you can touch and handle what you take. Eat, but don't think to do what is commonly meant by eating." You are indeed to *swallow*[2] the Body of Christ—even the Body

[1] Thus it was truly said by Wyclif: "Minus tropicat nostra sententia illud dictum quam sententia contraria que intelligit quod accidencia panis erunt figura Corporis Christi, quia illud infundabiliter tropicat utrumque extremum" ("De Eucbaristiâ," p. 296, Wyclif Soc.).

Bellarmine himself will thus be found to be on the side of the *tropical* and *figurative* interpretation of the language of *seeing*, and *touching*, and *taking*, and *eating*. He speaks of the doubt whether such words "dicantur de ipso vere, et proprie, an per aliquem *tropum*." And after stating the views of those who maintain the "vere et proprie," he says: "At sententia Theologorum communis contrarium docet" ("De Sacr. Euch.," lib. i., cap. ii.; "De Controv.," tom. iii., c. 462). And he argues decidedly and forcibly in favour of the rule, that words which signify other changes than local motion—"dicuntur quidem de Corpore Christi ratione specierum, sed improprie, et *figurate*" (*ibid.*).

Have we not here a teaching which demands a *figurative* interpretation of the words of institution, and maintains a *trope* very far more forced (if not more tropical) than that of Berengar, Wyclif, and the Reformed? And yet, after this, Suarez could write: "Neque immorari nos oportet in referendis, et refutandis *tropis*, *figuris*, et metaphoris, quibus Protestantes hæc clarissima verba corrumpere conati sunt" ("Defensio Fidei Cath.," c. 149; Col. Ag., 1614).

[2] "Mira res," says Hugo de Sancto Victore, "caro, quæ comeditur in imis, integra manet in excelsis" (Op., tom. iii., f. 154; Venice, 1588). "Ad id quod objicitur, quod Corpus Christi verum manducatur, dicendum quod in manducatione tria sunt. Masticatio, in ventrem trajectio, et incorporatio: et hæc tria respondent tribus, quæ sunt in sacramento. Masticatio namque est specierum tantum: incorporatio est quantum ad Corpus Christi mysticum: *in ventrem trajectio est non solum specierum, sed etiam Corporis Christi veri*, quod ibi est quamdiu est species panis: non ergo dicitur Corpus Christi verum vere manducari corporaliter, quia corporaliter masticatur: sicut enim non frangitur, sic nec masticatur" (Bonaventura, "In Sent.," lib. iv., dist. xii., pars i., art. iii., quæst. i.; Op., tom. v., p. 143; Lugd., 1668). See Cosin, "Hist. Transub.," cap. vii., § 24. Other opinions were also held by some (see Ridley's "Works," p. 200, P. S. edit.).

Alexander Alensis says ("Sum. Theol.," pars iv., quæs. xi.; "De manducatione Euch.," memb. ii., art. ii., § 1): "Si canis vel porcus deglutiret hostiam consecratam, non video quare vel quomodo Corpus Domini non simul cum specie trajiceretur in ventrem canis vel porci." And Thomas Aquinas (Op., 1593, tom. vii., f. 26): "Species possunt a brutis manducari, ergo et Corpus Christi." (See Cosin's "Works," vol. iv., p. 97, A. C. L., note A, from which these quotations are taken.)

To teach the contrary has been forbidden by a Pope (Gregory XI.), under pain of excommunication (A.D. 1371), and is declared by Thomas Aquinas to derogate from the truth of the Sacrament. (See Cosin, "Hist. Transub.," cap. vi., § 2, cap. vii., § 27.)

Bellarmine asserts: "Vere et proprie dicemus, Corpus Christi in

which is now glorified in heaven—but you are not to think that what you press with your teeth is Christ's Body. All that you touch, and handle, and wound are but the accidents

---

Eucharistiâ . . . transferri a manu ad os, et ab *ore ad stomachum*" ("De Euch.," lib. i., ch. ii. ; "De Controv.," tom. iii., c. 462 ; Ingold., 1601).

Again : "Respondeo, Corpus Cbristi vere ac proprie manducari etiam corpore in Eucharistia. Nam ad rationem manducationis non est necessaria attritio, sed satis est sumptio, et transmissio *ab ore ad stomachum*. . . . Non enim dicimus, Corpus Christi absolute manducari, sed manducari sub specie panis ; quæ sententia significat ipsas species manducari visibiliter ac sensibiliter, ac proinde ipsas dentibus atteri : sed sub illis invisibiliter, sumi etiam et *transmitti ad stomachum* Corpus Christi" ("De Sacr. Euch.," lib. i., cap. xi. ; "De Controv.," tom. iii., c. 512 ; Ingold., 1601.)

Jeremy Taylor calls this "a pretty device, that we take the flesh, and swallow down flesh, and yet manducate or chew no flesh," quoting from Hesychius ("In Levit.," lib. ii., c. 1) : "Non comedet ex eo quisquam, *i.e.*, non dividetur, quia dentium est dividere et partiri cibos, cum *aliter mandi non possint*" ("Real Presence," § 3 ; "Works," vol. vi., p. 29, edit. Eden).

For a differing authority, see Wyclif, "De Eucharistiâ," p. 309. And observe that even the gloss there quoted recognises concerning the *Corpus Christi* tbat it "*ducitur per gulam.*"

Bishop Cosin says truly : "Ex bypothesi transubstantiationis necessario quidem deduciter Corpus Christi posse esse in ventre muris sub specie panis. Contraria vero opinio non modo hodie a pontificis non tenetur, sed, ne deinceps teneatur, ipse etiam Pontifex Romanus, additâ excommunicationis pœnâ, prohibuit : adeo ut dubitare illis non liceat, quin res sit de fide, quæ a fide maxime abhorret" ("Hist. Trans.," cap. vi., § 2 ; "Works," A. C. L., vol. iv., p. 97).

As regards consumption, however, by irrational animals, Bonaventura said : "Est alia opinio, quod Corpus Christi nullo modo descendet in ventrem muris. . . . Et hæc opinio communior est, et certe honestior et rationabilior" ("Ad Sent.," iv., dist. xiii., art. ii., quæs. i.). This opinion, however, met with disapproval at the Synod of Paris, A.D. 1300. The doctrine of Aquinas also on this point was modified so far as this, tbat he held that an animal could partake of the body of Christ only *accidentaliter*, not *sacramentaliter* (see Hagenbach, "Hist. of Doctrines," vol. ii., p. 101 ; Clark), making a distinction which is not altogether easy of apprehension.

Thomas Waldensis held : "Quia gloriosum Corpus Christi caret ratione respectiva, ut sit cibus brutorum : idcirco quamvis reperiatur in *ore* bestiæ, aut in *ventre*, non tamen ibi comeditur : sicut nec comederetur ab eo auri massa, quamvis reperietur in ore vel stomacho : sed potest deglutiri, per gulam trajici, vel vorari" ("De Sacr. Euch.," cap. lx., f. 101 ; Venice, 1571).

It should be added that Pope Innocent III. seems to have turned away from all such conceptions, and that his teaching lies under the condemnation of Pope Gregory XI. (see "Myst. Miss.," lib. iv., cap. xi. ; Op., tom. i., p. 380). He further teaches (following Hugo de Sancto Victore) : "Dispensatione completâ, Christus de ore transit ad cor. Melius est enim ut procedat in mentem, quam ut descendet in ventrem. Cibus est non carnis, sed animæ. Venit ut comedatur, non ut consumatur : ut gustetur, non ut incorporetur" (cap. xv., p. 383. See also Hugo de Sancto Victore, Op., tom. iii., ff. 155, 290 ; Venice, 1588 ; "De Sacr. Fid.," lib. ii., pars x., cap. xiii. ; and Peter Damiani, "Expositio Can. Missæ," § 6 ; in Mai's "Script. Vet. Nov. Coll.," tom. vi., pars ii., p. 215 ; also "Syn. Carisiac.,"

of bread which no longer exists. You handle and bite nothing but the accidents of bread; you swallow and eat the Body of Christ.

This comes in the end of refusing to see a trope in the words of Christ, and insisting on their being understood *ut verba sonant*. Surely we may well ask, Is *this* to interpret them *ut verba sonant?*[1]

---

and "Fiorus Magister," as quoted in "Eucharistic Worship," p. 348). And this doctrine is followed by the "Fortalitium Fidei" (lib. iii., consid. vi., impos. xxiii., f. 74; Nuremberg, 1485).

But this teaching had been again corrected by Petrus de Tarantasia (afterwards Pope Innocent V.), who wrote: "Corpus Christi cibus est ventris susceptive, sed mentis finaliter, quia non nutrit ventrem sed mentem" (in iv. sent., dist. x., quæs. i., art. iv.; Op., tom. iv., p. 102; Tolos, 1651). And it has since been put (as it seems to us) under the anathema of the Council of Trent: "Si quis dixerit, Christum in Eucharistiâ exhibitum, spiritualiter tantum manducari, et non etiam sacramentaliter ac realiter: anathema sit" (sess. xiii., canon viii.).

It had been urged in the Council that "posset articulus sic formari, exhiberi in Eucharistiâ Christum, sed spiritualiter tantum manducari per fidem, et non sacramentaliter" (Theiner, "Acta Conc. Trid.," tom. i., p. 416); against which it was argued by Visdomini: "Si vero intelligat, Christum vere non suscipi, dum etiam per fidem spiritualiter manducatur, falsus est: nam et vere in eos [? os] recipitur, et *in stomachum* etiam, si salvæ sint species, traducitur" (*ibid.*, pp. 428, 429).

Such teaching is defended by appealing to the sayings of the Fathers. But that such Patristic language is intended to be *sacramentally* understood is clear from its going too far to be understood of anything more than the sacramental signs. See the forcible argument of the following:

"*Theophilus the Christian:* How think you? Must this [the language of the Fathers asserting nourishment by the body of Christ] be referred to the natural and true body and blood of Christ, or else to the signs bearing those names when once they be sanctified? *Philander the Jesuit:* No doubt to the signs. *Theoph.:* And were it not open madness to avouch it to be really true of the things themselves whose signs those are? *Philand.:* It were. *Theoph.:* Why, then, since corporal eating serveth only for corporal nourishing, and hath a continual and natural coherence with it, do you confess the truth in the latter and not as well in the former part of the action? Why do you not expound them both alike? *Philand.:* To say the immortal flesh of Christ is converted and turned into the quantity and substance of our mortal flesh is an horrible heresy. *Theoph.:* And to say that His flesh is eaten with our mouths and jaws, and lieth in our stomachs, is the very pathway and right introduction to that heresy, or at least to as brutish and gross an error as that is. *Philand.:* The Fathers affirm that His body is eaten with our mouths. *Theoph.:* And so they affirm that His body and blood do increase and augment the substance of our mortal and sinful bodies" (Bishop Bilson's "True Difference," pp. 770, 771; Oxford, 1585).

[1] "Quis audeat manducare Dominum tuum?" (Lombard, "Sent.," lib. iv., dist. xii., f. 314; Paris, 1558).

Lombard distinguishes between the action of the hands and the teeth: "Illa Berengarii verba ita distinguenda sunt, ut sensualiter *non modo in sacramento*, sed in veritate dicatur Corpus Christi tractari manibus sacerdotum: frangi vero et atteri dentibus vere quidem, sed *in sacramento tantum*. Vera ergo est ibi attritio et partitio: sed in singulis partibus

Well did Bishop Andrewes write: "Vestri homines, dum figuram unam fugiunt, mille se quæstionibus involvunt" ("Ad Bell. Resp.," p. 214. See Cosin, "Hist. Transubs.," ch. vii., § 24; and especially Bramhall, "Works," A. C. L., vol. i., pp. 14-19).

No wonder the "Ego Berengarius" stands condemned by such a teaching as this. How could the literal and natural stand before such a forced and unnatural[1] interpretation as that which results from the full-grown doctrine of transubstantiation? No wonder that the orthodox gloss of the thirteenth century condemned the orthodox language of the eleventh century. No wonder that the "Ego Berengarius" had to bear in its margin the words, "Nisi sane intelligas verba Berengarii, in majorem incides hæresim, quam ipse fuit."

N. DIMOCK.

(To be continued.)

ART. III.—ABSOLUTION.

(Concluded.)

THERE is no doubt that this is the sense of the "Absolution" in morning and evening prayer. (1) It is there simply declaratory; but even there we must be carefully on our guard against the idea that God's pardon is conveyed by this declaration. The message of pardon *is* thereby conveyed, but the pardon itself is given direct from heaven to all believers, whether present at the time or not. "He pardoneth and absolveth *all them* that truly repent, and unfeignedly believe His holy Gospel," a statement which is conclusive that the pardon is not conveyed by the message, but by faith to every believer direct from God. (2) The "Absolution" in the

otus est Christus" (Lombard, "Sent.," lib. iv., dist. xii., f. 315; Paris, 1588).

See also Bonaventura's "Apology for the Ego Berengarius," in "Sent.," lib. iv., pars i., dist. xii., quæs. i.; Op., tom. v., p. 143.

Note also the following: "Sub speciebus illis erat passibilis, sed erat ibi impassibiliter" (p. 133).

[1] According to Bellarmine (to use the words of Jeremy Taylor): "The pronoun demonstrative does only point to the accidents, and yet does not mean the accidents, but the substance under them; and yet it does not mean the substance that is under them, but that which shall be; for the substance which is meant is not yet: and it does not point to the substance, but yet it means it: for the substance indeed is meant by the pronoun demonstrative, but it does not at all demonstrate it, but the accidents only" ("Real Presence," sect. v., § 4; "Works," vol. vi., p. 50, edit. Eden; see also sect. vi., § 8, pp. 64, 65).

Communion service is obviously and beyond doubt *precatory* —that is, it is simply a prayer for God's pardon, which He alone can give. (4) But in the Visitation of the Sick, considering that "I absolve thee" was never used for twelve centuries, that the indicative was never used at all, whether "I" or "we," except in reference to the remission of Church censures or discipline, considering the fact that all this must have been well known to the Reformers, it is not to be believed that they shut their eyes to the plain facts of history, and used the indicative to refer to sin against God at all in any sense, declaratory or otherwise; and I agree with the conclusion so ably maintained by Blakeney in his history of the Book of Common Prayer, that the "I absolve thee" of this service refers to the removal of Church censure. The "Absolution" in the Visitation service, as you remember, reads thus: "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences; and by His authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

The first part is a prayer to the Lord Jesus Christ for *forgiveness*. And this prayer contains the announcement that Christ has left power to absolve, and describes the absolving power as left *to the Church—i.e.*, a congregation of faithful men. Christ holds "forgiveness" in His own hands, but He has left to His Church the right as a society to cut off unworthy members and to restore the penitent; and this right the officer of the Church proceeds to exercise in his pronunciation of the absolution. So Wheatley, who points out that in the collect immediately following pardon and forgiveness are *still* most earnestly desired, for which there could be no need if the penitent were already pardoned by God, by virtue of the absolution just pronounced, and thence argues that the previous absolution is intended by the Church to refer to ecclesiastical censures and bonds.

These censures in those days were very serious and "weighty matters" for a dying man. The Visitation Articles of the Bishops of the time show that the power of excommunication was exercised long after the Reformation. They ask: "Have you anie among you that be denounced and declared excommunicate? And do anie of your parish keep society with them before they be reconciled to the Church and 'absolved'"?

Excommunication was exercised long after the Reformation, and excommunication and absolution, therefore, are coupled together in the Homily for Whit Sunday: "Christ ordained the authority of the keys to *excommunicate* notorious sinners,

and to *absolve* them which are truly penitent." "Absolution" thus would mean either (1) the Church's formal removal of Church censures for offences against the Church, a very "weighty matter," which would press heavily on the mind of a dying man; or (2) the proclamation by the Church in her services of God's mercy in Christ's blood to all who repent and believe; but it is in the former of these senses that the words "I absolve thee" are used in the Visitation of the Sick, "the total disuse of which service the Church would never have allowed according to the sixty-seventh canon, but have insisted on its use by every minister, and its reception by every member, if she regarded it as the Divine sentence of remission of sin." I have so far spoken of the announcement by the Church in her services of God's pardon, or the prayer by the Church for God's pardon, or the remission by the Church of offences against herself and the removal of her censures and sentence. But there is another absolution and a higher pardon, which is *judicial*, as of a Judge on His throne, and direct; and for the original terms of that absolution, as laid down with infallible truth, we turn to the inspired records of that "higher, holier, earlier, purer Church," which are found in the sacred pages of the New Testament.

On this matter we say with Cranmer:

> Step after step,
> Through many voices crying right and left,
> Have I climbed back into the primal Church,
> And stand within the porch—and Christ with me.

Nothing is more remarkable than the contrast between the direct and indicative forgiveness meted out by Paul and the Corinthians for their erring brother's sin against the Church, and the treatment by Paul and the other Apostles of sin against God.

Their practice, whether as regards masses of men, as in Acts xiii. 38, or individuals, as in Acts xvi. 31, was to preach God's forgiveness, and the practice of the Apostles proves that they understood their Master's commission to the Church in John xx. 23, "whose sins" to be completely fulfilled by "preaching pardon through faith in the blood of Jesus," and precisely as St. Luke's inspired paraphrase of them explains them in Luke xxiv. 47, "that repentance and remission of sins should be *preached* (not "given" or "conveyed," but *preached*) in His name among all nations," and as a host of witnesses even in the dimmest times interpreted them, as Jerome, and Chrysostom, and Augustine, and Lombard, down to our own Cranmer and Becon, understood them. This Becon, who defines absolution as "verily a *preaching* of the free

deliverance from all your sins through Christ's blood," speaking of the text in John xx., says: "This is the meaning of the aforesaid text." Whensoever the ministers of the Lord's Word declare unto me the sweet promises of God the Father in Christ's blood, and I believe them, then are my sins forgiven me at the very instant; but if I do not believe them, then are my sins retained, that is to say, not forgiven, and this is the interpretation of the Fathers and of the Evangelists and Apostles.

No Church dreams of applying them in their literal and absolute sense without bringing into them some explanation. Romanizers drag in from outside that which is not found either in the practice of the Apostles or in the primitive Church, and interpret them thus: "Whosesoever sins (after their secret confession to you) ye remit (by your judicial absolution in the form 'Ego absolvo te') are remitted."

We interpret them in accordance with the language of the prophets and evangelists of the Old and New Testaments, "Whosesoever sins ye (declare to be) remitted (through faith in Jesus Christ's most precious blood) are remitted (by God to all believers)." The words in brackets necessary to our interpretation bring in the Lord Jesus Christ and faith in His blood. The words in brackets necessary to the Roman interpretation bring in the awful system of the confessional, whereby the black shadow of the priest is made to stalk, not merely between man and wife, but between the sinner and his Saviour.

The promises of God's mercy in Christ are recorded formally and plainly in the inspired pages of the New Testament, and are offered in a hundred passages to all believers. Though deeply indebted thereto, no Christian is, therefore, *dependent* upon the formal proclamation of the Church to which he belongs, nor upon the utterance of any priest, minister, or officer of that Church. He has the message proclaimed by the Holy Spirit in the Bible, and if with a penitent heart he believes that message, his sins are forgiven then and there. Precious and valuable as is the proclamation of the Church when in accordance with the Word of God—as we may thank God is the teaching of this Protestant Church of England, raised up by God to be a horn of salvation in this land, and to witness not merely *against* mediæval corruptions, but also, as the name Protestant implies, to testify *for* the truth as it is in Jesus—we are not dependent upon her announcement for forgiveness of our sins. We have access to the fountain itself of heavenly radiance; we can hear the Holy Spirit say, "Be it known unto you, men and brethren, that through this Man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins, and by Him *all that believe*

are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses" (Acts xiii. 33). And "to Him give all the prophets witness, that through His name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins" (Acts x.).

Precious and valuable as is the ministry of the Church, we are not *dependent* on it, or on any sermon, for access to God, or for the pardon of our sins, nor upon any set phrase of words whatever; for the way to the holiest of all has been made open for us by the blood of Jesus, and He invites us, even us sinners, to come to Himself, unless we read His words backwards, and are smitten with blindness, groping at noonday. It is Jesus who says, "Come unto Me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest;" it is Jesus who says, "Him that cometh unto Me I will in no wise cast out;" "And the Spirit and the bride say, Come; and let him that heareth say, Come; and whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely." The absolution of Jesus is not conditional; He can pronounce an absolution higher than a prayer and stronger than a declaration. He, the omniscient and heart-searching God, He who loveth us and hath loosed us from our sins by His blood, and He alone, can say, "Thy sins be forgiven thee! Go in peace!"

Beyond the clouds, within the veil,
Is the fit Priest for me;
He came from heaven to save my soul,
He died on Calvary!

Jesus, God's well-beloved Son,
Jesus is priest for me;
He speaks the gracious words I want—
"Ego absolvo te."

T. S. TREANOR.

ART. IV.—MR. CURZON ON MISSIONS IN CHINA.

I SOMETIMES wonder what would become of our newspapers if they treated their political, commercial, sporting, or theatrical columns with the treatment which they mete out to the fragments of space devoted to religious matters. Imagine the *Telegraph* or *Standard* sending a reporter to the Oval who did not know Mr. Grace from Mr. Stoddart, or understand the difference between a cut and a drive! For every department of life, except religion, it is deemed essential to employ an expert; but when anything has to be written upon a religious question—other than Church politics, such as Disestablishment and the like—it seems to be an accepted principle that an outsider is the best judge.

There is, indeed, a great improvement in the amount of religious information lately given, especially in the *Times* and the Radical organs, though certainly not in the two important newspapers named above; but if the May Meetings are alluded to in a leader or leaderette, is it not invariably from the point of view of a man of the world who looks at them from a distance, albeit, it may be, with a sort of patronizing kindness?

When we turn from the fleeting issues of the daily and weekly press to the grave and weighty volumes that essay to be standard works, we find a not dissimilar phenomenon. While a civilian would (with very few exceptions) be laughed at if he posed as an authority on military tactics, it is regarded as an almost indispensable qualification for the discussion of religious enterprises that one should have nothing to do with them, and so be able to give "impartial" judgment.

These thoughts have come to me with fresh force after reading Mr. George Curzon's pages on Missions in his recent valuable work, "Problems of the Far East." Mr. Curzon is one of our highest authorities on Asiatic questions. He knows Asia as few men know it. He is an accomplished traveller, and a cultured writer. And yet, on laying down his book, I have felt disposed to exclaim, "Well! if his comments on the political and social problems of China and Japan are of a piece with his remarks on Missions and Missionaries, then they are of little more account than the last smart article in an ephemeral society journal." Of course this conclusion would not be a fair one. The general value of Mr. Curzon's work is not to be gauged by his discussion of the missionary problem. But it is disappointing, very disappointing, to find a writer of his high calibre descending to repeat the stupid cavils about missionaries which one only smiles at if one chances to see them in a society paper. It is not that there are many misstatements, though there are a few. It is that the facts are twisted and travestied, and that the inferences drawn from them are entirely unworthy of a really able and thoughtful student of the subject.

If Mr. Curzon avowed himself a man of the world pure and simple, and a good hater of anything like devotion to the Christian religion, then we should take for granted his cheap sneers at "Exeter Hall," *et id genus omne*, which are the inevitable stock-in-trade of "smart" writers. But in his case they are accompanied with a profession of impartiality, and an occasional bit of mild praise thrown in regarding the "pious fortitude" and "excellent work" of missionaries, which may deceive the unwary reader. I myself cannot resist the conviction that Mr. Curzon is absolutely sincere in his desire and

purpose to be impartial, and in his good opinion, so far as it goes, of some missionaries; and his discussion of the subject only illustrates the impossibility of, say, a man who has never held a bat judging one of Mr. Grace's "centuries."

Let me take a very small and relatively unimportant instance of the blunders a clever writer may fall into when he wanders on to unfamiliar ground. Referring to the opposition which a preacher of the Gospel will meet with from the Chinese—which opposition, by the way, is denied by no one, and is indeed inevitable—Mr. Curzon asks what sort of reception a band of votaries of some new faith would meet with in England, if they began by "denouncing the Bible and crying Anathema *Maranatha* upon the Apostles' Creed." This is, to continue my former illustration, as if I were to say that Mr. Grace had placed an "on drive" into the hands of "slip." There are hundreds of servant-girls who could tell Mr. Curzon the meaning of "Maranatha"!

A much more serious matter than lack of acquaintance with St. Paul's use of a Hebrew word is Mr. Curzon's own attitude towards Christianity. On the very first page of his work, in an eloquent passage on the fascination of Asia, he observes that "five of the six greatest moral teachers that the world has seen" were "born of Asian parents, and lived upon Asian soil." Who are these five? They are thus enumerated: "Moses, Buddha, Confucius, Jesus, and Mohammed." Again, on another page Mr. Curzon refers incidentally to "the two best books that have ever been written upon the East—viz., the Old Testament and the "Arabian Nights." Is it possible for one who can write thus to understand Christian Missions? He may write about them: anybody may write about anything. I myself may write an essay on the status of peers' sons who are members of the House of Commons; but Mr. Curzon, who is interested in that subject, would hardly accept me as an authority upon it. Seriously, a writer on Missions, who desires to be impartial, should at least try to put himself in thought into the position of a missionary, or of a supporter of missionary enterprise, by seeking to grasp their principles and motives. He may entirely disagree with those principles and motives; he may notice them only to oppose them; but at least he should try to understand them. Mr. Curzon does profess to understand the position. He quotes St. Matthew xxviii. 19, as the missionary's avowed authority, and acknowledges that the missionary "conceives himself to be in China in obedience to a Divine summons, and to be pursuing the noblest of human callings." But he evidently imagines that this one verse in St. Matthew is an isolated passage. He says: "The selection of a single passage from the preaching of the founder of one

faith, as the sanction of a movement against all other faiths, is a dangerous experiment." Of the general tenor of Scripture, with its constant affirmation of the universality of the religion it reveals, its continual phrases "all men," "all nations," "the whole world," etc., Mr. Curzon gives no more sign of knowing than of knowing the meaning of "Maranatha." Like all writers of his type, he regards Missions as a more or less benevolent attempt to win men from their own "doxy" to our "doxy." The people who engage in such work may be good people in their way, but provokingly narrow-minded, and extremely troublesome. Now, if I do not believe that the Son of God came into the world to save mankind from sin, then I may fairly regard Missions as a "fad," and not always a harmless fad; but if I do believe such an overwhelming fact, then the duty is plain, obvious, indisputable, to make it known to those who have not yet heard it. *That* is the one fundamental principle of Missions; and the recognition of it—not necessarily the acceptance, but the recognition—is an essential qualification for any reasonable discussion of the subject. Mr. Curzon does not dispute this fundamental principle, he simply ignores it; for anything that appears, he never heard of it in his life. But then, what becomes of his claim to discuss Missions?

Let us, however, leave these preliminary considerations, and come to Mr. Curzon's actual remarks upon Missions as carried on in China. He begins by admitting that, "in endeavouring to arrive at an opinion upon so vexed a question, the risks, even after a careful study upon two separate occasions on the spot, are so great that it [is] perhaps the wisest to state the case *pro* and *con* with as much fulness as space will permit, leaving the reader to form his own conclusions." This is an excellent design: how is it carried out? The *pro* side occupies one page and six lines; the *con* occupies nearly thirty pages. So much for impartiality! At the close, our author observes that his only desire is to enable his readers, "first, to see that there are two sides to the Missionary question, and secondly, before making up their own minds upon it, to form some idea of what those sides are."

The *pro* side is given so briefly and in so condensed a form that I could only fairly state it by copying the whole. The devotion of many of the missionaries is mentioned; the influence of education and culture; the medical dispensaries, schools, etc.; the literary work done; and, we are glad to see —for in this one point Mr. Curzon does separate himself from the writers in *Truth*—"the occasional winning of genuine and noble-hearted converts." Moreover, the statement is expressly given as incomplete. "Much of the labour is necessarily devoid of immediate result, and is incapable of being scientifically

registered in a memorandum. They sow the seed; and if it does not fructify in their day or before our eyes, it may well be germinating for a future ear-time." This is excellent; but why, then, does Mr. Curzon, a few pages further on, dwell upon the utterly incommensurate results of "the prodigious outlay of money, self-sacrifice, and human power"?

But let us turn to the *con* side. Mr. Curzon divides the "objections and drawbacks" into three classes, (1) religious and doctrinal, (2) political, (3) practical. In dealing with these *seriatim*, we call attention to one feature of the discussion. The inherent and familiar difficulties of Missionary work in China are curiously mixed up with the imperfections of the missionaries and their methods, and both are used together as equally *cons* in the argument. It is as if, in discussing the conduct of the campaign for the relief of Chitral, the tremendous natural obstacles on the road were made a ground of attack on the military administration, along with any alleged failings in the commissariat arrangements. Both, no doubt, might have had to be taken account of in considering the possibilities of getting to Chitral at all; but if the plans and proceedings of General Low were the subject of discussion, the natural obstacles would be placed on the credit side of the account. Not so does Mr. Curzon reckon the immense obstacles to the Gospel in China when he estimates "results." Ancestral worship and missionary luxury both go to swell the total of *contra* items which are held to account for, if not to justify, the view of Missions taken in the club-houses of Shanghai. However, we take these "objections and drawbacks" as they stand in Mr. Curzon's pages.

1. Under the head of "religious objections and drawbacks" are included the following: Ancestral worship, the Term question, the variety of Protestant churches and sects, unrevised editions of the Scriptures, the preaching of dogma, and "irresponsible itinerancy." On ancestral worship, Mr. Curzon, like other critics, complains of the opposition of the missionaries to it, but he does not say what they ought to do with it. He will not commit himself to the opinion that men whose main purpose is to proclaim "the only true God" should somehow reconcile with this the worship of one's grandfather; but if he does not mean this, his remarks have no point at all. He suggests that a Chinaman visiting St. Paul's or Westminster Abbey might retort upon the missionary; but he does not get beyond the suggestion: he does not venture to say in plain words that putting up a monument to Wellington is parallel to burning incense at our ancestor's tomb, and definitely asking his spirit for protection. The annual garlanding of Lord Beaconsfield's statue is the most conspicuous instance in

England of honours paid to a dead man, but it would puzzle the smartest writer to compare it with ancestral worship. Of course the Chinese system is a tremendous obstacle to the progress of Christianity; but if the missionaries tolerated it in order to make converts more rapidly, Mr. Curzon would probably be the first to charge them with preferring success to truth.

The disagreement among the Missions regarding the right Chinese word for "God," and the variety of form under which the Christian religion is presented to the Chinaman, are fair subjects of criticism; though an "impartial" judge would probably express sympathy with the missionaries for what, after all, is their misfortune and not their fault. Protestant Christians have no Pope to settle internal controversies for them, and they have to bear the disadvantage, if disadvantage it be. But in reality the divisions of Christendom have no such effect upon the heathen mind as it is the fashion to suppose. If a Brahman Mission came to England, it would make no difference to us whether the preachers were votaries of Vishnu or of Siva; and to the average Chinaman all non-Roman Missionaries are much alike, whether they belong to the S.P.G. or the Plymouth Brethren. No doubt, within the Christian community, the difficulty is a real one; but it has no appreciable influence upon the heathen, and therefore none upon the number of baptisms. In the few cases of Chinamen sufficiently educated in Western ways to understand the position, however, it is very likely a convenient excuse for refusing the Gospel.

The lack of "impartial" fairness and candour in Mr. Curzon's remarks is conspicuous in his notice of "unrevised translations of the Scriptures." This is his own phrase; but when we go on to examine the particulars of the charge, we find that the word "unrevised" should be "unexpurgated." Mr. Curzon asks what an educated Chinaman is likely to think of Samuel hewing Agag in pieces before the Lord, or of "Solomon exchanging love-lyrics with the Shulamite woman." In what way these and similar episodes would drop out of a "revised" edition of the Chinese Bible we are not informed. What Mr. Curzon really objects to is the circulation of the Scriptures at all as they stand. Now, it may be freely conceded that the modern Chinaman is quite as likely to misuse the execution of the King of Amalek as some of our old English Puritans were. Nevertheless, it is the Christian's belief that if God gave man a revelation at all, He is quite able to protect it, and to make it a blessing and not a curse; and although such a consideration as this may be objected to in argument, I may at all events venture to remind Mr. Curzon of another, viz., that, as a

matter of fact, the nations that have an open Bible are the most flourishing nations of the world.

In this connection I may notice Mr. Curzon's objection to the "abstruse dogmas" taught by the missionaries. He is willing that the "ethical teachings of the Bible" should be offered to the peoples of the Far East. He thinks that "a simple statement of the teaching of Christ" might be to the Chinese "a glorious and welcome revelation." That is exactly what it has been to thousands of Chinese. But what is "the teaching of Christ"? In the very same paragraph Mr. Curzon says that "the bidding to forsake father and mother for the sake of Christ must to the Chinaman's eyes be the height of profanity." But who gave this "bidding"? Was it not actually a part of the very teaching of Christ Himself? The real fact is, that the revelation of Christ as the all-sufficient Saviour and the supreme Lord, and as One who *can* put His claims above even those of father and mother, does exercise over a Chinese heart, just as it does over an English or African or Indian heart, a power which no system of ethics, however lofty, ever does or can exercise.

> Talk they of morals? O Thou bleeding Lamb,
> The true morality is love of Thee.

There is one more item under the head of "Religious Objections and Drawbacks." This is called "Irresponsible Itinerancy." The reference is plainly to some of the China Inland missionaries, and, indeed, to one or two members of the famous "Cambridge Seven" in particular, for Mr. Curzon avows that he has some of his own schoolfellows in view, probably Mr. Studd and the Polhill-Turners. Their proceedings he regards as "magnificent, but not scientific warfare." Unfortunately, he nowhere gives us any inkling of what in his judgment really is "scientific warfare"; but it is curious that his warmest word of praise on another page is accorded to the "devotion and self-sacrifice" of "those particularly who in native dress visit or inhabit the far interior." The fact is that when in the clubhouses of Shanghai it is required to disparage the missionaries at the treaty ports with their European houses, Mr. Studd and his party can conveniently be used to point the contrast, while when the turn of the missionary pioneer in the far West comes for contemptuous allusion, "irresponsible itinerancy" is a good phrase to employ. Mr. Curzon hears first the one remark and then the other, and down they go into his pages without a thought of how far they are consistent with one another.

2. The pages on "Political Objections and Drawbacks" are chiefly occupied with a recital of the way in which the liberty

of missionaries to reside and build in the interior was secured by the duplicity of a French Roman Catholic missionary. Assuming the correctness of Mr. Curzon's narrative, we nevertheless fail to understand the point of it. According to his own statement, (1) the liberty exists, (2) no improper means were used by Englishmen to obtain it. Is it meant that English missionaries should refrain from exercising a right of residence which the Chinese law allows, and which the Chinese authorities have never contested? *More suo*, Mr. Curzon does not say so; but any stick will do to beat a dog with, and therefore he flourishes this one. Then comes in, of course, the "inevitable gunboat," for which, we are told, "many" missionaries clamour when they get into difficulties with the Mandarins. Mr. Curzon, however, acknowledges that there are "many honourable exceptions—men who carry their lives in their hands, and uncomplainingly submit to indignities which they have undertaken to endure in a higher cause than that of their nationality." "Exceptions"! Are not the exceptions the other way? Mr. Curzon mentions that in 1890 there were 1,300 Protestant missionaries in China. Can a dozen of these be named who have ever "clamoured for a gunboat," or asked for one at all with or without "clamour"? That the appeal has been made occasionally is true, but the men who have made it are rare "exceptions" indeed.

"Nevertheless," says Mr. Curzon, "the presence of missionary bodies in the country is a constant anxiety to the Legations, by whom, in the last resort, their interests, resting as they do upon treaties, must be defended." This we can well believe; and it is upon a subject of this kind that our author has a right to speak, and that we may fairly look to him for wise counsel. The position of a missionary in countries like the Turkish Empire and China, where possibly he might not be tolerated at all unless he could claim treaty rights as an Englishman, is peculiarly difficult. In New Zealand eighty years ago he had to live in daily and nightly peril of his life, with no consul to appeal to or gunboat to clamour for. In Uganda not ten years ago he could be cruelly murdered or ignominiously expelled without a murmur on the part of himself or his friends, still less with the thought of threatening the vengeance of British bayonets. But in Turkey and China the whole circumstances are different. The missionary there cannot divest himself of his English nationality, however sincerely he may desire to owe to it no special exemption from trial and danger. Mr. Curzon frankly faces these facts. "Whether it was wise or not," he says, "to introduce missionaries in the first place, China, having undertaken to protect their persons and to tolerate their faith, must

fulfil her pledge, and cannot be permitted to combine a mere lip respect for the engagement with secret connivance at its violation." And he goes on to advocate "firmness" on the part of European Governments in case of outrages as "the only policy for which the Chinese entertain any respect." He takes stronger ground, indeed, than most of the Missions would wish to see taken. So far from clamouring for gunboats, they would wish for as little consular interposition as possible consistent with the necessary maintenance of treaty rights, not from a missionary, but from a political point of view. But if the whole position is "an objection and a drawback" to Missions in China, then Mr. Curzon should put it on the other side of his balance-sheet. If the Chinese dislike missionaries because of their dependence upon alien powers, the disadvantage must make every successful advance the more creditable.

3. Next we come to the "practical charges brought against the work, arising partly from the missionaries' own conduct, partly from the gross superstitions of the people." Here, again, there is an obvious confusion in reckoning in the same category what may be open to criticism and what may well call for sympathy. Let the missionaries be criticised for their own imperfections and mistakes; but the superstitions of the people are not a "charge against the work," but a reason for appraising the work more highly. A good many of Mr. Curzon's *debit* entries ought to be on the opposite folio. Another flaw in the argument is this: Mr. Curzon begins by excluding Roman Catholic Missions from the discussion, and yet every now and then he is obliged to quote what he regards as their misdeeds to justify his strictures on Protestant Missions. Thus, under this head of "practical charges," he refers to the injudicious erection of high buildings and walls, so obnoxious to the Chinese doctrine of *fung-shui*. "It is strange," he says, "that missionaries of all sects and creeds seem to be quite unable to resist these easily surmounted temptations." But the only examples he adduces are the towers of the French cathedral at Canton, another French cathedral at Peking, and a cathedral of the Russo-Greek Church, not in China at all, but in Japan. Perhaps he is not aware of the anxious care of some at least of the Protestant Missions not to offend in this respect; but we may be sure that if he had known of any conspicuous case to the contrary he would have cited it.

Among the "sources of friction between the missionaries and the Chinese" which are enumerated are the refusal of native converts to contribute to heathen festivals, and the popular notions about the missionary's "witchcraft" and the

like. These are indeed frequent "obstacles and drawbacks"; but how they come to be included among the "practical charges brought against the work" we fail to understand. It is another case of "any stick."

Once more, sure enough, we come upon the inevitable sneer at the missionaries' "comfortable manner of living," their "domestic engrossments and large families," "encouraged, strange to say, by a liberal subsidy from the parent society for each new arrival in the missionary nursery." Here, again, we seem to have descended from the level of reasonable statesmanship, which Mr. Curzon in some of his comments succeeds in maintaining, to that of the commonest society paper. Did it occur to Mr. Curzon to make a simple inquiry into the actual amounts paid as stipends or allowances to missionaries, and a comparison between them and the incomes of all other Europeans in China? Did he take the trouble to ask if the "parent society" had any real reason for "subsidizing the nursery"? Did he ever attend, out of curiosity, a meeting of the governing body of the "parent society," and observe its jealous reluctance to allow its missionaries a dollar more than is proved to be necessary? Has he ever heard of the Church Missionary Society's principle of "no salaries, but allowances for maintenance according to need"? If a total of (say) £200 or £250 is found necessary for a married man with a couple of children, would he give the same amount to a young bachelor, in order to avoid the after "subsidies to the nursery"? The whole case is a perfectly clear one, and it is —shall we so express it?—unscientific to ignore all the facts and indulge in the cheapest and unworthiest of sneers.

But our author is equally hard upon the attempts to cheapen missionary labour. He refers to some society which had "committed the outrage" of allowing a party of twenty Swedish girls "£27 10s. a year each for board, lodging, and clothing," so that they were "destitute of the smallest comforts of life." Now, (1) we simply do not believe that this sum was to cover "lodging," for all Missions find *that* for their agents, independently of personal allowances. (2) These "Swedish girls" were evidently of the number of those elsewhere praised for their "devotion in wearing the native dress in the far interior," and, we may add, living native-wise in other ways; and if so, a little inquiry would have shown that some who are thus living find it actually hard to manage to spend much more than this. (3) The more so, when a large party live together. No doubt, £27 10s. would not keep one "Swedish girl," but perhaps £550 might keep twenty, if they are of the type praised by Mr. Curzon for "devotion and self-sacrifice." We must not ask our author what sum he him-

self, were he a missionary director, would fix upon as the *juste milieu*, certainly not for "Swedish girls," for he strongly objects to unmarried women being sent at all, whether Swedish or of any other nationality. In order to emphasize this point, he draws a picture of steamer after steamer coming from America, each with "a bevy of young girls, fresh from the schoolroom, with the impulsive innocence of youth," etc.; and adds that a "scarcely inferior stream of female recruitment flows in from the United Kingdom and the Colonies." Were this picture a true one, the statistical footnote on the same page would surely have to report more than 316 unmarried women, all told. This figure, however, belongs to 1890. Perhaps the "bevies" have come since.

Now, the conditions and methods of women's work in China are fair subjects of discussion; and all will allow that every possible precaution should be taken against causing needless offence to national customs and even prejudices. But there is a limit to this obligation. Would Mr. Curzon compel the English ladies in official and mercantile circles in Shanghai to wear loose garments, because a close-fitting dress is scandalous in Chinese eyes? Or would he insist on the ladies in Cook's Nile parties veiling their faces because they are in a Mohammedan country? If Christian women are willing to undergo privations and annoyances for the sake of winning their Chinese sisters to a knowledge of the Saviour whose teachings have elevated women wherever they have been accepted, they are not likely to be turned from their purpose by the supercilious smiles of Shanghai smoking-rooms, any more than the holy women who, years ago, went down into the London slums, pioneers of the great army that have followed them, were turned from their purpose by the fear of Mrs. Grundy.

Such are the "obstacles and drawbacks" which make up Mr. Curzon's *con* side. It will be seen that if the *pro* and *con* calculation is concerned with the character of the missionaries and the methods of their work, some of the most important points must be ruled out as "not evidence." But if the *pros* and *cons* are counted with a view to an estimate of results, attained or to be expected, then we may admit a good deal of this excluded evidence.

The true heading for the list of *cons*, however, would be this: "Reasons why the Traders of Shanghai dislike Missionaries." Only, if this heading were adopted, two or three of the *pros* might be transferred to the *cons*; for one cause of unpopularity of missionaries among their countrymen in the East is undoubtedly their high Christian profession and practice. No doubt there are high-minded and honourable

men, many of them, among both the official and the mercantile residents in treaty ports. But it is not to be denied that decided personal religion is no better liked there than it is in "the world" at home. To some it is utterly hateful; to others, a rebuke to conscience. No "impartial" observer could leave this consideration out of his reckoning.

But no doubt Mr. Curzon would say that the question of the results of Missions is at least one of those upon which he has endeavoured to throw light. To the evidence on this subject, however, he devotes just half a page; and in the brief form in which he gives it, it is entirely misleading. After a passing hint that the statements in missionary publications must be received with caution, as "of course" they convey an impression more favourable than is apparent to "many," Mr. Curzon does adduce the official returns of the Societies, or rather, the totals gathered from them. But observe the way in which this is done. The number of "converts" is given as 37,300 in 1890, and this is affirmed to be "a proportion of only one in every 10,000 of the Chinese population." But a moment's examination would have shown Mr. Curzon that 37,300 is only the number of the inner circle of communicants. The Missionary Societies, in their anxiety not to overstate results, put forward this figure as fairly representing the spiritual fruits of their labours. But in any comparison with the aggregate population of China, the whole number of adherents must be reckoned, including both baptized persons who are not communicants and *bonâ fide* candidates for baptism. Moreover, "population" includes, of course, a large proportion of children; therefore the children of adherents, whether baptized, as in most Missions, or unbaptized, as in Baptist Missions, must likewise be included in the statistical return of "Christian population." Five minutes' inquiry of any experienced missionary would have shown Mr. Curzon that, for the purpose of his calculation, the 37,300 must be multiplied by at least three, perhaps by four. Then again, the number of Protestant missionaries is given as 1,300 in 1890, and the "37,300 converts" are credited to them as "the harvest of half a century's labour." But this omits all the converts who have died. These, on a modest estimate, would add half as many again to the number. Therefore, instead of "each shepherd having a fold of less than thirty," as Mr. Curzon expresses it, each would have (say) three times thirty, and half as many again, or 105. But even this estimate of "harvest" assumes that there have been 1,300 missionaries at work for half a century, and that all of them have been "shepherds." The figure, however, includes missionaries' wives; and nearly two-thirds of the 1,300 of 1890 were the

increase of the preceding decade. At every point, therefore, Mr. Curzon's statistical argument is incorrect and misleading. What would be thought of a consul who reported on exports and imports after this fashion?

We wonder whether Mr. Curzon was ever present in an assembly of Chinese Christians. To mention only one Mission in the smaller half of one province, Fuh-Kien: Did he chance to attend the annual conference of 300 Chinese delegates from congregations in more than a hundred towns and villages—picked men, many of them sufferers for Christ's sake, many voluntary and unpaid evangelists, and several educated and ordained clergymen? Perhaps an hour or two spent in listening to their prayers, praises, accounts of work, and practical business discussions, would have given him a view of the "results" of Missions which no statistics can ever convey.

I must not close without just referring to another part of Mr. Curzon's volume, where he devotes two pages to the consideration of the prospects of Christianity in Japan. There is here a curious illustration of the way our author collects his "evidence" and draws his inferences. He mentions the "combination of circumstances" which "has led many to suppose" that "here [in Japan] at least, the Church of Christ is sure of a magnificent spoil, and that Japan is trembling on the brink of a mighty regeneration." This is put rather rhetorically; but it is true that, a few years ago, there was a widespread impression, largely derived from the anticipations of the Japanese newspapers themselves, that a national adoption of some form of Christianity might possibly be imminent. But in a footnote to the words "on the brink of a mighty regeneration," Mr. Curzon says, "Such appears to be the view of the Church Missionary Society. . . ." (I will finish the quotation directly). Had Mr. Curzon really desired to know the view of the Church Missionary Society, he could easily have ascertained it, for it has been stated several times, and a postcard to the office would have obtained for him correct evidence by return of post. The Society has, particularly at the time that the general impression alluded to was prevalent, mentioned the fact, but mentioned it both doubtfully and deprecatingly. In the first place, its leaders did not share the extremely sanguine expectations expressed in some quarters; and in the second place, they earnestly hoped, and avowed that they hoped, that no premature adoption of an outward form of Christianity would occur, and that the superficial adhesion of a nation of 40,000,000 of people still heathen at heart would be very doubtful gain to the cause of true Christianity. But let me now finish Mr. Curzon's footnote. The evidence that

the Church Missionary Society regards Japan as "trembling on the brink of a mighty regeneration" is that "it has recently created two new bishoprics in Japan"! Might it not have occurred to Mr. Curzon that other reasons for this step were possible? When is it that two additional generals are despatched to the seat of war? Is it when victory is just complete? Or is it not rather when the campaign looks like being prolonged and arduous? The simple fact is that the plans for the new bishoprics had no connection whatever with the questionable anticipations of five or six years ago. Yet there stands that conspicuous footnote in an important and widely-read book by one of our leading authorities on Asiatic affairs! Really, there is nothing more left to be said.

EUGENE STOCK.

ART. V.—DR. KARL HIRSCHE AND THE "IMITATIO CHRISTI."

DR. KARL HIRSCHE, after spending over thirty years of his life in trying to establish the claims of Thomas à Kempis to the authorship of the "Imitatio Christi," died in July, 1892, without having been able to complete his labours, although we hope he has written enough to establish the truth of his thesis to the satisfaction of any unprejudiced reader. The results are now before us in three octavo volumes, the first of which was published in 1875, the second in 1883, while the third has only just been issued.[1]

In the first two volumes he printed a chrestomathy of the undisputed works of Thomas, with a criticism thereon in order to show the similarity to the "Imitatio," both in thought and arrangement of sentences as well as in style. He also laid great stress on a discovery which he made in the little MS. volume written by Thomas himself, a volume which is in the Burgundian Library at Brussels. This discovery was a system of punctuation and of accentuation of considerable intricacy, which brings out a rhythm, and occasionally rhymes of a great value to the reader. Dr. Hirsche did not wish to assert that such punctuation does not exist in other works of the middle ages, but that in this volume it is of such an intricate nature as is rare in MSS., and could only have been done by one who read over the works with the greatest care; and the fact of its only existing in such MSS. as are contemporaneous with Thomas,

[1] Hirsche (Karl), "Prolegomena zu einer neuen Ausgabe d. Imitatio Christi nach dem Autograph des Thomas von Kempen," Bd. iii., 8vo. Berlin, C. Habel, 1894.

and in houses of Brethren of his order, would go to prove that the accentuation Thomas had given to his works was valued and copied by his intimate friends, but passed over as non-essential by others. Dr. Hirsche published an edition of the "Imitatio" printed in accordance with this system, and notwithstanding the affection of his eyes, which hindered his work, he was enabled by the help of friends to bring out a second edition before his death.

In the present volume of the "Prolegomena" there has been added a German translation of the first book, which he was able to dictate to his wife; it is based on the punctuation of the Brussels MS.

The second title of the volume just issued is "Proof of Thomas's Authorship of the 'Imitation' from its Contents and from the MSS." From its contents Dr. Hirsche has no difficulty in proving that the author was a German, from the numerous Germanisms, or as Canon Spitzen calls them "Hollandisms,"[1] in it. The so-called Gallicisms or Italianisms pointed out by the opponents of Thomas are shown to be words in common use in works that are often quoted.

The next point advanced is that the author was a monk, as he expressly states that fact, which of course precludes the claims of Chancellor Gerson, as he was not one.

After this Dr. Hirsche dwells on the form and style of the work, which are such as we should expect from Thomas's own statement in the prologue to the "Soliloquy," in which he compares himself to a "gardener, who, by planting trees and flowers, makes a meadow into a pleasant park." There is no system or development of doctrine; there is, so to speak, "pictorial grouping;" ideas are set down and then sentences are added to throw an illuminating light upon them, and sentences are found repeated not only in the various books or treatises forming the "Imitatio," but often in the same book. This is a strong peculiarity of Thomas, as we find in his other works quotations from one another and also from the "Imitatio," so that his opponents have called him a plagiarist. This he certainly is not, for the passages are not as exotics, but are woven into the text as clear ideas of the author's own. The "Imitatio," like his other writings, was for edification; he uses doctrine merely as the groundwork of good living; "his interest as a writer does not turn on the doctrine, but on the life; he does not think it worth his while to attack "false doctrine, he attacks false ways of living." "On church government, hierarchical orders, the relations of councils to popes, of church to emperor

[1] Thomas à Kempis was born in Germany, though he lived in Holland. The fact of the words being Germanisms or Flemicisms is immaterial.

and to empire, nothing is contained in his writings." Dr. Hirsche gives a valuable *résumé* of the "Imitatio" and of its system of teaching. And having thus given all the internal evidence in favour of Thomas, he passes on to a consideration of the MSS., especially of those whose date is undisputed, and which are contemporary with Thomas. The Kirchheim Codex is generally pointed to as the oldest, and it has an inscription giving the authorship to Thomas; Dr. Hirsche, however, passes it by, as the inscription is of a different ink from the rest of the MS. The oldest he mentions is the Codex de Monte Hierosolymi (now at Wolfenbüttel); it contains the first book, and is dated 1424; it contains "De Tribus Tabernaculis," a work of Thomas. The next is the Codex Bethlehelmi, dated 1427, that is when Thomas was in his forty-seventh year; it contains the four books and is carefully written, and has the punctuation as in the Brussels MS. This MS. is also called the Gaesdonck Codex; it came from one of the houses of the Canons Regular. The others examined are the Codex Noviomagensis, 1427; Osnabrugensis, 1429 (this has only Book I.); Roolf, 1431 (in this is a different system of accentuation); Wiblingensis (Books I. and II.), 1433; Weingarten (Books I-III.), 1433; Millicensis II. (the books are here treated as parts of one work), 1433; Paduanus (4 books), 1436; Augustanus, 1437; Lunaclacensis 1438; Magdalensis (Oxford), 1438; Rothensis, 1439; Augsburg (first book), 1440; and lastly the celebrated Brussels MS., 1441. This volume has always had a peculiar importance in the controversy, on account of its having been indisputably written by Thomas himself. Is he the mere scribe, as his opponents say? Or is he not rather the author, as he makes no distinction between the four treatises forming the "Imitatio" and those which follow, concerning which no dispute as to authorship has occurred? Dr. Hirsche, in common with most modern examiners of the MS., speaks of it as neat and correct as such a document could be. Quite the opposite was the opinion of the French commissioners appointed by the Archbishop of Paris to examine the MS. when it was sent to Paris in 1671. Their examination was in one way superficial, as they call it a parchment codex, while it is partly on parchment and partly on paper. They found, first, that the third and fourth books of the "Imitatio" were transposed; second, there were omissions of words; third, solecisms; fourth, erasures and alterations, presumably by a later writer, in agreement with better texts. Dr. Hirsche points out that these objections are not so damaging as they seem, for anyone who examines MSS. must know that errors always occur. The transposition of the third and fourth books is no error, and as to the solecisms the author was not writing in classical Latin, and such words

abound in mediæval literature; besides, out of the thirty-three solecisms thirty are also in a MS. which they approve of. This was the Codex Gerardimontensis, which Gence, a follower of Gerson, takes as the text of his edition, and which agrees in almost everything with the Brussels MS. even to its contents. Gence claims it as the prototype from which the other is taken. Dr. Hirsche, however, points to the greater probability of its being the other way, as the majority of the works in both are indisputably those of Thomas à Kempis. As to the erasures and corrections, they are made by Thomas himself, and almost certainly such alterations as an author might make. Of course all this evidence would be of no avail if, as is asserted by the Gersonists, MSS. exist before the time of Thomas; but as to this Dr. Hirsche has paid great attention, and points to the uncertainty of palæography in deciding the question, and these apparently older MSS. have been shown to have been of later date from including works undoubtedly written in the fifteenth century. Dr. Hirsche was unable to enter into the question of contemporary evidence, on which point we have the proofs advanced by Kettlewell and Cruise; he has, however, done his best to prove to the unprejudiced reader that Thomas à Kempis is certainly the author of the "Imitatio Christi."

L. A. WHEATLEY.

ART. VI.—UNITY AND SCHISM.

IN the May number of the CHURCHMAN Chancellor Smith, writing on "The National Church and Unity," has criticised an article in the February number on "The Catholic Church—Schism." I think the Chancellor has somewhat misapprehended the article, and has sometimes expressed himself with ambiguity. I have not suggested that the external unity of the Church militant was a matter of indifference. On the contrary, I earnestly desire the mutual recognition and communion of all the visible Churches of Christ, their union, and the incorporation in one visible body of all members of the Mystical Body. For this object I pray and labour. I refer to "The Three Churches" in the CHURCHMAN, January, 1894. But I am unable to concur when the Chancellor, after stating that "polychurchism" is in the abstract unlawful, goes on to say, "This reflection clearly imposes upon us the duty to eradicate *all* the causes which lead to its existence and promote its growth." What! are we Anglicans to give up Episcopacy, which is the main cause of visible disunion with

the Church of Scotland? What! are we Anglicans to abandon the supremacy of Scripture—"that everlasting protest," as Archbishop Tait said, "by which in our Prayer-Book and Articles we point to Holy Scripture as the standard of truth"? And shall we rescind the protest of Articles vi., xi., xiv., xix., xxii., xxiv., xxv., xxviii., xxx., xxxii., xxxvii., which separate us from Rome? This is the aspiration of Lord Halifax. *Hoc Ithacus velit.* These suggestions must shock the loyalty of the Chancellor. I must add I regret the reference to the words of Ridley and Latimer in the days of Queen Mary, misleading if applied to justify union or communion with Rome, and, indeed, the answer is to be found in the next page (412) of "The National Church and Unity."

The critic quotes me as laying down "that physical schism is sinful when a man, in opposition to the voice of his conscience, abandons one ecclesiastical unit and resorts to another, but that it is not sinful when a man does so in obedience to the voice of his judgment and conscience." This, says the Chancellor, "can only be maintained on the footing that there are no such things as sins of ignorance," and my observations on Newman, Manning, and their associates are mentioned as cases in which I inconsistently stigmatized as schismatical men who may have been fully conscientious. This interpretation of my article (p. 232) is not accurate. I did not speak of ecclesiastical units *simpliciter*, such as the Anglican and Presbyterian Churches, the Greek and Roman bodies, but of congregations (*cœtus*) which are and have the notes of visible Churches, and of congregations which do not possess these notes. I refuse to apply the ugly word "sinful" to the conduct of a man who, holding the Catholic faith, passes at the dictate of his conscience from one to another visible Church—I may view his *mistake* with regret—but I apply the word to members of a visible Church who wilfully and not ignorantly desert it against their conscience, and also to those who, whether ignorantly or not, pass over from a visible Church with the Bible in their hands to communion with a body which does not possess the notes of and is not a visible Church.

The Anglican Church, our Church, declares dogmatically that amongst the essential notes of a visible Church are the preaching of the pure Word of God and the due administration of the sacraments. These notes are wanting in Rome. I refer also to the Black Rubric and Articles xxx., xxxi. The guilt, however, in the latter case, whether a sin of ignorance or not, is in the adoption of impure doctrine, not the consequent act of separation, and so I understand St. John's condemnation to be directed against the anti-Christs, not because they went

out, but because they were anti-Christs, probably men who denied "that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." It is well when anti-Christs leave a visible Church of Christ and go to their own place. When members of a congregation embrace false doctrine, whether sceptical or superstitious, and cannot or will not be persuaded to recant, the sooner they excommunicate themselves the better for the Church of Christ.

I do not think five pages was too much space for a discussion on the words "one Catholic Church." The question is one of supreme importance in itself, and in consequence of the confusion which arises from the ambiguous use of the word "Church" in theological papers. It is used in various significations by the Chancellor. The intention of my article was to prove that the reiterated precept by writers of the so-called High Church Party, "Hear the Church"—assigning to supposed human utterances authority co-ordinate or superior to that of Scripture—was erroneous and *absurd*, inasmuch as no Church exists with a voice to which such authority can be reasonably assigned. Such is not the Catholic Church, the mystical body of Christ, for that spiritual entity has no voice. Such is not the Church composed of all baptized persons; these are in no practical sense incorporated; neither they nor any majority of them have any collective or audible voice. Such is not any supposed combination or aggregate of all particular visible Churches (which Hooker recognises as in a sense one Church), for these have no concurrent voice or recognised organ of expression. The Lambeth Conference could not pretend to be their representative. Such is not any particular Church, nor does any particular Church claim such authority except on the assumption that it is not particular, but Catholic or Universal—an assumption intolerable to members of all the Reformed Churches. Where is the Church to instruct us with authority as to the *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, and to establish that authority as equal or paramount to the Word of God?

For myself, I have searched in vain, and I can find no Church which is entitled to say, "Hear my voice," or to which my allegiance is due, except the particular Church of which I am a member, though there are other visible Churches which command my respect and consideration, and I concede that my Church has no claim upon the allegiance of members of any other visible Church.

I have said I heartily desire the unity of the Church. But no reasonable man can hope for union or communion between the Reformed Churches amongst themselves so long as Episcopacy and the doctrines of Apostolical Succession are alleged

to be "fundamental truths," *essential* to the existence of a Church; and not only union and communion, but recognitions as visible Churches of Christ, are denied to all who do not accept these doctrines; just as union with Rome is also impossible so long as the Reformed Churches hold Scripture as the rule of faith.

ROBERT R. WARREN.

Notes and Queries.

A RENDERING OF 1 CORINTHIANS XV. 23-28.

"BUT each one in his own rank. The firstfruits is Christ. Next are those who are Christ's at His coming. Then will be the end, as soon as He shall have resigned the kingly office to God, even the Father; as soon as the latter shall have made impotent all rule, both authority and power alike.

"For He must be King until God shall have set beneath His feet all enemies. Death is the last enemy to be made impotent. For God did place beneath His feet all things in subordination. Yet it is clear that whenever He shall say that all things are placed in that subordination, the all things are exclusive of Him Who made them subordinate.

"And as soon as ever all things shall be subordinate to Him, then the Son too shall become subordinate to Him Who made all things to Him subordinate, that God might be all in all."

H. J. N. MARSTON.

Review.

Degeneration. Translated from the German of Dr. MAX NORDAU. London: Heinemann. 1895.

FEW books, at once so bulky and so prolix, have attracted more attention in recent years than the remarkable volume lying before us. No doubt the very title of the work is responsible, in some measure, for the widespread interest it has excited; and the subject, which that title indicates, is of itself a stimulating one, for the public is very curious to learn new facts and indulge in various speculations upon its own diseases, whether physical or mental and moral, and to gossip glibly thereon. But the main interest of Max Nordau's work is something more than this. It is a sincere and honest attempt to lay bare, not in any spirit of pruriency, but decidedly and vigorously, some of those "streams of tendency *not* making for righteousness" which are flowing so foully and so unrestrained through the strata of contemporary thought. The book is often unjust, and the writer's opinions are often curiously wrong-headed and inconsequent (not seldom exasperatingly inconsistent); but of its real sanity and cleanness there can be no shadow of doubt.

It is written throughout with admirable vigour and directness, and

displays frequently a keen scientific spirit. Its bias, indeed, is over-scientific at times, for if the truth be told, Max Nordau seems to have got into his head the notion that nothing is true but what is scientifically true—a fallacy which need not be refuted here. Scientific truth is good; but there is something higher and nobler even than this, and that is moral and religious truth. It is not for one moment contended here that this iron-handed castigator of our modern "morality" is blind to the supreme value of moral truth—even though his appreciation of what is termed religious and spiritual truth is uncomfortably vague and inadequate—but it is difficult not to discern in every paragraph too one-sided a leaning to science, as though it were the be-all and end-all of life, unmindful of the issue to which such leanings, if pushed to their logical consequence, are apt to tend.

"I have undertaken," says the author in his prefatory dedication to the distinguished Turin Professor, Cæsar Lombroso, "the work of investigating the tendencies of the fashions in art and literature; of proving that they have their source in the degeneracy of their authors, and that the enthusiasm of their admirers is for manifestations of more or less pronounced moral insanity, imbecility, and dementia." Max Nordau's contention is that modern degenerates are not always criminals, prostitutes, anarchists, and pronounced lunatics, but are often authors, musicians, and artists. With characteristic force of purpose, he pens chapter after chapter to demonstrate this; and, within certain limits, I think he has abundantly proved his main contention. There *is* an unceasing output of literary and scientific energy at the present time, which, if duly scrutinized, appears to contain within itself the seeds of mental decay and moral contamination throughout the entire body politic. The *fin-de-siècle* writers of the present day, with their arrogant and futile assumptions, and their total disregard of moral rectitude, as well as of that purity and sanity of thought without which no true work can be effected, are flooding the minds of the rising generation with pestilential theories and foolish fancies; and their devotees strive both to popularize these theories and fancies, as well as to exaggerate them. The disciples of Verlaine, of Baudelaire, of Ibsen, and of Maeterlinck (to name these alone) have raised the interest created by their productions, both in England and on the Continent, into the form of a cult. What this means, a careful examination of Max Nordau's exhaustive criticisms will only too clearly show. We are thankful, then, despite all the defects of Max Nordau's book (*e.g.*, his ridiculously unfair tirades against Ruskin) to find in his pages so stalwart a championing of what is manly, of what is sane, of what is lovely and of good report; and we may not unfairly follow his lead in characterizing the "decadents" and "degenerates" of our time as—far from being heralds of a new and better order—little else save mental paralytics, with diseased imaginations. Max Nordau hardly goes too far (as some recent disclosures in our midst have given us sad cause to know) when he stigmatizes their imitators as enemies to society, and when he bluntly cautions the public against the lies of such parasites.

It only remains to add that the present translation of the German original of Max Nordau's work has been admirably made, and must have cost the (nameless) translator much time and trouble. How is it that an index has been omitted? Surely, in a work of such magnitude, so necessary an aid as this ought not to have been overlooked.

E. H. Blakeney.

July, 1895.

Short Notices.

The Jesuits in China. By Canon JENKINS. Pp. 165. London: Nutt.

No English theologian knows more of the internal history of the Roman Church than the learned author of "The Life of Valentine Alberti," "The Life and Times of Cardinal Julian," "The Creed of Pope Pius IV.," and "Pre-Tridentine Doctrine." The history of the Jesuits in China forms a very curious episode in the missions of the Roman Church. The controversy on the Chinese rites agitated the Church of Rome during the seventeenth century, and illustrates the internal machinery of that great and complex organization. Canon Jenkins writes with complete knowledge of his subject, and with studied impartiality. Such a monograph on one of the by-paths of Church history is not only interesting in itself, but, like a bone in the hands of Professor Owen, it throws light on the whole character and structure of Romanism.

A Churchman to Churchmen. By the Rev. A. E. BARNES-LAWRENCE. Pp. 112. Price 1s. Simpkin, Marshall and Co., 1893.

By some strange oversight this valuable little book has not been noticed before. It contains six papers on the points on which the followers of Dr. Newman have been leaving the teaching of the Church of England. These points are: The Church, The Ministry, Baptism, The Lord's Supper, The Prayer-Book, The Different Means of Grace. Mr. Barnes-Lawrence states with clearness and firmness the historical doctrine of the Reformed Church on these matters; and his work will put things plainly and decisively before many a perplexed mind.

The Churchman's Manual. By Bishop NUTTALL, of Jamaica. Pp. 318. S.P.C.K.

This little manual is a useful compendium of Church of England devotion and teaching. It consists of two parts: (1) Didactic and devotional; (2) Catechetical. The first part contains rules for holy living; the Lord's Prayer explained; the Apostles' Creed explained; private prayers; family prayers; children's prayers; preparation for Communion; companion to Communion; confirmation; marriage; doctrines and duties; a scheme for reading Scripture; history and explanation of the Prayer-Book; and a help to visiting.

The Primate of the West Indies writes as an evangelical member of the Church of England, and with learning, thought, and moderation.

Which Way? or, The Old Faith and the New. By Miss E. J. WHATELY. R.T.S. Pp. 127.

The Religious Tract Society have performed a good service to the Church in publishing these papers of the able and thoughtful daughter of the famous Archbishop of Dublin. The work should be on the list of the Church Pastoral Aid Society, and be circulated widely with that of Mr. Barnes-Lawrence. Miss Whately writes with great acuteness and excellent historical judgment on the difference between Romanists and Protestants: The Old Faith of the Apostles, and the New Faith of the Fourth Century; Rome's Claim to Supremacy; The Infallible Church; The Guardianship of the Scriptures; Idolatry; The Priesthood and the Altar; Confession and Priestly Intercession; The Five Additional Sacraments; Works of Merit; Venial and Mortal Sins; and Purgatory.

We earnestly pray for a blessing on this most useful volume.

Apostolical Succession tested by Holy Scripture. By Principal WALLER. Pp. 132. Price 1s. London: Thynne.

This is an admirable and convincing appeal to Scripture against mere human tradition on a very important subject.

The Catechism of the Orthodox Eastern Church. Pp. 63. S.P.C.K.

This is the shorter edition of 1888. It is very interesting by way of comparison with our own Catechism. It recognises the seven Sacraments, but its doctrine of the Eucharist appears moderate: "Great is the mystery of the Eucharist, because it represents the death and sacrifice of Jesus on the cross on our behalf."

Christian Creeds and Confessions. By Professor GUMLICH. Pp. 136. London: Norgate and Co. 1893.

Without actually giving word for word these different documents, the learned author gives their chief characteristics and points of difference. People very often talk vaguely about differences of creed and opinion; but in this important handbook they will find these differences most clearly and tersely put.

A Briton's Birthright. By A. S. LAMB. Pp. 102. Price 1s. Nisbet and Co.

This useful and timely book calls attention to the privilege of belonging to a National Established Church, shows that this is intended to be Protestant, exhibits the fact that this character is now in danger, inquires with great perspicuity how this bas been brought about, and shows that Disestablishment would be no remedy. The facts which the writer adduces are indisputable. One slight mistake, made by Lord Coleridge, is quoted, in which he said that the Virgin in the Reredos at St. Paul's Cathedral was crowned. She is simply a human figure.

The book places the aims of modern Sacerdotalism in a strong, clear, and unquestionable light.

Some Notable Archbishops of Canterbury. By the Rev. MONTAGUE FOWLER. Pp. 222. Price 3s. S.P.C.K.

These are careful and thoughtful studies by a writer who has had the advantage of living in the atmosphere of Lambeth. The primates selected are Augustine, Theodore, Anselm, Becket, Chicheley, Warham, Cranmer, Parker, Laud, Sancroft, Howley, Sumner, Longley, and Tait.

There are excellent chromolithograph portraits of Grindal, Warham, Cranmer, Parker, Laud and Whitgift. Also a succession of the Archbishops of Canterbury and a table of brief facts about each of the ninety-one. Mr. Fowler's style is pleasant, and his judgment sound and temperate.

Fallen Angels. By ONE OF THEM. Pp. 230. Gay and Bird.

The writer has thought long and seriously on the subject of human existence, sin, and suffering; and has deliberately adopted a theory of pre-existence. He believes that we are each being offered another chance in consequence of some previous fall, and that in this way all things at last will be subdued to the will of God. He has collected an enormous number of interesting opinions on this and kindred subjects, and writes with point and force. He asks the most unexpected questions on subjects usually taken for granted, and his writing is full of interesting suggestions.

The Review of the Churches. Vols. V. and VI. October, 1893—October, 1894. Pp. 386 and 449.

This very useful and beautifully illustrated publication has been changed from a monthly to a quarterly edition. The change is probably considerably regretted, as there was no other monthly review that brought the events of co-temporary English Christian life into one focus. The title was probably against a wider circulation, as the plural of the word "Church" is unpalatable to the High Church party. We cordially wish the new quarterly a successful and useful career.

The Householders' Treasure. By the Rev. F. BOURDILLON. Pp. 288. Price 2s. 6d. R.T.S.

Mr. Bourdillon's charm as a religious writer has long been acknowledged; and everything from his pen is received with gratitude. The present volume consists of forty-two papers on suggestive subjects, with printed titles. They would make capital subjects for addresses; and are full of that personal sympathy, and strong, clear, and intelligent faith which in all Mr. Bourdillon's writings have been so helpful.

Sierra Leone after a Hundred Years. Bishop INGHAM, of Sierra Leone. Pp. 368. Seeley and Co.

This very interesting historical account begins with Governor Clarkson's diary; continues with gleanings from the company's reports and other records, and has sketches of the population, Christianity, and the general results.

The Bishop says: "There is much to be very thankful for. More progress would have been observable, as has been already indicated, but for the unsettlement caused by constant immigrations; and if children and fools, as they say, should never be allowed to see a work half finished, let us be careful not to judge too hastily by what we may at present observe in a people who are by no means of one original tribe or language, who are, however, in process of formation into one people, and who are passing through phases—sometimes unlovely ones—towards a more final development."

Such monographs on particular missions by those best acquainted with them are of high value.

Augustine and his Companions. By the BISHOP OF STEPNEY. Pp. 201. Price 1s. 6d. S.P.C.K.

The volume contains an admirable series of four lectures delivered in St. Paul's Cathedral in January, 1895. It follows the volume on "The Church in these Islands before the Coming of Augustine." There are few scholars so well qualified to speak on these earlier periods of Church history than the late Disney professor. His lectures are full of matter, and bright in style; the interest never once flags, and he may be depended on for absolute accuracy. There are two interesting notes: one on co-consecrators, in reference to the consecration of Archbishop Parker, and the other on the Pallium.

Foundation Stones of the Church of England. By AUSTEN CLARE. Pp. 187. Price 2s. 6d. S.P.C.K.

This interesting little volume contains fifteen lessons, with story-illustrations on the founding of the Church of England. They are written in a style interesting to children, and will serve a very useful purpose in the schoolroom. It is in five parts, each containing three lessons: The Ancient British Church; The Roman Mission; The Celtic Mission; The Spiritual Children of Landisfarne; Organization; and Consolidation.

The Following of Christ. By the Rev. CHARLES L. MARSON. Pp. 199. Price 5s. Elliot Stock.

This daintily-printed volume contains short extracts on a great variety of moral and religious subjects, by a great variety of writers, ancient and modern, in poetry and prose. The width of selection is illustrated by the fact that among the authors quoted are Bishop Lightfoot, Dr. Arnold, F. D. Maurice, J. S. Mill, Carlyle, Martineau, Jowett, T. H. Green, Newman, Pusey, Scott, Dr. Parker, and Stopford Brooke. The collection is helpful and suggestive.

The Life and Teachings of Jesus. By ARTHUR KENYON ROGERS. G. P. Putnam and Sons. 1894.

This book is divided into two parts, the first dealing with the source of the four Gospels, the second with the life and teachings of Jesus. The author proves, to his own satisfaction, if to that of nobody else, that the Fourth Gospel was not written by St. John, but probably by some presbyter of the early Church, who intended it to be read as an ideal work of fiction. Mr. Rogers also tells us that few, if any, of the miracles we read of in the Gospels occurred; that the fact of the Resurrection is extremely doubtful, and that Christ did not institute the Eucharist. On the whole, however, though there is much in it with which we can not agree, the book is well written, and, if read with care, should prove interesting.

Fables and Fabulists. By THOMAS NEWBIGGING. Pp. 152. Elliot Stock.

It was a happy idea of the writer to gather together accounts of those who, in the long history of literature, have used this charming form for imparting wisdom. He writes agreeably of Æsop, Phau Babr, Pilpay, Lockman, La Fontaine, Gay, Dodsley, Northcote, Lessing, Yriarte, Krilot, and the old Hindoo, Arabian, and Persian fables. It is an instructive introduction to a fascinating department of literature.

Public School Text Books of Religious Instruction:

The Pentateuch. By the late BISHOP OF BATH AND WELLS and the Rev. C. HOLE. Pp. 240. Price 2s. 6d.

The Gospel of St. Mark. By the Hon. and Rev. E. LYTTELTON. Pp. 180. Price 2s. Longman and Co.

No safer guide could be found for the literature of the Pentateuch than Lord Arthur Hervey. His work was uncompleted, but was finished by a most careful and experienced scholar, Mr. Hole.

The notes to St. Mark are very brief. According to the preface, they are meant to help the reader if he is willing to work; but they assuredly will not deceive him if he is not. They merely suggest lines of thought, giving references for the following out of the suggestions. Mr. Lyttelton is deeply interested in the religious teaching of public schools, and may be trusted to know how much it is useful to give the boy.

Handbooks for Bible-classes:

From the Exile to the Advent. By the Rev. WILLIAM FAIRWEATHER. Pp. 210. Price 2s. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

The centuries covered by this manual are little known by readers of the Bible. This volume is an extremely useful and careful summary of events, tendencies, and influences of the time between Ezra and our Lord.

Present-Day Primers:

A Primer of Assyriology. By Professor SAYCE. Pp. 127. R.T.S.

The wonderful story of the discovery and decipherment of Babylonian and Assyrian inscriptions is here concisely and ably given. The harmony of the history of these two great countries and the Bible is sketched, and the results of the inscription in point of religion and literature are supplied. There are seven excellent illustrations. The little book shows clear light on a subject of profound importance, even to the elementary student of the Bible.

MAGAZINES.

We have received the following (August) 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.

ON St. Peter's Day, at St. Paul's Cathedral, the Archbishop of Canterbury, with several assistant Bishops, consecrated the Rev. Canon Awdry as Bishop Suffragan of Southampton, Archdeacon Maples as Bishop of Likoma, the Rev. W. M. Richardson as Bishop of Zanzibar, the Rev. John Dart as Bishop of New Westminster, and the Rev. E. A. Anderson as Bishop of Riverina. The sermon was preached by Canon Jacob, Vicar of Portsea.

The Very Rev. Frank Rosebrook Millspaugh has been elected Bishop of Kansas, in succession to the late Bishop Thomas. The Bishop-elect is an American by birth, and has passed his life in the United States. He was educated at first at the Shattuck Military School, but, coming under the influence of Dr. Breck, the pioneer missionary of Minnesota, and of the late Bishop of Kansas, he entered the Seabury Divinity School, and was eventually ordained to a church in the diocese of Minnesota. Afterwards, however, at the suggestion of Bishop Whipple, he took up missionary work in a part of the diocese. He was appointed Dean of Trinity Cathedral, Omaha, in 1876; and during his ten years' tenure of the office the cathedral was erected. He afterwards accepted the charge of St. Paul's, Minneapolis, where he did an important work for many years. In April, 1894, he accepted an invitation from the late Bishop of Kansas and became Dean of Grace Cathedral.

Archdeacon Bardsley, D.D., Vicar of Bradford, has informed his congregation of his intended resignation. He has been Vicar of Bradford for fifteen years, and has been appointed by the Bishop of Ripon to the vacant residential canonry in the cathedral of the diocese.

The recent annual report of the Church Missionary Society shows that the society now occupies 434 stations, of which 47 are in West Africa, 15 in Eastern Equatorial Africa, 2 in Egypt and Arabia, 16 in Palestine, 2 in Persia and Bagdad, 176 in India, 22 in Ceylon, 10 in Mauritius, 28 in China, 14 in Japan, 41 in New Zealand, 52 in North-West America, and 9 in the district of the North Pacific. The total number of workers in connection with the society now amounts to 5,973. The European missionaries consist of 344 clergy, 93 laymen, and 466 females, of whom 274 are the wives of missionaries. There are 20 Eurasian clergy, while the native workers consist of 309 clergy, 3,744 laymen, and 997 females. The native Christian adherents number 210,624, of whom 187,586 have been baptized. The communicants number 56,538. The returns of baptisms during the year are necessarily incomplete, but 12,467 have been recorded —viz., 4,478 adult, and 7,989 infant baptisms. The society has 2,016 schools and seminaries, with a total of 84,725 native scholars. The medical missions of the society provided relief for 4,846 in-patients and 373,355 out-patients.

At their recent meeting, the committee of the Bishop of Liverpool's Clergy Sustentation Fund were enabled to raise the stipends of underpaid incumbents with large populations under their charge to a minimum of £270, or £245 with house. They also sought to level up the incomes of clergy with small rural parishes to £235, or its equivalent. This is an advance of £10 over last year in the former class, and of £5 in the latter class. The Bishop's desire is to raise the minimum of the former to £300, and of the latter to £250. There are livings so small that even the committee's maximum grant (£80 and £60 respectively) do not raise the stipends to the desired minimum.

The annual general meeting of the Corporation of the Church House has been held at the Church House, Dean's Yard, the Archbishop of Canterbury presiding. Those present included the Bishop of London, Lord Egerton of Tatton, Admiral Sir Erasmus Ommanney, Lord Ashcombe, the Hon. Dudley Fortescue, and the Dean of Westminster. The annual report stated that satisfactory progress was being made with the new Church House, and particularly with the great hall block. There was now every probability that the fabric would be completed before the end of the present year. During the year the subscriptions and donations had been greater than those of either of the two previous years. The Bishop of London proposed the adoption of the report, and referred with satisfaction to the progress which was being made with the erection of the real Church House. He could speak from experience as to the utility of the Church House, for meetings of committees of Convocation and of other bodies connected with Church work were now held with facility and convenience. The library was being added to in a generous manner, and it was hoped that further donations in this respect would be made. Lord Ashcombe seconded the motion, and remarked that the Church House was an absolutely necessary adjunct to the Church of England.

The annual meeting of the Curates' Augmentation Fund has been held at Grosvenor House. The Archbishop of York presided, and said he hoped the meeting would result in a large increase of subscriptions and an access of new energy. The report, presented by the Rev. J. R. Humble, showed receipts of £11,499, the year's increase of £1,996 being chiefly due to legacies. The amount distributed in grants was £7,090. While in eighteen years £20,000,000 had been raised for Church work, this had chiefly been spent on bricks and mortar, while the claims of flesh and blood had been strangely neglected. The Earl of Cranbrook, in moving the adoption of the report, said that the money given by this society, at whose birth he had assisted, was not a charity, but a reward for work done. He could not altogether agree that there was a great want of additional benefices. It was better to have a large parish under a clergyman with a staff of curates than to divide it into a number of poor livings. This enormous subdivision was telling much against the interests of the Church. Men were simply bewildered by the number of claims made upon them. He looked forward to a time when the Church as a Church, and acting through her authorities, should combine her forces. The population was increasing in a frightful ratio, and the Church, as it claimed to be national, must meet the wants of the nation. The clergy were never less able to multiply curates, but curates must be multiplied, or the needs of the population met by lay help; and the duty fell upon the laity. Landowners were suffering very grievously; but there were duties which must be fulfilled, or evils worse than the loss of a little money would be the result. Prebendary Webb-Peploe, who seconded the motion, said there were 1,300 curates who had reached the age recognised by the society, with very little prospect of preferment. At least £2,000 had been

spent on their education, yet at the age of fifty their average income was about £120. The beneficed clergy had never been in such straits before, and there were now 11,000 fewer benefices than clergymen. It could hardly be expected that parents would send their sons into the Church unless every clergyman should have some prospect of comfort, though not of luxury, in his declining years. The motion was supported by Prebendary Barker, and carried. The Archdeacon of London moved that the society deserved the hearty and liberal support of all Churchmen. This resolution was seconded by Sir Walter Phillimore and adopted.

A meeting of the board of management of the Bishop of London's Fund has been held at the office, 46a, Pall Mall, the Bishop of London in the chair. The report of the executive committee stated that the total amount received between January 1 and July 6 had been £15,152, being £1,224 more than the amount received up to the corresponding date in 1894. With the balance at the beginning of the year this had placed at the disposal of the committee a total sum of £20,898. Grants had been made as follows: Missionary clergy, £1,250; additional curates, £3,280; lay agents, £2,746; parsonages, £875; schools, £1,505; mission buildings, £4,804; and churches, £2,470—a total of over £16,930. A sum of £206 had been received for the Special Church Repair Fund, and grants amounting to £195 had been made for the repair of seven churches. The total amount of Church collections received up to July 6 had been £5,344, received from 378 churches.

The Archdeacon of London presided (in the absence, through illness, of the Dean of Canterbury) at the thirty-ninth annual meeting of the Poor Clergy Relief Corporation. Dr. Pigott read the report, which stated that during the past year the income of the corporation had increased under every head—annual subscriptions from £2,805 to £2,875, donations from £3,586 to £5,910, church collections from £226 to £248, and legacies from £1,570 to £5,858. As against this, the official auditors' statement shows that the grants, ranging from £5 to £50 each, voted to 976 cases, amounted to £10,972—an increase of £3,000 over the sum distributed by the committee during the preceding year. A warm tribute was paid to the memory of the late Lord Selborne, who had been a most generous supporter to the corporation, as was almost every member of his family, from its foundation.

The thirty-first annual meeting of the supporters of the St. Andrew's Waterside Church Mission has been held at the Church House, Dean's Yard, the Bishop of St. Albans presiding. The annual report recorded satisfactory work for the year, but stated that while the total receipts showed an increase, there was a decrease in the amount received from legacies and donations, and the council had been compelled to discontinue some grants for want of funds. Increased support was urgently needed to enable the council to carry on the work of the mission.

At Belfast a very interesting function has been performed by the Right Hon. the Lord Mayor in the unveiling of a handsome memorial tablet to the Right Hon. Sir Joseph Napier, Bart., late Lord Chancellor of Ireland, Vice-Chancellor and M.P. for Dublin University, LL.D., D.C.L., M.R.I.A. The tablet has been erected in connection with the Church of Ireland Young Men's Society, in the founding of which many years ago the late distinguished Belfastman took a warm interest, and the first lecture in the interests of which he delivered. The monument, which is of the Renaissance style of architecture, of very chaste design, is placed on the left wall entering the hall, near the platform. It is

supported on two projecting corbels, moulded and carved on face, between which is a semicircular slab or apron, having the coat-of-arms, with mantle, crest, and motto of deceased, sculptured in high relief, with foliage springing from either side. A richly-moulded cornice rests on the corbels, and supports the inscription slab, on which is neatly engraved the following inscription :

"Erected by the Members of the Church of Ireland Young Men's Society, Belfast,
In Memory of the Right Honourable
SIR JOSEPH NAPIER, BART.,
One of the patrons of the Society, and by whom the first public lecture in its interest was delivered. As a lawyer trusted implicitly and successful; a staunch friend, an honoured Irishman, one of whose history Belfast may well congratulate itself. His public career was marked by most sterling qualities, honourable, upright, consistent, and of the very highest principle; in Parliament a skilful and able debater and a wise counsellor; in the General Synod of the Church of Ireland a constant and most helpful member for many years; a firm, uncompromising, evangelical Protestant, adhering faithfully all his life to the principles of the Reformation. Born at Belfast 26th December, 1804; educated at Belfast Academy under James Sheridan Knowles, and afterwards in Trinity College, Dublin. Elected M.P. for Dublin University, of which he was eventually Vice-Chancellor, 1847; Attorney-General of Ireland, 1852; D.C.L. of Oxford, 1853; Lord Chancellor of Ireland, 1858; created a baronet, 1867; his coat-of-arms placed in Gray's Inns, 1868; appointed a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, 1868; Chief Commissioner of the Great Seal, 1871; died at St. Leonard's, 9th December, 1882. Aged 78 years. 'Thou hast brought me to great honour and comforted me on every side.'—Psalm lxxi. 19 v. This monument is to one of the noblest of the sons of the United Kingdom."

The Rev. Ernest L. Ridge, chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, has written to the papers: "The Archbishops of Canterbury and York have for some months past ceased to be patrons of the Church Extension Society (Sisters of the Church)."

The Bishop of Dover has consecrated a new church, by the name of "The Church of the Holy Innocents," to be a chapel-of-ease for the parish of St. Mark, Lower Norwood. The church has been erected in the Decorated style from designs by Messrs. Bodley and Garner, and has cost £10,000.

Bishop Wilkinson has consecrated the English Church of St. John, Boulogne. The building cost £6,000, and is the result of seven years' labour on the part of the chaplain, the Rev. J. H. Fry. The church is vested in the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.

The new English Church of St. James the Apostle, at Grindelwald, will be opened on St. James's Day, July 25, when the sermon will be preached by the Dean of Norwich. The cost of the church will be about £2,200, and it will seat 300 persons. About £1,400 is still required. The patronage of this chaplaincy is now in the hands of the Colonial and Continental Church Society, 9, Sergeants' Inn, Fleet Street, and it is earnestly hoped that visitors to the Continent who are interested in the work will contribute to the building fund.

The Corporation of the Church House has received a donation of £200 from Mr. Albert Brassey towards the building fund.

An anonymous donation of £1,000 has been received by the Additional Curates' Society.

The Fishmongers' Company have contributed £1,500 to the decoration of St. Paul's Cathedral, the cost of the mosaic in the chancel dome which represents the creation of fishes.