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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

SEPTEMBER, 1895.

ART. I.—CHRISTIAN MISSIONS IN CHINA.

A people numerous as the ocean sands,
And glorying as the mightiest of mankind;
Yet where they are, contented to remain;
From age to age resolved to cultivate
Peace, and the arts of peace: turning to gold
The very ground they tread on, and the leaves
They gather from their trees year after year.

ROGERS.

THE recent war between China and Japan has been not only startling in its issues, but also misleading in its apparent lessons and conclusions. The sudden and complete collapse of China's colossal power before the vigorous attacks of Europeanized Japan, though a surprise to the world at large, was no surprise to those who knew something of the ramifications of decay in Chinese official systems, both civil, military and naval — years of corruption and misrule, of unpaid officials and consequent official extortion and wholesale pilfering, of uneducated and ill-trained officers, and rank and file without love of country or trust in their leaders—all this must of necessity have produced sooner or later failure and collapse, notwithstanding many cases of individual heroism and conspicuous gallantry. And the grave fears which many have long entertained, lest the very wide spread of the opium habit in the Chinese army might enervate and demoralize her fighting power, seem to have been fulfilled in a startling manner indeed. But if the world concludes from this war that the Chinese are cowards and have no stomach for hard fighting, the world is quite mistaken. Well trained, well paid, well led, the Chinese on land or on sea may yet prove most formidable foes not to Eastern Powers only, but also to the armies and navies of the West. Or if we conclude from recent events that Japan is civilized and enlightened, and China far behind in

barbarism and ignorance, here again the conclusion is hasty, and in great measure erroneous. Whatever advantage quick-silvery Japan may have taken of her contact with the West during the past twenty-five years—and however thick or thin the veneer of Western customs may be which now covers the Japanese people—it is notorious that Chinese civilization has for long centuries commanded the homage of Japan, so far at any rate as literature is concerned, insomuch that no educated Japanese would allow himself to be ignorant of Chinese classical lore; whereas educated Chinese are as a rule profoundly and contemptuously ignorant of Japanese literature. Now, this leads me to the position which I wish to maintain in the present paper—namely, that China, from the fact of her ancient civilization, from the glory of her ancient literature, from the comparatively high tone of her ancient religions, and from her pride of power and of fancied universal superiority, *affords to Christian missions a field of almost unique difficulty, and a field therefore of supreme honour and importance.*

We have been sometimes asked by unfriendly or patronizing critics to realize the audacity and presumption of our missionary enterprise by imagining a Buddhist priest or a Confucianist sage on the steps of St. Paul's Cathedral, or on the slopes of Hampstead Heath, expounding in imperfect English his foreign creed and philosophy for the enlightenment of educated Christian Englishmen. The comparison has never seemed to me quite honest, and therefore not quite so alarming as the critics would wish us to believe. For in the first place it is based upon a disguised but yet perceptible *petitio principii*. The whole force must be derived from the assumption, which we utterly reject, that the claims, historical, doctrinal and spiritual, of Christianity and of other religions are so nearly similar as to reduce them merely to rival claimants for the faith of mankind. If this were so, then indeed an English Christian preacher in Chinese temple courts, and a Buddhist preacher in English Christian shrines, would be on a par, either as to absurdity or as to audacity, whichever you please.

But if Christianity be, as its great facts of Divine miracle absolutely prove to be the case, Divine, heavenly, and not Western or Eastern, then the picture fades away, and the comparison fails to convince or to alarm. Moreover, in many mission fields—in regions of West or East or Central Africa, or amongst the Makololo and other tribes of South Africa, or amongst the Papuans of Australia, or the Eskimo of the far North—the comparison is almost impossible. There, in countless instances, the European Christian missionary en-

counters barbarism, gross ignorance, dying if not extinct religions, conscience in a state of coma, literature unknown, the languages not reduced to writing, and even the simplest arts of civilization in agricultural implements or mechanical contrivances absent. And the consequence is, that so far from threatening to send rival religious emissaries to England, the natives, if not blinded by ferocious hostility, regard the missionary as a demi-god, as far and away their superior in knowledge and education; and they listen to the religious teaching also as the word of a superior race, and as claiming their fear at any rate, and their awed attention—a voice as it were from mid-air, if not from the very heaven of heavens.

In China the scene is quite different, so that the critics' comparative picture looms once more on our sight. And firm faith in our Divine mission, and simple obedience to our Lord's command, save us triumphantly, it is true, but thus *only*, from ridicule, and the charge of audacity and meddlesomeness; because in China we are *not* demi-gods, but, in common parlance, barbarians or worse. We may boast of our Western civilization, and of the triumphs and wonders of our printed literature, and the Chinese scholar will tell you quietly that the secret of printing was discovered in China so long ago as A.D. 177, when the ancient classics were engraved on stone and impressions taken from them; and that block printing was practised in the T'ang Dynasty (A.D. 618-910), and adopted for the printing of the nine classics by Imperial order A.D. 952, or 470 years before the birth of Caxton (A.D. 1422)—as far before that father of European printing as we are after him. Or if we venture to speak of the wide spread of education in England, especially during this nineteenth century, and of our system of competitive examinations, opening the avenues to posts of emolument and of influence in civil and military departments practically to the whole population of our islands, our Chinese friend will courteously remind us that this wonderful proof of the awakening of England has been the custom in the Central Realm for at least a thousand years; that the highest office in the empire below the dragon throne has been open to the lowest peasant in the land by competitive examination through all these centuries; and that the reverence for literature, and the universality of the education of boys with a view to a literary career, has been a characteristic of Chinese civilization all through the dark middle ages of England's and Europe's comparative ignorance and semi-barbarism. "To be sure," the Chinese disputant will perhaps add, "we cannot keep pace with you gentlemen from the West in the discoveries and applications of modern science. Your astronomical knowledge

we envy and admire; your railways, telegraphs, mining and geological researches, all these outstrip us. But while you were asleep in scarcely more than animal life, untaught and untrained in reading and composition, our nation was absorbed in the study and imitation of the historical records of our ancient realm; of the odes, which were old when our old sage Confucius lived and taught and worked two thousand five hundred years ago; and of the philosophy of Mencius and Chwangtse: and they were absorbed also in the investigation of the secrets of nature by way of astrology, geomancy and kindred sciences."

And when we draw nearer, and, abandoning all further allusion to the effects of education and civilization in Christian lands, strive to bring our friend face to face with the message and the great Sender of the message, he replies, still perhaps courteously and calmly, "You bring us religions from the far West. Doubtless your system is an excellent one, and well suited for your honourable country. But we in China are not devoid of religious systems; we have, in fact, three creeds—Confucianism, Buddhism, and Taoism; two founded and sanctioned by the great teachers and philosophers, Confucius and Laotzu, six hundred years before your sage lived." Here we eagerly correct our friend. "Not so," we say, "for Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. But pray proceed." "The third," he says, "Buddhism, was founded by the great Indian sage even earlier in the world's history, and was brought to our country eighteen hundred years ago. These creeds all teach us to be good, and we accept them; why should you introduce this foreign creed, with a similar object, doubtless, but superfluous and disturbing, in our opinion, and also in the opinion of our great Emperor, Yung Ching, who, in his sacred edict nearly two hundred years ago, warned us against strange and outlandish creeds?" Are we to reply with denunciation and wholesale condemnation? God forbid! St. Paul refrained from such with far greater provocation and temptation in image-ridden Athens. China's creeds are not self-condemned, as so many of India's systems are. They all three promulgate and approve of high-toned systems of morality; their searches after the absolute are often startling in their earnestness and keenness; and their temples for the most part are filled with images of placid and majestic mien, or of terror only and threatening. Our answer must be very far indeed from one of supercilious contempt, or haughty disdain. We accept large parts of their moral precepts. We simply ask, Has anyone in your honourable country followed these systems honestly and constantly? Your religions talk of good deeds—can they tell you how to get rid of the guilt of our bad deeds? They all admit the presence of moral evil—

can they eradicate it? Can they pardon the past, and justify the sinner, and guide the bewildered, sin-plagued soul into the land of righteousness? Your own great sage, Confucius, and your common proverbial talk, unite in admitting that there is none righteous, no, not one; and that there is no place of prayer for the sinner against heaven!

And it is just here that faith, the faith which, as I have said above, alone justifies our mission enterprise, becomes no longer mere endurance, but flashes into triumph. For here the vague guesses of religious thought yield to the certainty of Christian verities. Here in the atonement, and justification, and intercession of the incarnate Son of God, and in the Divine Spirit's sanctifying power, moral failures and moral faults are forgiven and obliterated; morality is no longer a scheme of duty, but a living reality; and the soul is prepared for life eternal without transmigration, or restless change, in that blissful atmosphere where holiness is the everlasting environment.

But my contention is that it requires a very firm grasp on Christian certainties, and a very loyal obedience to the Saviour's command, to buoy the missionary up, when sometimes in weakness and in weariness, sometimes confronted by Chinese pride and arrogance, or by polite superciliousness, he tells his message on a foreign shore, and in a foreign tongue.

Neither must we forget, in estimating aright the difficulties of missionary enterprise in China, and its successes notwithstanding, that we are not in China the *conquering* race. We are regarded, indeed, as a *masterful* race, more particularly in the wars of 1840-42 and 1856-58; but the prestige which attaches to the English name in India, where, with the strange expansion of our power, order, security, civilization, and improvement have come to the people—such a prestige is to a very small extent indeed ascribed to the European name in China. In China surely, if anywhere, our Divine faith conquers in its own Divine might, and not by any adventitious advantages.

Now, *is* it conquering? It is most certainly advancing and expanding, and is conquering *hearts*, if not nations and tribes. "The Word of the Lord," the blessed Book of God, in the *Wên-li* or classical style (the dead language of China, which is used for literature alone), and in the *Kwan-hwa* and other spoken languages—that Word which has its own voice wherever it speaks to readers or hearers, and its own fine-tempered edge of convicting sharpness, has now "free course," and is "running" through the land, though not yet everywhere "glorified." "The wires are laid," as a missionary in Mid-China said long ago; "we wait but the flash from heaven." Christianity, though often exposed to ignorant and truculent assault, and

Christians, though often tried by official or by family worry and persecution, yet enjoy full legal toleration. And the official recognition of the beneficent object of our Divine religion, in the treaty which sanctions the promulgation and acceptance of Christianity, has never been officially traversed or withdrawn.

The number of Chinese Christian adherents in connection with the Protestant churches of Europe and America has grown to a body exceeding 100,000; whereas seventy years ago every Protestant Chinese Christian could have been seated in one small room in Hong-Kong. The Roman Catholic Christians are estimated at more than a million.

The Church of England, though still far behind some other Christian Missions in China, is developing her organization. In 1861, when the writer first went to China, we had one English Bishop for all China and Japan. Now there are four English Bishops in China (one for Western Mid-China is to be consecrated very shortly), three for Japan, and one in Corea; besides an American Bishop in China, and one in Japan.

The number of native clergy in China connected with the Churches of the Anglican Communion amounts to upwards of thirty, whereas there was scarcely more than one Chinese in Holy Orders thirty-five years ago.

Theological colleges, training schools, and day schools for boys and girls in very large numbers, are carrying on work of supreme importance; and Mission hospitals, some of them admirably equipped, and managed with cleanliness, and skill, and energy which European hospitals could scarcely surpass, are exercising influence of incalculable value.

And, thank God, "the engrafted Word" brought home by the Spirit of God, has "saved" a large number of Chinese "souls," who have passed beyond the reach of the voices of persecutor or of tempter for ever; and the loving Spirit of God is leading daily increasing numbers into the land of righteousness.

I shall be thankful indeed to God if this brief review of China as a Mission-field, of unique difficulty and of supreme interest and importance, may lead readers of the CHURCHMAN to deeper and more careful study of this great land, and its history and people; and then, further on to the solemn question, Why should I not go in person, and help in my measure, by the Holy Spirit's grace, to win China for Christ?

ARTHUR E. MOULE, B.D.

NOTE.—The foregoing article was written before the appalling news from China reached England of the sudden outbreak of ferocious fanaticism by which missionaries belonging to the C.M.S. and C.E.Z.M.S., well known to many readers of the CHURCHMAN, and loved and honoured for their life and work, had been murdered with great barbarity.

China seems bent upon ruining her reputation in the eyes of the civilized world. Public authority must demand, not blind vengeance, but justice, which is the truest mercy; and the full recognition and guarantee of those treaty rights and privileges, the lapse or ignoring of which may endanger the safety of every foreigner in China. In calmer moments one might be tempted to plead that till the staring posters in the streets of London and at every railway-station bookstall shall be clear for, say six consecutive months, from the announcement of murder, outrage and violent crime in England, China cannot in common justice be condemned as cruel, barbarous, and inhuman, because of the barbarous and inhuman cruelty of a band of fanatics in one of its wide provinces.

But these are not calm moments, and I leave the argument of my paper unaltered, and perhaps only fortified by the terrible events at Kucheng on August 1. Put the worst construction possible on these massacres, I still maintain that a country with such strange, unique, and contradictory features, an ancient civilization, a literature of extreme antiquity and of the greatest interest, religions in their original forms marked by pathetic earnestness and high moral codes, pride of race, of history and of the fancied suzerainty of the world, all these rudely shaken by outbreaks of local atrocities indescribable in their horrors, and of cruelty inconceivable in its diabolical details, afford surely to the Christian athlete a foe to be thrown in the Master's name, and by those "wrestling thews" which the Spirit of God alone can give—a foe not to be despised or ridiculed, not to be hated or neglected, but to be won and conquered by faith and prayer and the Gospel of the grace of God.

Such, I am sure, is the vengeance for which those martyred spirits would call could they speak to us from that peaceful shore "where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest."

A. E. M.

August 5.

ART. II.—REUNION.[1]

THE chief difficulties and perplexities of life arise when two principles, both of them good, come, or seem to come, in conflict with each other. When that which is plainly right is confronted with wrong, when moral and immoral action are set one against the other, our decision is quickly arrived at, and we pass on; but when one principle leads us forward, and another which seems equally admirable thrusts us back, our interest is at once awakened. We ask ourselves which of the two is to prevail, which should be predominant, and which should give way.

The two principles of truth and unity seem thus to come into conflict. They do not really do so, for where truth is not present unity becomes only conspiracy in error, but they seem to conflict in many particular cases. Now, when this occurs, each man is bound to strike for truth, and, if it must be, to let unity go. *Stet veritas, ruat cœlum.* Belief of a truth is one thing; acceptance of a truth which we do not believe for the

[1] Paper read at a meeting of the South-Eastern Church and Lay Alliance, June 19, 1895.

sake of bringing about or preserving union is another. Acceptance substituted for belief is not a virtue, but a vice. We have seen dogmas accepted by men who did not believe them in their own hearts, for fear of rending the Church or causing schism. These men were dishonest before the tribunal of their own conscience and unfaithful to God, whether they were Dr. Newman accepting the dogma of infallibility, which he knew that "an insolent and aggressive faction" had forced upon the Roman Church, or the German bishops who had voted against that dogma, and yet did not dare to carry their words into action for fear of consequences. The *laudabiliter se subjecit* of the man who assails a falsehood and then withdraws his words at the command of authority, instead of excusing the act of withdrawal and making it praiseworthy, adds to it the shame of cowardice.

We must lay down, then, as our first principle that truth must not be sacrificed for anything else; that whatever a man believes to be true, even though it be false, he must not give up until he is convinced of its falsity. If we believe that the world rests upon an elephant and the elephant on a tortoise, we must not accept a truer theory, in order to agree with others, until we are convinced of its greater truth. "First pure, then peaceable," is the scriptural order. No peace is to be found except in truth.

Secondly, what is unity? (*a*) It is not uniformity. It is not necessary that there should be an identity on all points, great and small. It is not an absorption of smaller bodies in a larger body in such a way that the smaller bodies lose their own independence.

(*b*) It is not a transcendental, mystical agreement, so rarified as to escape definition, and confined to the region of feeling, existent to-day, and not existent to-morrow.

But (*c*) it is agreement in fundamentals, with liberty of differing in non-essentials. When this agreement, joined with liberty, is found, there *may be* unity; but unity is not yet arrived at until each side recognises the other as at one with itself in things essential, till each desires to be at one with the other, and until both take measures for becoming united on terms which both approve.

It may be asked, Are there such things as fundamentals? Are not all the statements of Scripture equally true? Yes; they are all equally true, but not all equal truths; that is, there are some statements of Scripture which are of more importance to our salvation than others. For as Archbishop Laud in his controversy with Fisher has said, "This proposition of Christ to St. Peter and St. Andrew, 'Follow Me, and I will make you fishers of men,' is as firm a truth as that which

He delivered to His disciples, that 'He must die and rise again the third day,' for both proceed from the same Divine revelation out of the mouth of our Saviour. And yet both these propositions of Christ are not alike fundamental in the faith" (p. 48). But how are we to know what are fundamentals? Is it not very difficult? It is; but here the Church, which is not the mistress, but the handmaid, of Holy Scripture, comes to our assistance. The Bible is the full, perfect, and sufficient record of the revelation of God to man; but He who gave that revelation gave also to His Church the function of arranging the truths of revelation for man's use, and declaring what are the vital doctrines of Christianity. This she has done with regard to positive truths in the three Catholic creeds which are the creeds of the Church of England, as part of the Church Catholic; and this she has done negatively for us in England by declaring in her articles and formularies what those doctrines are which militate against the fundamental truths of Christianity, and must therefore be repudiated by all who desire to unite in the pure primitive and Catholic faith. It is not sufficiently noticed that for true union to be attained between two persons or two bodies there must be agreement, not only in what they hold, but in what they reject. For example, it is not enough for them to agree that God is to be worshipped; they must also agree that none other but God may be worshipped. It is not enough to agree that in the Holy Communion Christians feed upon Christ; there must also be agreement that that feeding does not take place by the means of transubstantiation or consubstantiation. Else the agreement come to is only seeming, not real, and those who have added to the faith once delivered to the saints seem placed in a more favourable position for reunion negotiations than those of a purer faith.

Now, what present prospects are there of the reunion of divided Christendom? There is one thing, and, so far as I can see, one thing only, which opens a vista of hope. That is, the desire spread abroad in many hearts to bring it about. If the desire come from God, God will effect His purpose in His own way. I believe that it was the Conference of Bonn which struck the keynote which is now echoing throughout the world. That conference was called by that noble truth-lover, Dr. Döllinger, at the instance of a committee, consisting in equal parts of English Churchmen, Orientals, and Old Catholics, for the purpose of conferring one with another, and thereby seeing where and how union could be brought about without the sacrifice of truth. At that conference all the great Christian bodies were informally represented, in greater or less degree, with the exception of the Roman communion, and to our

astonishment it was found that substantial agreement could be, and was, come to on such burning questions as the canon of Holy Scripture, the authority of the original text of Holy Scripture, the liberty and duty of reading Holy Scripture, the use of a language understood by the people, justification, free grace and human merit, works of supererogation, merits of the saints, the number of the Sacraments, tradition, the immaculate conception, confession, indulgences, commemoration of the faithful departed, the nature of the Holy Eucharist, purgatory, papal infallibility, the procession of the Holy Ghost.

The reconciling work of the Bonn Conference was not fully effected, owing to opposition and indifference in England, the immobility of the East, and political complications. But the thought was born of a union which was not Roman, and yet was visible, and the thought brought forth fruit. The idea of reunion is at least now in the air.

Different ways of reunion have been, and are being, proposed. Let us consider them.

There is the Roman way. This is the way of submission. However much it may be wrapped up in honeyed words, any proposals emanating from Rome, whether addressed to ourselves or to the East, are nothing else but demands for submission. How can it be otherwise, when the essential condition of union is the acceptance of an authority which is universal, immediate, and not to be distinguished in practice from that of Christ Himself? What use would any conditions, or limitations, or compromises be, when one party in the negotiation claims to be, and to be recognised as, infallible, and, therefore, to be obeyed whenever he chooses to pronounce upon any matter of faith or morals that may be in question? Supposing that this predominant partner pleases of his grace to allow any seeming concessions in doctrine, discipline, ritual, or practice, is it not demonstrable that they would be granted only as a means of making the fly walk into the spider's chamber, and that they would be withdrawn one by one after they had served their purpose, and that there could be no remonstrance made by the outwitted sufferers who had blindly bound their own hands and given away their liberty? The answer of the Church of England to any Roman advances must be clear and definite. "We will join you, but it must be on the basis of the Catholic faith, 'which faith, except every man do keep—not only whole but also undefiled—without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.' But you have defiled the faith by adding to it the articles of the creed of Pope Pius IV., and the supplementary dogmas promulgated by Pope Pius IX. Give up your doctrines of transubstantiation, sacrifice of the Mass, half-Communion, seven sacraments, purgatory, invocation, images, relics, in-

dulgences, tradition, justification, supremacy, immaculate conception, infallibility, universal bishopric and then we can treat with you. Till then our loyalty to the Catholic faith forbids it."

It is said that we ought to meet Leo XIII. half-way, because he is so well-meaning. That a man is well-meaning is no reason why we should be tempted from the firm rock of revealed truth into the quagmire of human traditions. And if he is a man of personal piety, we must recollect that that piety is tinged with the grossest superstition. In no respect has Leo XIII. drawn back from the aims and objects of Pius IX.; only he pursues them in a more politic manner. Not one claim, not one doctrine, has been modified; nay, rather an advance has been made. Leo XIII. has given his full official sanction to the fable of Loretto, to the fable of La Salette, to the fable of Lourdes, to the fable of Compostella, to the fable of Trèves, and to every new superstitious practice which places St. Mary in the position of her Divine Son. But the other day, having wrested from the King of Italy by diplomatic cleverness the nomination of the Patriarch of Venice, he appointed a man whose first utterance was a declaration of the practical identity of our Lord Jesus Christ and the Pope of the day, whose words were to be accepted as Christ's. Are these the acts and these the sentiments which should encourage us to entertain for a moment the thought of the possibility of our union with a society whose doctrines they too faithfully represent?

The Oriental way of reunion differs essentially from the Roman. Here there is no quasi-divine Pope to whom to make submission; there is no Pius IV.'s creed, nor Pius IX.'s supplement to it, which must be accepted. All that is required is the acceptance of the Nicene Creed, and the dogmas and decrees of what they call the Seven Œcumenical Councils. We have no difficulty with the Nicene Creed, no difficulty with the six Œcumenical Councils, for these Councils promulgated no doctrine which we do not hold. But there remains the seventh so-called Œcumenical Council, the second Council of Nicæa. This we can never accept, for it teaches the invocation of saints and the adoration of icons and relics; but this the Oriental Church clings to and gathers to its bosom. It was no Œcumenical Council. It was a Provincial Council of the Patriarchate of Constantinople, repudiated, as soon as its decisions were known, by the then healthier Church of the West at the Council at Frankfort, and its teaching is unscriptural. It is this Council, far more than the question of the single or double procession of the Holy Ghost (which might be adjusted), that makes reunion as proposed by the Oriental Church impracticable. Perhaps there is a stronger obstacle

still, namely, a belief secretly cherished, if not always openly declared, that though Papal infallibility is false, the Oriental Church is nevertheless infallible; and also a doctrine too near to that of transubstantiation.

I have argued that union with either Rome or Greece, as they are, is not possible. Supposing that either one or the other could be effected, should we be any nearer the reunion of the whole Church? Not in the least; for Rome and Greece are irreconcilably opposed to each other. The Oriental prelates have declared Rome to be the apostacy of the latter days, and Rome looks on the Oriental Church as a schismatical and now as a heretical body. A union with Rome would alienate us from the East; a union with the East would alienate us from Rome; a union with either of them would alienate us from the great Protestant communities. The only result would be confusion a hundredfold confounded; not peace, but a sword.

Are we thus driven back on the theory of an invisible, impalpable, spiritual union? But this is no adequate union—certainly not such a union as St. Paul and as our Lord contemplated; for St. Paul says that there is not only one spirit, but also one body, and, therefore, a merely spiritual union does not satisfy his requirement; and our Lord prays for a union which, while based on mutual love, shall be visible to all men. It is better to acknowledge that union is not under present circumstances attainable, than to evacuate the meaning of the word union, and to persuade ourselves that it exists when it is non-existent.

What, then, is to be our conclusion on the subject of reunion?

Now, first, we must accept facts as they are, not create them as according to our imagination they ought to be, or we should like them to be. As a matter of fact, Christians have settled down now according to six chief types or moulds.

There is the Roman type, which accepts the papal monarchy and all its consequences.

There is the Oriental type, which owes allegiance to Constantinople and St. Petersburg.

There is the Anglican type, which seeks to recover and maintain the primitive faith and discipline as found in holy Scripture, and held in the first ages of the Church.

There is the Lutheran type, which prevails in Scandinavia and Germany.

There is the Calvinist type, which is found in France, Switzerland, and Scotland.

There is the Zwinglian type, to which our Dissenting bodies may be assigned without any great inexactness.

All these different classes of men are Christians; all those

who have been baptized, and have not apostatized from the faith by rejecting the Lord Jesus, are Christians, are members of the Church. How can we Anglicans, who form one of the types, unite ourselves with the other types, or with any of them, without thereby alienating ourselves from the rest, and thereby failing to promote, instead of promoting, unity?

First, let us see how far we are already united with each of them.

We are united with those that belong to the Roman type in the faith contained in the three Catholic creeds, except so far as it is cancelled by the later creed of Pope Pius IV. and its supplement by Pius IX., and we agree in the episcopal regimen of the Church, except so far as it is overthrown by the Papal despotism.

We are united with those that belong to the Oriental type in the faith of Holy Scripture and the teaching of the six Œcumenical Councils, except so far as it is perverted by the false teaching of the so-called Seventh Council, and we agree in the government of the Church by bishops, priests, and deacons.

We are united with those that belong to the Lutheran and Calvinist types in a Scriptural faith, except so far as they hold consubstantiation and an exaggerated form of predestination.

We are united with those that belong to the Zwinglian type in the main outlines of the Christian faith, however disproportionately held.

Now, we cannot join closer with Rome on account of her many false doctrines and usurping claims.

We cannot join closer with the Oriental Church on account of the second Council of Nicæa and some practical and doctrinal corruptions. We cannot join closer with the Lutherans, Calvinists, and Zwinglians on account of their respective peculiar doctrines and their defect in discipline. Truth rises up in our path, and warns us back with threats which we dare not disregard. We must be content to acquiesce in the Church remaining in its state of schismatical separation of part from part, for which no one part is altogether answerable. We must wait till it be God's good pleasure, in a way that we know not of, to remove difficulties which are to us insurmountable.

Can we, then, do nothing to satisfy this instinctive desire after union except wait God's pleasure? I think we can. But we must be content with small things. "Askest thou great things for thyself? Ask them not," "Here a little and there a little"—such must be our motto in the home field, in the mission field, in all spiritual action.

The step which I think is open to us to take is this: There are Christians now to be found on the Continent who do not

belong to the Roman, or the Oriental, or the Lutheran, or the Calvinist, or the Zwinglian communions—men who, like ourselves, profess to be seeking to recover purely primitive truth, and who, with us, consider that the true regimen of the Church is by bishops, priests, and deacons. They are not many—about 120,000, all told—but they are to be weighed, not only counted. Twenty-five years ago they formed the most learned and pious part of the Roman Catholic Church. Driven out because they would not accept false doctrine at the dictation of the Vatican Council, they organized themselves apart and rejected the doctrines of Trent, and they are now to be found in more or less numbers in Germany (under Reinkens), Switzerland (under Herzog), Italy (under Campello), Spain (under Cabrera), France (under Loyson), and Austria (under Cech). Here there is nothing to make us check our longing for Christian brotherhood. They stand, I believe, in all essential things on the same basis as ourselves. And here, to their advantage and our own, we may make some advance in Christian union, while with respect to others we wait God's time and God's pleasure.

A question remains—Should we pray for reunion? Christ prayed for union, and therefore we may well do so. But just before His prayer for unity He had promised His disciples the Spirit of truth, who should guide them into all truth. Reverently following this indication of our Lord's will, let us not dissever our prayer for unity from our prayer for the maintenance of the truth. If we pray for the preservation of the truth alone, we may become harsh and severe in guarding it; if we pray for unity alone, we may forget truth in our yearning for peace; if we pray for both, we may desire and strive for both. The following prayer by a former Archbishop of Canterbury is in use at present: "Gracious Father, we humbly beseech Thee for Thy Holy Catholic Church. Fill it with all truth, and in all truth with all peace. Where it is corrupt, purge it; where it is in error, direct it; where it is dark, enlighten it; where it is superstitious, rectify it; where anything is amiss, reform it; where it is right, strengthen and confirm it; where it is in want, furnish it; where it is rent asunder, heal the breaches thereof, O Thou Holy One of Israel. For Jesus Christ's sake."

If we prefer it, we may use the prayer appointed for the Accession Service, where we pray to be "united in the holy bond of truth *and* peace, of faith *and* charity" (Prayer for Unity in Accession Service). Or what could be better than the words of our Church which we know so well?—"More especially we pray for the good estate of the Catholic Church, that it may be so guided and governed by Thy good Spirit

that all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the way of truth and hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life."

In these words of our Church, we pray for unity, but we do not lose sight of truth, nor subordinate its claims to those of peace. Whose heart does not burn at the thought of a united Christendom going forth conquering and to conquer? But we are entrusted with the defence of God's truth, too, and we must defend it.

F. MEYRICK.

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

PART II.—DOCTRINAL (*concluded*).

BUT we have not yet exhausted the curiosities which belong to this retractation of Berengarius. We must not omit to notice the very curious use which was made of it in England three centuries later.

Assuredly we should have been little disposed to expect to find this retractation cited in support of the teaching of Wyclif and the Lollards. Yet in the treatise "De Eucharistiâ," which was written by Wyclif probably some time before 1383, and not long before his death,[1] this confession of Berengarius is pleaded over and over again as a part of Rome's Canon Law, and as a law which availed to bless and not to curse the doctrine which, under the teaching of Wyclif and his followers, was spreading like wildfire among the people of England.

It is certainly a very curious fact that Wyclif, who in his latter days and in the maturity of his views was, like Berengarius, strong in defence of the tropical or figurative exposition of the words of institution,[2] should cite in support

[1] See Loserth's Introduction to "De Eucharistiâ" (Wyclif Soc.), pp. lx., lxii.; and especially "De Eucharistiâ," p. 117.

[2] Witness the following: "Quia ex verbis Christi tam de sacramento panis quam calicis patet ipsum locutum fuisse figurative. Nam non dubium quin panem materialem accepit, benedixit et fregit et ex illo manducare precepit, quem demonstravit dicens: Hoc est corpus meum, quod oportet omnino figurative intelligi sicut et verba de calice. Nec dubium quin, sicut panem et vinum materiale assumpsit, sic ipsum sumi tamquam sacramentum mandavit; aliter enim illusorie equivocasset cum ecclesia. Et sic indubie figurative locutus est Joh. vi° (ut patet per Augustinum); unde miror quomodo aliqua subtilitas potest ex relacione ydemptitatis 'quod pro vobis tradetur' excludere locucionem figurativam, cum antecedens locucio foret ad hoc efficacior; ut in isto dicto Joh. xv°, 1: 'Ego sum vitis vera' foret evidencius quod excludit figuram loquendo

of his contention the very words which were put into the mouth of Berengarius as a distinct renunciation of just that opinion. Yet Wyclif is found contending that the words which in this confession are applied to the true Body and Blood of Christ, cannot possibly be understood otherwise than of that which is the Body and Blood of Christ, not in essence, but in figure.[1] If this is felt to be doing a violence to the natural meaning of language, it must be remembered that, from the standpoint of the newer doctrine, the fully-developed doctrine of Innocent III., some such violence was of necessity done to the words, even by the stanch upholders of transubstantiation. The words of the Romish gloss are sufficient evidence of this. Indeed, in this matter Bellarmine may be said to follow pretty closely the leading of Wyclif.[2]

---

ydemptice quam dicendo, sicut dixit implicite quod apostoli sunt palmites que inseruntur in hac vite. Idem enim est dicere: Hoc est corpus meum quod pro vobis tradetur, et: Hoc efficaciter et sacramentaliter figurat corpus meum quod pro vobis tradetur" ("De Eucharistiâ," pp. 115, 116, Wyclif Soc.).

Compare the following: "Sed replicatur per hoc quod responsio ista implicat locucionem istam esse tropicam: 'Hoc est corpus meum,' quod est hereticum, cum tunc foret falsa de virtute sermonis. Sed stulti sic arguentes obliti racionis argumenti vel consequencie, ideo oportet acute respondere illis iuxta suam stulticiam, negando arguciam tam in materia quam in forma. Locucio autem tropica est verissima, summe katholica et miraculosissime conversiva. Nec est color ex istis concludere quemlibet talem modum loquendi per locum a simili vel quod quidditas aut natura panis et vini corrumpitur pocius quam si peccator convertitur in iustum, ergo natura illa destruitur. Sic, inquam, natura panis melioratur per benediccionem, quia post nudum esse naturale habet superadditum esse sacramentale, ut efficaciter figuret et faciat verum corpus Christi ad quemlibet eius punctum, et sic vere accipit sed tropice predicacionem corporis" (*ibid.*, p. 153).

Thomas Waldensis, in his bitter invectives against Wyclif, constantly regards him as a follower of Berengarius, and identifies the Eucharistic doctrine of the one with that of the other. (See "De Sacr. Euch.," f. 101; Venice, 1571. See also f. 72.)

[1] See "De Eucharistiâ," pp. 26, 30, 32, 230.

[2] "The Roman Council under Pope Nicholas II. defined that not only the Sacrament of Christ's body, but the very body itself of our blessed Saviour, is handed and broke by the hands of the priest, and chewed by the teeth of the communicants: which is a manifest error, derogatory from the truth of Christ's beatific resurrection and glorification in the heavens, and disavowed by the Church of Rome itself. But Bellarmine, that answers all the arguments in the world whether it be possible or not possible, would fain make the matter fair and the decree tolerable; for, says he, the decree means that the body is broken, not in itself, but in the sign; and yet the decree says that not only the Sacrament (which if anything be is certainly the sign), but the very body itself is broken and champed with hands and teeth respectively" (Bishop Jeremy Taylor, "Liberty of Prophesying," sect. vi., § 10; "Works," edit. Eden, vol. v., p. 458).

Joannes Parisiensis argued that the confession could not apparently be made intelligible, "nisi per panis assumptionem, et idiomatum com-

But the artillery of Wyclif's vehement denunciation was directed especially against the idolatry[1] which he clearly saw in the newly-defined doctrine of transubstantiation. The novelty of that doctrine he would expose with an unsparing hand. The existence of accidents without a subject was a notion which—though he had long striven to defend it—he had now utterly rejected. That the substance of bread and wine after consecration had ceased to exist—this he had become fully convinced had never formed a part of the faith of the Christian Church of earlier ages.[2] In this position he fortified himself by appealing to the teaching of the ancient Fathers; but he appealed also—and on this point he quite fairly appealed—to the "Ego Berengarius." He contended that that declaration was still a part of the Canon Law,[3] and that, according to this, there remained on the altar after consecration no mere accidents[4] of a subject which no longer existed, no mere

---

municationem." He adds: "Ista igitur confessio Berengarii paneitatem remanere et assumi confirmat" ("Determinatio," p. 96. See especially Alix's Preface, pp. 17 *sqq.*; London, 1686).

[1] See "De Eucharistiâ," pp. 26, 142, 143, 317 (Wyclif Soc.).

[2] At the head of the Forty-five Articles of Accusation for which Wyclif's memory was condemned at the Council of Constance stand these three:

"1. Substantia panis materialis, et similiter substantia vini materialis, manet in sacramento altaris.

"2. Accidentia panis non manent sine subjecto in eodem sacramento.

"3. Christus non est in eodem sacramento indentice et realiter in propria præsentia corporali."

See "Mansi," tom. xxvii., c. 632, 635.

And these very same propositions had been set first among the ten condemned as heretical in the Council at London summoned by Archbishop Courtnay against Wyclif in 1382. (See Du Pin, "Eccles. Hist.," vol. xiii., p. 116; London, 1699.)

Yet from Wyclif's own words we have the assurance that in his earlier years he had been holden in the bonds of the scholastic doctrine. See Loserth's Introduction to "De Eucharistiâ," Wyclif Soc., pp. iv., v. He declares: "Licet quondam laboraverim ad describendum transubstantiationem concorditer ad sensum prioris Ecclesiæ, tamen modo videtur mihi quod contrariantur, posteriore Ecclesiâ aberrante" ("De Euch.," p. 52, Wyclif Soc.).

Almost all his works later than 1380 give repeated evidence of the change in his views (Introd., p. ix.).

[3] See "De Eucharistiâ," pp. 4, 5, 32, 117.

[4] "Super quo textu dat glossa pro regula ut omnia referas ad species ipsas, ita quod iste sit sensus: profiteor non panem et vinum sed species panis et vini per se positas non solum esse sacramentum nec corpus Christi, sed sub illis contineri corpus Christi. Et sic confessio Berengarii est inpossibilis et heretica de virtute sermonis, sed debet glossari per suum contradictorium, cum hereticum sit quod panis et vinum remaneant post consecracionem sacramentum, sed sunt res aliene nature, non panis et vinum sed accidencia que non possunt esse corpus Christi, sed in illis est corpus Christi" ("De Eucharistiâ," p. 225, Wyclif Soc.).

species of absent bread and wine, but bread and wine themselves in their own true nature and substance.

It must be borne in mind that the one point which Wyclif is concerned to insist upon is this permanence after consecration of material bread and wine. And he quite fairly and rightly argues that this permanence is implied in the assertion that after consecration *the bread and wine are the Body and Blood of Christ* (see especially "De Eucharistiâ," pp. 117, 125, 230, 231). He is fully sensible that there is an apparent inconsistency in the latter part of the recantation. And he acknowledges the difficulty of bringing into harmony with his interpretation the "non solum sacramentaliter sed in veritate . . . dentibus atteri." But he replies that these words *must* be equivocally interpreted (see p. 230), and appeals to the *glossa ordinaria* in support of this view. And he adds that the former opinion of Berengarius (the view renounced in his recantation) would *now* be approved in three particulars (particulars *then* condemned as heretical), viz., (1) that the white object after consecration remains only a sacramental sign; (2) that it is not the Body of Christ; (3) that the Body of Christ is not the object of the senses, nor the subject of fraction ("De Eucharistiâ," pp. 34, 35, Wyclif Soc.).

In truth, the "Ego Berengarius" was much more a contradiction and condemnation of the subsequent transubstantiation of scholastic philosophy than it was of the doctrine which had been maintained by Berengar. And Wyclif's word was fully justified: "Quod in tempore successit credendi varietas, sic quod illud quod tunc fuit articulus fidei jam est falsum" (*ibid.*, p. 32).

Indeed, Berengar himself had not failed to see how the language of his confession gave a handle to such an argument as that which Wyclif used: "Dicens ergo Humbertus ille tuus, panem, qui ponitur in altari, post consecrationem esse Corpus Christi, panem propria locutione, Corpus Christi tropica accipiendum esse constituit, et illud quidem recte, quia ex auctoritate Scripturarum" ("De Sacrâ Cœnâ," p. 86; Berlin, 1834).

The truth is that the confession is inconsistent with itself. No intelligible interpretation can be given to it without doing violence to either the earlier or the later portion of it. If the language of the earlier portion is allowed to override that of the later, then—though not without very forcible violence being applied to the later—the confession must be understood to be a condemnation of transubstantiation, seeing that what is ground with the teeth must still be the substance of bread. If (as is most natural) the latter part is allowed to have the pre-eminence, then—in spite of the testimony to the substance of bread—we have the teaching of a substance too completely

transubstantiated to be allowed by the upholders of transubstantiation, and of a presence too grossly material to be endured by the subsequent teachers of the Real Corporal Presence in the Sacrament.

See Sutlivius, "De Missâ Papistica," lib. ii., cap. ix., p. 212; London, 1603.

The example of Wyclif was not followed, we believe, by any of the great divines of the English Reformation. Some of them,[1] indeed, wrote approvingly of Berengar's sacramental views. But their references to the language of his recantation are mainly for the purpose of showing the discrepancies of the Romish doctrine, and the difficulty of reconciling the statements made at different times, or at the same time, by different doctors, in support of the doctrine of the Mass.

And we could hardly make this difficulty more apparent than by setting beside the words of Berengar's confession, as inserted in the "Decretum" of Gratian, the following ancient *dictum* ("the very barbarous gloss," as Bishop Jewel calls it: "Works," vol. i., p. 503), which may be said to gather up the teaching of the ancient Fathers on the subject, and which has strangely been suffered to hold its place among the glosses appended to the "Decretum":[2] "Id est, cœleste sacramentum,

---

[1] See, *e.g.*, Jewel, "Works," vol. i., pp. 193, 458, P. S. edit.

[2] This very remarkable *dictum* is the gloss on the following words, quoted as from Prosper's "Liber Sententiarum Aug.": "Sicut ergo cœlestis panis *qui Christi caro est*, suo modo vocatur Corpus Christi, cum re vera sit sacramentum Corporis Christi . . . vocaturque ipsa immolatio carnis, quæ sacerdotis manibus fit, Christi passio, mors, crucifixio, non rei veritate, sed significante mysterio; sic sacramentum fidei, quod baptismus intelligitur, fides est."

On this extract Dean Goode has observed: "The words in italics are clearly corruptions of the original, being wholly inconsistent with the remainder of the passage, and also with the views of Augustin expressed in the passage referred to" ("On Euch.," vol. i., p. 263; see also p. 241).

Wyclif well said: "Notandum quod inter omnia decreta sanctorum istud decretum cum glossa sua magis facit pro nostra sententia. . . . Recoleret, inquam, de textu Augustini, ubi dicit de omnibus modis contendere approbandum quod *caro est carnis et sanguis est sanguinis sacramentum;* et illam carnem vocat iste sanctus celestem *panem qui vere est Corpus Christi suo modo;* tunc enim verecundaretur de glossa quam hic addicit, hoc est: *improprie dicitur Corpus Christi suo modo, sed non rei veritate.* Beatus autem Augustinus exponit se ipsum quod ille panis sacratus videtur esse Corpus Christi modo signi, cum tropice et sacramentaliter vere significat Corpus Christi. Nec dubium quin Augustinus intendit per panem naturam panis, non accidens, quod tam expresse asserit *non posse per se esse*" ("De Eucharistiâ," pp. 224, 226, Wyclif Soc.).

Of the words as quoted in the "Decretum," it has been said: "These formal words, as Gratian allegeth them, are not found in any one place together in S. Austen or S. Prosper: howsoever, the sense and sentence is well collected out of Saint Austen, as also out of Saint Prosper" (Featly's "Appendix to the Fisher's Net," p. 61, margin). Dr. Featly

quod vere representat Christi carnem, dicitur Corpus Christi, sed improprie. Unde dicitur suo modo, sed non rei veritate, sed significati mysterio, ut sit sensus, vocatur Corpus Christi, id est significat"[1] ("Decret.," pars iii.; "De Consec.," dist. ii., can. xlvii., c. 1278; edit. Venice, 1567).

What a remarkable witness is here against the mediæval corruptions of the faith! And this on the pages of the "Decretum" of Gratian! This appended to Rome's Canon Law! What a striking testimony to the simple truth as held by the Fathers, as contended for by Berengar, as upheld by the Reformed Church of England!

Let the reader be asked to weigh well the meaning of these words, and then endeavour to reconcile them with the confession of Berengarius, and we are sure he will then find nothing wanting to make perfect the *curiosity* which has been the subject of this paper.

Surely we have here a Romish witness to the ancient Catholic and Apostolic faith of the Eucharist—the faith which, cleared from the superincumbent weight of mediæval superstition, from the augmentation notions of Damascenus, from the more grievous errors of Paschasius, from the materialism of "Ego Berengarius," from the dialectic subtleties of the scholastics, from the transubstantiation of Innocent III. and the Tridentine Council, was set on high by the English Reformation, and witnessed for to the death by our English Reformers.

This paper cannot be more fitly brought to a close than by a quotation from Bishop Jeremy Taylor. Speaking of the words of institution, he says: "We have reason not to admit of the literal sense of these words, not only (1) by the analogy of other sacramental expressions in both Testaments—I mean that of circumcision and the Passover in the Old, and baptism

---

argues: "In this allegation, unless you will tax Gratian with false quoting, there is a threefold cable, which cannot easily be broken. First, S. Austen's authority, out of whom S. Prosper collecteth this sentence; secondly, S. Prosper's, who in effect relates it, and approves it; and thirdly, Gratian's, who inserts it into the body of the Canon Law, and citeth both for it. The words both of Gratian and the gloss here are so clear against your real presence of Christ's Body, under the accidents of bread and wine, that never any Protestant spake more expressly and directly against it" (*ibid.*, pp. 61, 62).

[1] Although these glosses cannot be cited as forming any part of the Canon Law, yet the "Decretum" of Gratian bears conspicuously on its title-page the words, "Unà cum Glossis et Thematibus prudentum, et Doctorum suffragio comprobatis . . . Glossis receptis a vitio repurgatis" (Venice, 1567). In the same edition, the Preface (by Hieronymus Messaggius, Jur. Cons.) declares: "Illud [opus] ad vetustorum exemplarium fidem doctissimorumque virorum adnotationibus accuratissime recognitum, ut quasi ab infantia ad integram ætatem excrevisse et adolevisse ad hanc sui perfectionem videatur."

as Christ discoursed it to Nicodemus in the New Testament—but also (2) because the literal sense of the like words in this very article introduced the heresy of the Capernaites; and (3) because the subject and predicate in the words of institution are diverse and disparate, and cannot possibly be spoken of each other properly. (4) The words in the natural and proper sense seem to command an unnatural thing, the eating of flesh. (5) They rush upon infinite impossibilities, they contradict sense and reason, the principles and discourses of all mankind, and of all philosophy. (6) Our blessed Saviour tells us that 'the flesh profiteth nothing'; and (as themselves pretend) even in this mystery, that 'His words are spirit and life.' (7) The literal sense cannot be explicated by themselves, nor by any body for them. (8) It is against the analogy of other Scriptures. (9) It is to no purpose. (10) Upon the literal sense of the words, the Church could not confute the Marcionites, Eutychians, Nestorians, the Aquarii. (11) It is against antiquity. (12) The whole form of words in every of the members is confessed to be figurative by the opposite party. (13) It is not pretended to be verifiable without an infinite company of miracles. . . . (14) It seems to contradict an article of faith, viz., of Christ's sitting in heaven in a determinate place, and being contained there till His second coming" ("Real Presence," sect. vi., § 11; "Works," vol. vi., p. 67; edit. Eden).

N. Dimock.

Art. IV.—CHURCH REFORM.[1]

It may be safely predicted that, just as the mention of the sixteenth century is always associated with the word "Reformation," so the nineteenth century will ever, at any rate in this country, be connected with the idea of "Reform." It has witnessed Reform Bills without number, reforms in almost all our civil and secular institutions, and no small amount of reform in our ecclesiastical system. The improvements effected in the Church (by which expression I mean throughout this paper "the Church of England") about the commencement of the present reign, by the establishment of the Ecclesiastical Commission, the commutation of the tithes, and the passing of the first Pluralities Act and the Church Discipline Act, amounted to little short of a revolution. After that came a lull; but as the decades rolled by, important

[1] A paper read before the South-Eastern Clerical and Lay Church Alliance, on June 18, 1895, by P. V. Smith, LL.D., Chancellor of the Diocese of Manchester.

changes were brought about. The terms of clerical subscription were relaxed, the Table of Lessons was altered, the use of shortened services was permitted, and the number of bishops was increased. At length, about ten years ago, a fresh demand arose for still more sweeping Church reforms. The amount actually effected up to the present time, as the result of this demand, has not been such as to satisfy the more ardent spirits amongst us; but the movement, so far from being exhausted, appears to grow in intensity from day to day.

In discussing the lines upon which we should proceed in the future, it is essential in the first place to determine the object which we desire to attain. There are two classes of would-be Church reformers, whose aims and ends are diametrically opposite. The one class regard as disastrous the presence within the Church of what they consider to be erroneous teaching and practices, and desire to introduce such reforms as would render the continuance of them impossible. The others, on the contrary, are anxious to expand rather than to contract the limits of the Church. Between these opposite aspirations no agreement can be negotiated. We must, therefore, at the outset of our subject, make up our minds as to which of them is correct. And this will depend on the view which we take of the true *rôle* and *status* of the Church. Ought she to be a mere sect, struggling to hold her own among other Christian bodies, and inviting our allegiance on the ground of her practical superiority to them; but making no claim to be *the* national visible representative of the Holy Catholic Church in this country, and maintaining no protest against the division of Christians inhabiting the same locality into various competing denominations? Or ought she to assert her position as the one National Church of the land, to which, if God's will were done in earth as it is in heaven, all English Christians would belong?—although, partly from her own fault, and partly from the fault of others, this is, unhappily, far from being the case at present, and, under existing circumstances, we lay no personal blame on those who are detached from her communion. To me, at any rate, the mere statement of the alternative supplies the answer. The sentence of condemnation which St. Paul passed upon the divisions of the early Christians, who were yet all the time in communion with each other, appears to me to apply with tenfold force to the divisions of the present day, which actually debar us from intercommunion, and coop us up in separate ecclesiastical organizations. The use of the prayer for unity on Whit-Sunday in this and, I believe, in other dioceses, and in not a few Nonconformist places of worship, is one among many signs that we are becoming alive to this. And, surely, the

remedy lies not in narrowing, but in widening the Church. It was well said by some old sage, "Unity of opinion is the bond of ignorance, unity of profession is the bond of hypocrisy, unity of the Spirit is the bond of peace." And if we join with the Apostle in praying for grace upon all those who love in sincerity Jesus Christ, the Lord Jehovah, we shall do all we can, consistently with the maintenance of lawful liberty of thought and action for ourselves as well as for them, to unite them to us outwardly as well as inwardly. The reforms which I am about to advocate, though put forward primarily in the interests of the Church herself and of her present members, would, if carried out, tend to smooth the way for this much-to-be-desired consummation.

I propose to submit suggestions as to reform on four heads, namely, Cure of Souls, Finance, Public Worship, and Government. Of these the two former appear to me to be the more pressing, and, at the same time, to be the more likely to be speedily advanced. The first subject — Cure of Souls — embraces the whole legal relationship of an incumbent to his parishioners; that is to say, (*a*) his appointment to the parish, (*b*) his rights during his incumbency, and (*c*) his removability.

(*a*) It is universally admitted that the law and practice as to the appointment of incumbents to parishes, or, as it is generally called, Church patronage, stand in need of reform, though considerable difference of opinion exists as to the precise lines on which that reform should be carried out. Some of us would abolish private patronage altogether; others, without going so far as that, would totally prohibit the sale of patronage; and while the majority who have considered the question are in favour of the less drastic proposals of the Archbishop's Bill on the subject, there is yet a fourth section who consider even these proposals too sweeping, and would limit the reform to the creation of some safeguards against patronage falling into unworthy hands. I frankly confess myself to be on the side of the majority in this matter. Their view appears to me to be not only the only one which is practically feasible at the present moment, but also to be on the whole as defensible in theory as any other. No system of patronage will be absolutely free from objection, and private patronage has advantages which would be lost by its complete suppression. So long, however, as it is retained, there must be retained with it the legal right to transfer the patronage; otherwise it would inevitably in some instances ultimately fall by descent into the hands of a pauper, a criminal, or a resident at the Antipodes, who would have no power of dispossessing himself of it. And to restrict the right of transfer to voluntary transactions while transfer by sale was prohibited would in

some cases invite evasions of the law by secret bargains, and in others would enormously increase the difficulty of obtaining a surrender of the patronage from an undesirable owner of it.[1] The right course seems, therefore, to be to retain the sale of patronage, but to get rid of the existing scandals and abuses attending it. These are, roughly speaking, of two kinds: First, the putting up of an advowson, apart from any property in the parish, for sale by public auction to the highest bidder; and, secondly, the conversion of the sale of patronage into what is practically a sale of the cure of souls itself, either by the sale of the next presentation apart from the rest of the advowson, or by the sale of the advowson immediately before an inevitable or prearranged vacancy, and by the power which the purchaser possesses of presenting himself or the person in whose interest the purchase was made. Both of these abuses are struck at by the Archbishop's Bill, which also proposes to give to the parishioners an opportunity and a recognised legal status to make objections to an intended appointment of an incumbent, and enlarges the grounds on which a bishop may decline to ratify the appointment by institution. Fault has been found with this last-mentioned proposal, on the ground that it will place the destinies and reputation of the clergy too much in the hands of the bishops and of the archbishops, to whom an appeal will be allowed; and the Church Patronage and Avoidance of Benefices Bill which has been introduced into the Commons, and contained an almost identical provision, has been amended in this respect by the Standing Committee on Law, to which it was referred after its second reading. As it now stands, if any parishioner objects to the appointment, the objection is to be considered by the bishop and two assessors, one of them being the chancellor of the diocese, or some barrister or solicitor as his deputy, and the other being the archdeacon or rural dean, or, failing them, some clergyman appointed instead. Institution will then be

[1] The only conditions on which the total abolition of traffic in private patronage could be entertained would be: First, Due regard to the vested interests of existing patrons, either by awarding them a pecuniary compensation for the loss of their proprietary rights, or else by fixing such an interval (say twenty-five years) between the passing of the measure and the date of its taking effect as would be a sufficient substitute for pecuniary compensation; and, secondly, the legal conversion of private Church patronage into a pure trust, with all the legal incidents of a trust, including a power to persons interested in its due execution, to obtain from the High Court or some other competent authority the appointment of a new trustee of the patronage, in case of the patron going to reside abroad, or becoming bankrupt or otherwise unfit to act in the trust, and failing himself to appoint a fit patron in his place. If these two conditions could be satisfactorily secured, the sale and purchase of advowsons might be absolutely prohibited.

refused only if the bishop and one of the assessors consider that some ground for so doing, which is mentioned in the Bill, is proved to exist. For my own part, I think that a middle course between the two Bills would be the best. I would not require the assessors to be summoned to hear every objection made by a parishioner. I would give the bishop power to reject on his own authority any which he thought frivolous or untenable, and only require him to try the matter with the assessors in cases where he considered that there was a *primâ facie* case shown for refusing institution.

(*b*) Passing on to the parson's rights during his incumbency, I mean by these his control over the parish church and its services, and his power of prohibiting the ministrations of any other clergyman in the parish, with the solitary exception of the bishop of the diocese. As to the first of these rights, I do not suggest any reform. The legal relations in this respect of the incumbent to the ordinary, the churchwardens and the vestry, are, I submit, satisfactory. But I venture to urge a modification of the second. It has already been encroached upon by the Church Building and New Parishes Acts; under some of the provisions of which a new church with independent patronage can, under certain circumstances, be built, and a new and independent parish be formed, within the limits of an existing parish, without the consent and against the will of the incumbent. In closely-populated towns, where the area of each parish is small, parishioners who are out of sympathy with their own incumbent on account of doctrine or ritual, or for any other cause, can, and frequently do, attach themselves to another congregation, and, in case of sickness, inter-parochial comity allows of their being visited by the pastor of their choice. But in more rural districts this is not possible, and in these districts it not unfrequently happens that large numbers desert the Church and betake themselves to Nonconformist ministrations, in consequence, in some instances, of the complete neglect of the parson to provide opportunities of public worship in a remote part of the parish, and, in other instances, of his presenting them with a ritual which is distasteful or objectionable to them. I maintain that in both these cases the parishioners ought to have the power, with the sanction of the bishop, assisted, if you will, by a consultative council, to provide themselves with a Church of England place of worship and a clergyman to minister in it independently of the incumbent. This is no novel idea. A Bill to give effect to it was actually introduced into Parliament in four successive years from 1872 to 1875. In 1873 it was carried through the House of Commons before Easter, and its second reading in the Upper House was supported by the advocacy of Archbishop

Tait and by the votes of Archbishop Thomson and ten other prelates. No bishop voted against it; but it was thrown out through the exertions of Lord Shaftesbury and Lord Dynevor. But for the mistaken though well-intentioned opposition of those two noblemen, this important item of Church reform would have become an accomplished fact twenty years ago.

(*c*) Coming now to the incumbent's removability, we are all aware that he has at present a freehold in his benefice, from which he cannot be removed against his will, except for gross breach of ecclesiastical law or grave moral delinquency. If a commission of inquiry finds him guilty of flagrantly neglecting his duty, he can be required to appoint and pay one or more curates, and if he fails to do this, the bishop can make the appointment and sequester the revenues of the benefice to provide the necessary amount of salary. But, however mischievous may be the continuance of the incumbent in the living, and his residence in the parish, no power exists to put a stop to either. To judge from the utterances of some of the clergy, they seem to regard this state of things as their natural right. The laity, on the other hand, accept it as a historical fact, and realize its useful side in conferring upon the clergy an independence, which, if rightly used, is of great value. But they recognise also that it leads, in some few cases, to grievous mischief; and there is a strong feeling that these cases call for a modification of the law. Witness the Church Patronage and Avoidance of Benefices Bill, already referred to, which was brought in and supported by what is called the Church party in the House of Commons, and has passed the two ordeals of a second reading and a discussion in the Standing Committee on Law in that House. I have already alluded to the clauses of that Bill on the subject of presentation to livings. With respect to avoidance, it proposes in the first place that sequestration of a benefice on bankruptcy, or for debt, shall in certain cases, unless the bishop directs to the contrary, render the living void; and in the second place it makes the compulsory retirement of an incumbent possible, in case of three years' mental or bodily incapacity. But the commissioners who are to deal with such a case may certify that the retirement is inexpedient, if provision has been made for the adequate performance of pastoral duties in the parish; and the pension to the retired incumbent is to be one-third of the income of the benefice, or if that fraction is under £100, then £100 or so much of that sum as the income of the benefice will produce. Cases not within either of these two categories are treated in a different manner. The Bill recognises that remissness or wanton failure in the discharge of the duties of the incumbency, however culpable,

and however injurious in its consequences, ought not to be visited with the same condign punishment of deprivation, as is incurred by the commission of a serious offence. It proposes, therefore, to deal with culpable incompetence by extending and making more stringent the provisions of the Pluralities Acts in reference to neglect of duty. If a commission of inquiry is appointed under those Acts, and the commissioners report that "the incumbent is unable through his own fault, or unwilling, competently to discharge the cure of souls" in the parish, the bishop is to have power to suspend him by inhibition from his office for so long as the bishop thinks fit. The following incidents are liable to attach upon an inhibition: (1) the bishop may appoint a curate or curates to perform the duty and direct payment of their salary out of the income of the benefice; with this proviso that the incumbent is to be left, for his own use, not less than £100 a year, or the whole income, if under that sum, or one-third of the income, if one-third exceeds £100; and (2) the bishop may, if he considers it requisite in the interests of the parishioners, order the incumbent to vacate the parsonage house; which in that case may be let during the inhibition, or assigned as the residence of the curate or curates. An appeal, however, is to lie to the archbishop against the inhibition itself and any of its incidents.

I have dwelt at some length on the first branch of our subject, on account of the two Bills actually before Parliament. It must be admitted that the second of them has not received the same amount of general attention, or been so fully discussed, as the first; and it is easy to raise the cry that its provisions will operate harshly and unjustly upon deserving clergy. But the experience of all former legislation warrants no such anticipation. Both Bills are honest attempts to remedy existing evils; but it is safe to predict that, if they become law, they will be administered with too much, rather than with too little leniency.

II. My second heading is Finance. If in my former remarks I may appear to have shown too little sympathy with our parochial clergy, I hope that I shall atone for it by what I am about to say. From the time of St. Paul downwards, the remuneration of the clergy has always been a serious problem in the Christian Church. In this country, thanks to the universal endowment of the Church by our forefathers, the problem has not presented itself with the same urgency as it might have done; but even here it has long been more or less pressing. It was the occasion of the founding of the Corporation of the Sons of the Clergy as long ago as 1655; and the numerous other clerical charities which have been instituted

attest the extent to which it has been recognised as existing. But it has recently assumed an acute form, partly in consequence of the agricultural depression (which has reduced the rents of glebe lands, and in some cases rendered them unlettable, and in connection with which the value of every nominal £100 of the tithe rent-charge has fallen from £112 15s., at which it stood in 1875, to £73 13s.), partly in consequence of the large number of new and unendowed or poorly endowed benefices which it has been necessary to create in districts suddenly become populous, and partly in consequence of the clergy as a body not having the same amount of private means as heretofore. As matters stood in 1893 (and they are probably worse now), out of a total of 14,018 benefices, only 4,080, or less than one-third, enjoyed an income of £300 and upwards; while of the remaining two-thirds 1,379 had an income of less than £100, and 4,173 an income of between £100 and £200. Heartrending instances of clerical distress are from time to time made known, and many more exist which are never disclosed. Surely some reform is wanted here; some scheme which, without superseding or interfering with the existing clerical charities and sustentation funds, shall supplement their efforts and meet the cases with which they do not deal. So far, there is general agreement; but unfortunately the widest divergence of opinion prevails as to the direction which the reform should take, and the lines upon which the scheme should be formed. In 1893 the Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation resolved that it was desirable to establish a general fund from which there should be made grants from year to year, or for a longer period, in augmentation of the incomes of poor benefices, and also (when deemed expedient) grants for the permanent augmentation of such benefices by calling forth grants from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners or Queen Anne's Bounty, or from other sources. The Upper House preferred simply a scheme for the permanent augmentation up to £200 a year of the 4,173 benefices between £100 and £200, which, of itself, would require an annual income of £210,000, or a capital sum of £7,000,000; and they suggested that half of this should be raised as a general fund, and the other half as diocesan funds. The House of Laymen, a few months later, declared in favour of the permanent augmentation of poor benefices as the best remedy for the impoverishment of the clergy, and recommended that a diocesan association for the purpose should be formed in every diocese in which there was not one already existing.

On the other hand, the Convocation of the Northern Province decided in favour of an organization confined to the province, and proposed diocesan boards to administer the funds; and the House of Laymen of that province, unlike

their brethren in the south, expressed a preference for sustentation by means of annual grants rather than the permanent augmentation of livings. As the natural consequence of this conflict of opinion, nothing has as yet been done. But the need for action is as great as ever, if not greater; and there are signs that the question will not be allowed to rest. At their session last April, the London Diocesan Conference passed unanimously the following resolutions:

"(1) That it is the duty of every adult lay member of the Church to contribute individually towards the support of the clergy; and that, with a view to providing all the clergy with an adequate income, a general clergy sustentation scheme should be framed and a general fund established to which Churchpeople of all classes and all degrees of income should be expected to contribute. (2) That reforms in Church patronage and in the tenure of livings ought to accompany the carrying out of the scheme, and that the vested rights of the clergy, under the present system of Church patronage and of the tenure of livings, ought not to confer any vested right of continuous participation in the benefits of the scheme. (3) That copies of these resolutions be sent to the Houses of Convocation and the Houses of Laymen of Canterbury and York, with a request that they will take them into speedy consideration and draw up a scheme of sustentation for the Church."

It was evident from the tone of the discussion that the Conference were quite prepared to recognise that there should be full liberty under the scheme to appropriate contributions to the northern or southern province, or to a particular diocese or parish or other area; and the concession of this liberty would enable the existing diocesan funds, as well as the provincial organization resolved on by the York Convocation, to be affiliated to the scheme or dovetailed into it. It would also admit of special funds being hereafter started to benefit particular areas. I believe that such a scheme represents the reform which we want. It would be based on the foundation of the duty of the laity, and not of charity; it would be thoroughly comprehensive and elastic, and it could be so worked as to be a help in keeping the clergy up to the mark in the performance of their duty, since the administrators of the fund might withhold sustentation from a parson who flagrantly failed in that respect.

III. I have mentioned Public Worship as a third point of reform. It is here that the views of the two schools of Church reformers stand out in sharpest contrast. The one would revise the Prayer-Book, eliminating from it all that suggests sacerdotal or sacramentarian doctrine; while the

other, instead of further limiting the formularies to be used in divine service, would give additional license in reference to them. After my opening remarks, it is needless to say that the reform which I advocate is of the latter kind. In an irregular way much has already been done towards effecting it. Nominally our public services are regulated by the Act of Uniformity of 1662, as modified by the Amending Act of 1872, which, under certain restrictions, permits shortened services and the dividing of services. But in practice the law is everywhere ignored and set at defiance. It has been tacitly assumed that the promise which every clergyman makes at his ordination, that in public prayer and administration of the sacraments he will use the form prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority, has no application to services in unconsecrated buildings such as mission-rooms. In these the parson indulges in exactly what form or absence of form he pleases. He does the same in church at any extra service beyond the regular Matins and Evensong and Communion service, and even with these wholly unauthorized liberties are taken. Not only are the State Prayers often omitted on Sunday without any legal warrant, but I have even heard the Litany begun immediately after the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, Sentences, and Collects being skipped over. It has become, as we know, an almost universal practice to omit the Exhortation in the Communion Service, and that service is frequently commenced in the early morning at the Offertory Sentences, or, if any part of the ante-Communion Service is used, at any rate the Commandments are passed over. The introduction of hymns at the beginning and end of the service and before the sermon is, of course, a practice of much longer standing. The net result of all these departures from the strict letter of the law, and of the sanction to a certain latitude in ritual which has been given by the decisions in the ecclesiastical cases during the last five-and-twenty years, and notably by that in the Bishop of Lincoln's case, is that while the Prayer-Book remains the authoritative standard of the Church's forms and ceremonies, individual incumbents may and do, without rebuke or hindrance, indulge in a large license of variation from it. The religious spirit of the times undoubtedly requires this elasticity. It is new wine which will not be confined in the old bottle of uniformity. The fact that reform in this direction is being to such an extent informally carried out renders an alteration in the law on the subject less pressing than it otherwise would be. At the same time, the present state of things is not altogether satisfactory. It allows the parson, who has no qualms of conscience about breaking the unwritten law of the

Church, to consult expediency to an extent from which his more scrupulous brother shrinks. It encourages general lawlessness all round, with the result that some of the clergy outstep all bounds of moderation, while those who inveigh against them for so doing have, if not beams, at any rate very big motes, in their own eyes. The reform which I regard as wanted is, roughly speaking, the legalization of the present state of unauthorized license, with some additional facilities for framing new prayers on various subjects, as, for instance, foreign missions. It would not be complete if it did not dispel all doubt as to the lawfulness of Evening Communion, and give explicit permission for the distribution of the elements without the repetition of the formulas of administration to each individual.

IV. The suggestion of altering the law of the Church on the subject of public worship naturally brings us to my fourth branch of reform—Church Government, including the process of legislation; since none of us would care to see a Bill for further amending the Act of Uniformity run the gauntlet of the House of Commons as at present constituted. A time when the very foundations of the fabrics of Church and State are threatened is not the most opportune for proposing structural alterations in that fabric. Yet it is well to recognise that in defending the principle of the Establishment we are not committed to the defence of all its existing incidents. The Church would remain the National Church, and the union of Church and State would be preserved, if, instead of the Crown appointing the bishops and deans, the initiation of their appointment were left to the Church, with the requirement, however, that it must be sanctioned by the Crown; and if, instead of ecclesiastical laws being made by Parliament, the Church were permitted to enact them for herself, subject to the right of Parliament to veto any measure which appeared to it to be inconsistent with the interests of the nation. I am not prepared with any alternative to the present mode of appointing our Church dignitaries. The problem is not an easy one, as is proved by the experience of our colonies, where the difficulties of an election are not unfrequently evaded by committing the choice of a new bishop to certain prelates in the mother country. With respect to the future legislative and governing bodies of the Church, it is possible to speak with more confidence. The framework for these already exists in the voluntary Parish Councils, Ruridecanal Conferences, and Diocesan Conferences, which have been established during the last quarter of a century; and last, but not least, in the two Houses of Laymen which have been attached to the Northern and Southern Convocations.

The only assemblies of the Church which at present possess a legal and constitutional status lie at the opposite ends of the chain. They are the Convocations on the one hand and the vestries on the other. Both stand in need of reform; the Convocations, to increase the proportion of the non-official members, and render them more truly representative of the whole body of the clergy, and the vestries, to free the system from the accretions of plural voting according to rateable values, and of the select vestry, where it exists—accretions imported in reference to the secular business, which was formerly entrusted to the vestries, but which has now been taken out of their hands by a series of statutes culminating in the Parish Councils Act. The reform of the Convocations presents a *crux*, into the solution of which there is not time to enter now. Suffice it to say that, in spite of the unconstitutional clause on the subject in the Welsh Disestablishment Bill, Parliament has no more right to meddle with the composition of the Convocations than the Convocations have to interfere with that of Parliament. The Convocations must reform themselves; though I admit that they cannot do so without the sanction of Parliament, in some form or other. The vestry question stands upon a completely different footing. It is true that, like the Convocations, the old common law vestries had their origin independently of Parliament. But Parliament has repeatedly legislated respecting them, and it actually created the vestries of our new ecclesiastical parishes. Now that the functions of the old vestries are confined to ecclesiastical matters, the question arises whether their composition should remain as at present, or whether membership of them should be restricted to professed adherents of the Church. The former alternative is more consistent with the claim of the Church to be a national institution; and it has been acquiesced in, without remonstrance, for half a century, as the constitution of the vestries of new ecclesiastical parishes, whose functions have never extended beyond the affairs of the Church. But a strong feeling exists in the opposite direction, and the problem was felt to be one of such difficulty that the Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation resolved the other day that any legislation at the present time on the subject of the ecclesiastical vestries would be inexpedient. It will require, however, to be faced sooner or later, together with the question of the qualifications and mode of appointment of churchwardens as purely ecclesiastical officers. And when this has been done, the next step will be to build up, on a legal basis, a series of superior Church assemblies analogous to those now existing for civil purposes. With the vestry, as the counterpart of the parish

meeting, to begin with, a Church Council, consisting of churchwardens and sidesmen, might be elected, to correspond with the Parish Council. The Ruridecanal Conference, when legally constituted, would correspond to the District Council and the Diocesan Conference to the County Council. At the head of all, and analogous, as it has always been, to Parliament, would stand the Convocation of each province, but reinforced, as it had not previously been, by a formally constituted House of Laymen. Whether the two Convocations should for all or any purposes be amalgamated into one National Synod is a question too remote for present discussion; but it is obvious that, if no such step were taken, any new ecclesiastical legislation, which the Church desired to initiate for herself, would have to run the gauntlet of six separate assemblies; namely, the Upper and Lower House of Convocation and House of Laymen of each province. The advantage of this procedure, however, in the way of preventing hasty changes, might possibly outweigh its drawbacks.

The survey of my four items of Church Reform is now completed. I would merely observe in conclusion that one of them—Finance—can be carried out by the Church herself without recourse to any extraneous aid. The others, no doubt, would require the co-operation of Parliament; but it is quite certain that if all Churchpeople were united and persistent in demanding them, this co-operation would not be long withheld.

P. V. SMITH.

ART. V.—PERSONALITY.[1]

"The abysmal depths of Personality."—TENNYSON.

"IF I am not mistaken," said Professor Sanday at the late Church Congress, "Mr. Illingworth's lectures will be found to mark the beginning of a new phase in the religious thought of our time—a phase in which philosophy will once more take its proper place in supplying a broad foundation for other branches of theological study, and at the same time quickening them with new life." The high hopes raised by such words as these will surely not be disappointed when we approach the volume of lectures itself. Since the year 1780 volume after volume of Bampton lectures has appeared in annual succession, broken only in the years 1834 and 1835, when no appointment was made on the Bampton foundation.

[1] "Personality, Human and Divine" (being the Bampton Lectures for 1894). By J. R. Illingworth, M.A. London: Macmillan.

Out of the goodly array of books thus produced, about half a dozen stand out quite conspicuously from the rest—Mansel's famous work on the "Limits of Religious Thought," Liddon's "Divinity of our Lord," Wace's "Foundations of Faith," Hatch's "Organization of the Early Christian Churches," Cheyne's "Origin of the Psalter," and last (certainly not least), Illingworth's "Personality, Human and Divine." Assuredly, since the publication in 1858 of Mansel's oft-discussed examination of the Limits of Religious Thought, there has appeared, in connection with the Bampton trust, no such valuable contribution to philosophical theology as the lectures for 1894. It is difficult to over-estimate Mr. Illingworth's admirable handling of a subject which bristles with difficulties so numerous and so manifest; of his dialectical skill, on the one hand, and of his profound apprehension of the vitally important character of the subject he so reverently deals with, on the other. Nor is the lecturer's literary art less noticeable, whether for its purity of style or ease of expression; and this, as readers will not be slow to admit, is, in itself, a by no means small recommendation. There is, perhaps, only one conspicuous blemish in the book, and that is the absence of an index.

Two great schools of thought divide thoughtful men to-day into opposite camps; the one school takes it for granted that God is unknowable, and that, if He exists, for mankind His existence is as though it were not; the other school takes it for granted that He not only does exist, but that He is knowable, and that if the human mind cannot *com*prehend Him, it may, and does, *ap*prehend Him. The disciples of the former school have, for the most part, elected to be known as Agnostics.

Now, what Illingworth sets out to demonstrate is briefly this: not merely is God knowable, but His personality is, in all respects, though infinitely transcending human personality in degree, nevertheless essentially akin thereto; accordingly, to know God we must first know man, and to know Him as a person, we must first know man as a person. Thus it is that through the instrumentality of our own finite personality we attain to some cognition, faint and dim, it may be, yet still in its measure certain, of that Infinite Personality in whose life alone our lives can find their affirmation and justification.

The record of the conception and growth of the idea of God forms one of the most profoundly interesting chapters in the history of the race. And however firmly convinced we may be that this idea of God is, in some form or other, a primary element, nay, necessary factor, in the constitution of human thought, we need not refuse to admit that the unfolding of this germ-idea, the making explicit what was previously im-

plicit, has been a genuine growth, needing the lapse of many centuries for its completion.

In the early beginnings of his earthly life, it is not unnatural to suppose that man's thoughts would turn in an outward direction to that visible world which made itself so palpable to his senses, to which he seemed bound by ties of the closest and subtlest intimacy, and which affected him with longings so strange and unaccountable. He had become conscious of the world; beyond such consciousness he had not advanced, but that consciousness was the first great step in the evolution of the human mind. Ages later, perhaps, and only by painful steps and slow, he learnt to recognise that between himself and the world lies a gulf of difference; Nature gradually drew further and further from him, and (so to speak) forced him to confront her and gaze upon her. Nature and man are no longer one in the way they have been hitherto. Vast indeed is the stride which man has now made; he has learned to distinguish himself, as a conscious subject, from the non-self, as object. Man has at length become a self-conscious being.

There is, indeed, a third stage in this unfolding of man's mental life, and that third stage is the idea of God. Only by constant reflection upon his inner self and the outer world was it borne in upon the human consciousness that an eternal dualism of subject and object could not *ultimately* satisfy the demands of thought. Behind and beyond and beneath the subject and the object there must surely be a something, in the unity of which the manifold differences both of subject and object are merged, and from which they spring. We are occupying no debateable ground here; our position so far is, to all intents and purposes, identical with that held by even the most rigidly orthodox Agnostics. No one has more clearly seen this than Mr. Herbert Spencer, who, though often unjustly spoken of as a materialist, has strenuously maintained that the eternal energy which lies behind matter and spirit is in truth the greatest of all realities. There can be no doubt that it is so; the conviction of this is, in some shape or another, a primary datum of human consciousness. It is only when the Agnostic assumes that this eternal energy is not merely inscrutable only, but totally and for ever impenetrable to the spirit of man, that we differ. The human mind will not tolerate being put off with a persistent "nescimus" upon a matter so vital as this. Either the energizing power which the universe everywhere manifests is a purely materialistic force, or it is not. If the former alternative be the true one, how comes it that a materialistic view of the universe always fails in the end to give any satisfaction to the yearnings of man's mind and heart? Because, I reply, man is a spiritual

being, and he seeks a spiritual cause for phenomena; he is, by the very conditions of his being, forced to admit that the universe is essentially spiritual, that reason does declare itself in the ordered realm of nature, and that, whatever difficulties this conviction may bring in its train, they are immeasurably surpassed by the difficulties which any other view of the question entails. Only in the light of this spiritual cause of the universe can the shifting currents of material things become linked in harmonious movement, and disclose their meaning and character.

So strong does this tendency towards unity (if I may so call it) appear to be in all the higher developments of human thought, that a refusal to admit its claims has resulted in the strangest aberrations of the human intellect. Certain scientists have, in their search for causality, postulated for individual atoms a consciousness, which, however, in no way brings us nearer to a solution of the problem involved.[1] An infinite series of consciousnesses would require some single consciousness, if it is to mean anything for us; for to assume an infinite series of conscious atoms merely multiplies *ad infinitum* the original difficulties presented by the concept of consciousness itself.

We have thus far seen that the presence of phenomena in space and time not only justifies, but demands, in order that these phenomena may themselves have coherence and meaning, that we recognise an infinite and eternal Presence, of which the visible world is but a mode—a living and actual embodiment appealing to man's senses and understanding. But this timeless and spaceless Energy can have no adequate signification for us, unless its reality, presupposed in all that we see, appeals to the whole conscious life and being of man in the sum of his activities. Man's instinct for worship is a thing concerning which there can be no shadow of doubt; it is an evident historic fact. But man is totally unable to worship any mere philosophic abstraction which appeals to his understanding alone. Man is a spiritual being; and the highest function of his existence, the highest term in his mental and spiritual condition, is personality, the unity of which is a verity not to be shaken. Personality is the consummated harmony of man's whole being; the perfect focus in which the scattered rays of his many-coloured life are finally blent in the pure light of self-consciousness and oneness of being, shining with steady brilliancy upon the world of outward experience. Personality, says Illingworth, is the canon of reality.

[1] Häckel is a notorious offender in this respect. Compare what he says in his recent brochure, "Monism."

This being the case, we cannot predicate, as a quality of the Infinite being, of whose life the world is but (so to speak) the material symbol, anything less than personality; for personality is the highest and completest idea which we are able to form. It is also the *terminus a quo* of all human thought; for, as Illingworth so justly observes, the externality of things is only conceivable when referred to personality, apart from which these things have no real existence.

It is at this stage in the problem that I have found Illingworth's lectures of the deepest and most permanent value. His first lecture deals with the development of personality from the human side, and he shows, in a masterly manner, that the final conception of personality is due to Christianity; whence it naturally follows that the Christian conception of personality really introduces a lasting element of the highest import into human life. Personality, according to the standpoint of the purest Christian philosophy, is that unity in which men's attributes and functions meet; hence the power of this philosophy to unify, in a wholly unique degree, the divergent faculties, thoughts, and emotions of man into a consistent whole. One corollary of the deepest significance follows upon this—man cannot transcend his personality; he cannot get outside himself.

At this important juncture the objection of the thoroughgoing Agnostic makes itself heard. He will assert that the concept of a personal God which we have reached is but the projection of ourselves upon an infinite background, and, therefore, in the end, a creation of our own desires. He does but echo the utterance of the ancient Greek thinker, Xenophanes, who argues thus:

> ἀλλ' εἴτοι χεῖράς γ' εἶχον βόες ἠὲ κέλητες
> καὶ γράψαι χείρεσσι καὶ ἔργα τελεῖν ἅπερ ἄνδρες,
> ἵπποι μέν θ' ἵπποισι, βόες δέ τε βουσὶν ὁμοίας,
> καὶ κε θεῶν ἰδέας ἔγραφον καὶ σώματ' ἐποίουν
> τοιαῦθ' οἷόν περ καὐτοὶ δέμας εἶχον ὁμοῖον.[1]

The half-truth contained in these verses constitutes, in reality, one of the most malignant of falsehoods; it is so plausible to conclude that man must needs regard God as "a bigger kind of me," yet so replete with mixed truth and error. Man can only think of God, it is true, from his platform of finality; can only conceive His infinite being—if that being is to mean anything more to him than a fever-shaken effort of the imagination, nebulous and vague—under limitations of sense; dream of His timeless and spaceless existence under the

[1] Fr. 6 *apud* Clem. Strom., v., p. 714, "The lions, if they could have pictured a god, would have pictured him in fashion as a lion, the oxen like an ox, and so forth."

conditions both of space and time. We cannot fling our arms around God; but we can humbly touch the border of His garment. In brief, our idea of God is an apprehension, never a comprehension.

The fact of man's religiousness is undoubted; and the testimony of all history is to show that belief in God or gods has never been absent from the race. Now, belief in God was, as Illingworth says, achieved through man's belief in himself; he naturally argued from his known personality to God's personality. In the course of centuries the original concept advanced, though whether or not this advance was merely the regaining of fuller knowledge held previously is another matter. The contributions of Indian philosophers (to name no others) in the evolution of religion were not inconsiderable, though, owing to the extreme vagueness and dreamy mysticism of the setting of their thoughts, their influence on philosophy has been wholly indirect. The Indian view of things is a universal Pantheism—of imagination, however, not of thought. Hence, in India, adequate concepts of personality were unattainable. Even in Greek philosophy the idea of a personal God is misty; but Plato and Aristotle undoubtedly cleared it of many accretions, or at least showed how the problem was to be attacked. Plato's method was largely emotional, while Aristotle's was grounded on a basis of pure intellection. Certainly the Semitic view was, in all its higher manifestations, clearly personal; this is proved by the very idea of a *righteous* God. The Hellenic and Semitic concepts, passed through the clarifying medium of Alexandrian speculation, elevated the personality of God into the position of certainty.

The doctrine of the Trinity, as it emerged from the schools of Alexandrian philosophy, though admittedly incomprehensible in its totality, is a valuable aid in rendering explicit our notions of the Infinite. Personality in man seems to split itself up into three distinct yet vitally related elements: (1) Self-consciousness, or reason; (2) self-determination, or will; (3) self-realization, or love. Hence, arguing by analogy from the human and finite to the divine and infinite personality, we may expect to find a triple element in Deity itself. This is precisely what, according to the Christian doctrine of the Trinity,[1] actually exists. God moves out of Himself and makes Himself object to Himself in the Eternal Son, and recoils upon Himself in the Eternal Spirit, thereby effecting a perfect and complete process in the unfolding of the Absolute. It is in the light of this infinite and eternal progression that we find a reconciliation between matter and spirit, between God and the world.

[1] Contrast this with the Trinity of Indian philosophy.

In one of the many thoughtful notes appended by Illingworth to his book, we are reminded (see p. 244) that this Christian doctrine of the Trinity, with all the possibilities of Divine self-determination which it involves, is "a further assistance towards the conception of a personality which is at once infinite and yet definite." To the various suggestive references given there, in which this idea is drawn out, we might add one from Lotze,[1] who remarks: "Perfect personality is in God alone; to all finite minds there is allotted but a pale copy thereof. The finiteness of the finite is not a producing condition of that personality, but a limit and a hindrance of its development." One may justly, perhaps, observe in this place that, apart from Christianity, there *is* no really adequate concept of personality; for the Unitarian's conception of it as "an undifferentiated unity" is not, properly, thinkable. If it be objected that the Christian conception of the Divine personality is an argument based on analogy, and consequently valueless as proof, I submit that in such a matter the fact that it *is* so based is one of the strongest reasons for accepting it as a true estimate. Analogy is not logical proof, and from the nature of the case cannot so be, but an analogy of the kind we are using is the highest sort of proof. God's existence and selfhood cannot be treated like a formula of logic or a problem in algebra; and even logic itself, we do well to remember, is human, after all.

One turns with a curiosity, natural enough under the circumstances, to the pages in which Illingworth deals with "the proofs" themselves—the famous triad which has caused such infinite dissensions in the philosophic camp. How to better his statement of these three proofs—cosmological, teleological, ontological—would be difficult indeed. Due weight is allowed for each of these "proofs of the existence of God," and the nowadays much-abused ontological argument has the justice done to it which it deserves. Notwithstanding all the dirt thrown at it by recent writers, I firmly believe it to constitute, in the main, the strongest strand in that rope of proof whereby we hope to draw down God to us in the sphere of intellectual belief. The very thought of God is that which cannot *not-be*. Our idea of Him, inadequate as it always will be, cannot be an empty dream; it must have some objective reality somewhere to correspond with it. The arguments, cosmological and teleological, are only valid on the assumption that thought is valid. Now, "to think" means "to know," and is a universal desire of the human mind; such a desire, of course, implying

[1] "Microcosmus," vol. ii., p. 688 (E. T.). Cf. an essay by Professor Knight on "Personality and the Infinite" in his "Studies in Philosophy and Literature."

that there is something that is and can be known, *i.e.*, intelligible. "The universe we find to consist of intelligible relations; these can only exist through thought, and as they are certainly independent of all individual human thinkers, they must exist through a universal thought." Now, thought implies a thinker; therefore universal thought implies a universal thinker. Again, as personality is the highest sort of thinking we can conceive,[1] universal mind cannot be less than personal. And this initial conviction is the beginning of the self-revelation of universal mind to us. Such, in effect, is Illingworth's statement of the ontological proof. Nothing could be more satisfying in its ultimate effects on the conscience, thought, and life of a sincere seeker after truth.[2]

But, if finality is to be looked for, I do not imagine for a moment that any one of the three proofs, *taken singly*, constitutes a strand powerful enough to bear the strain to which it will be subjected. Taken, however, together, and still further reinforced by the moral argument, derived (1) from the freedom of the will, (2) from our own sense of moral obligation, it forms a four-fold cord that cannot be broken. Or, to change the metaphor, the four proofs, running into one at diverse points in their course, have force enough, thus linked, to carry before them every obstacle, just as separate streams are feeble when alone, but, united, move as one majestic river which sweeps with its onward current each hindrance in its way, ere it joins the great sea. Whatever be our view from time to time of the precise methods of intuition, we need to keep constantly before us this sovereign fact, that knowledge is not a mere intellectual process. To know God aright we must first love Him, or, as Plotinus somewhat differently expresses it, "He must become godlike who desires to see God." The prevailing spirit of our age is the "intellectualism" of the scientific mind. "Its ambition," says Professor James Seth, "is to *understand*, and to understand *Nature*." But the understanding is only a part of man, and not the greatest part, either; nor is Nature, in the term's common acceptance, all that veritably is. Nature is but the reverse of Spirit; taken by itself and for itself, it is only an abstraction—the half of reality, and no true existence. The phenomenal remains, and will ever remain, an impenetrable

[1] "The denial of personality is the denial of knowledge. Without a metaphysical ego there could be neither memory nor sensation. Its very negation is tantamount to its affirmation; for, without this principle of permanence, the concepts employed in its denial could not possibly have been formed."—DR. MOMERIE.

[2] For a thorough examination of the "proofs," see Professor Knight's "Theism" (published in 1893), an earnest, and even noble book.

mystery, unless the noumenal key be applied to unlock its hidden chambers and disclose its riches. Man, truly, is not all intellect, nor must intellect be allowed to thrive (as it too often does) at the expense of the rest of his nature. And, therefore, in the highest resort, the existence of God becomes a certainty to us—not so much by reasoning, as by actual experience. In other words, the supreme vision of God is granted to us through the instrumentality of our moral nature, inasmuch as morality is the condition of spiritual insight.

Other points of profound interest both to theologian and philosopher might be touched upon in connection with Illingworth's lectures; my purpose, however, will have been amply achieved if what has been said thus far induces the reader to study the book for himself. No book of this decade is more truly worth our earnest and careful consideration. The following extract from Professor Seth's recent work[1] may fitly close the foregoing comments:

"Instead of surrendering the idea of Personality, we must cherish it as the only key to the moral and religious life. It is the hard-won result of long experience and deep reflection. The depth and spirituality of the conception of God have grown with the growth of the idea of human personality. As man has learned to know himself, he has advanced in the knowledge of God."

EDWARD HENRY BLAKENEY.

ART. VI.—ENGLAND'S DEBT TO THE WORK OF THE CITY COMPANIES.

THE last farewell of our Blessed Lord to His beloved disciples was taken at a festal meal. And the duty of feasting[2] and rejoicing at fit seasons is one which will only be repudiated by the morose, the dyspeptic, the fantastic, the scornful, the pessimistic, the fanatical, and the inhuman. However frugal and austere a man's habits may be in the ordinary hours of his

[1] "A Study of Ethical Principles," by James Seth (1894).

[2] Feasting has no necessary connection with excessive eating. It appears to include the following elements, or some of them:

1. Hospitality.
2. Good company.
3. Choice music.
4. Lights and flowers.
5. The artistic element in food and drink, however simple.
6. The artistic element in plate, glass and china, or more careful preparation than usual.
7. Temperance.
8. Conversation.
9. Short appeals to good feeling on public institutions and objects.
10. Thanksgiving.
11. Charity.
12. Absence of care.

home and of his business, there are occasions when it is good for him to relax and make merry with his friends. It is a check to self-righteousness, it prevents artificiality and priggishness, it promotes mutual understanding and good humour, it brightens the monotony of life, it reminds us that we still belong partly to the earth with all its citizenships and obligations, as well as to the kingdom of heaven. In the Revelation the joys of the unseen world are depicted under the figure of "the marriage supper of the Lamb," "the marriage supper of the great God." More than once our Lord describes the future blessedness under the same figure; the marriage supper of the King's Son. He Himself with great significance performed His first miracle at a wedding feast, and showed His sympathy with the harmless pleasures of the kindly race of men by creating enormous quantities of generous wine. It was the custom of the Pharisees to give quiet entertainments on the Sabbath day; and our Lord Himself attended at least one of these dinners. When Matthew the tax-gatherer became His disciple, he made a great feast to bid farewell to his friends; and our Lord made no scruple about being present. In that most touching parable of the Prodigal Son, He makes the happy father say, "Bring hither the fatted calf and kill it; and let us eat and be merry." He contemplated as a matter of course the occasions when His disciples would be invited to banquets, and gave them directions how to regulate their conduct; they were not to push forward. He supplied His followers with principles for their own entertainments: they were not to forget the poor. The early Christians had friendly and festive gatherings; St. Jude complains of those unworthy members who were spots in their feasts of charity. St. Paul allowed the Corinthians to attend entertainments given by unbelievers: "If any of them that believe not bid you to a feast, and ye be disposed to go; whatsoever is set before you, eat, asking no questions for conscience' sake." There is nothing in the least grim, dismal, rigid, or unsociable about simple, genuine, unspoiled Christianity.

We cannot but remember how large a part the duty of feasting took in the ancient dispensation and revelation of God to His people. There was the Feast of the Passover, the Feast of Pentecost, the Feast of Tabernacles, the Feast of the New Moon, the Feast of Trumpets, the Feast of Purim, the Feast of the Dedication, the Feast of the Sabbatical Year, and the Feast of Jubilee. These were real occasions of abundance and rejoicing. At the dedication of his temple, for instance, "Solomon offered a sacrifice of peace-offerings, which he offered unto the Lord, two-and-twenty thousand oxen, and a hundred and twenty thousand sheep. . . . And at that time

Solomon held a feast, and all Israel with him, a great congregation, . . . seven days and seven days, even fourteen days. On the eighth day he sent the people away; and they blessed the king, and went unto their tents joyful and glad of heart for all the goodness that the Lord had done for David His servant and for His people Israel." Simple reasonable enjoyment is not the sum of existence, but it is certainly one aspect of human life, and one that if we wish to be complete we cannot with safety altogether neglect.

The virtue of hospitality is comparatively easy amongst scanty populations, in small towns and rural districts where the inhabitants are known to each other. It is not difficult there to gather together kindred souls who will sharpen wit, improve intelligence, and knit hearts in kindliness and unselfish affection. But it is quite the reverse in large and crowded communities. There, persons living next door or in the same street may remain for years, for the whole of life, complete strangers. "Hospitality," said an acute observer, the French essayist, Montesquieu, "is most rare in trading countries, while it is found in the most admirable perfection amongst nations of wanderers." The fact is, that in a great mercantile community private individuals are necessarily so much engaged in their own pressing concerns that they have neither time nor inclination nor opportunity for bringing all and sundry together to their board. And yet even a man who has perhaps exceeded in this line of warm-hearted friendliness is not without his beneficial effect upon society: "Let the hospitable man, the man of the most generous liberality, who has mingled freely and profusely with those around him, who has bestowed the time upon others which might have been more wisely employed upon himself, reflect upon all he has done, and say how far he has profited by it. Has his life not been a series of disappointments? If so, let him not regret, for hospitality has an inherent value; it is the choicest gift in the bounty of heaven, and is associated with countless benefits and priceless boons which heaven alone has power to bestow."[1] "There is an emanation from the heart in genuine hospitality which cannot be described, but is immediately felt, and puts the stranger at once at his ease, breaking through the chills of ceremony and selfishness, and thawing every heart into a flow."[2] It is obvious that in any large civic community such an admirable virtue, if it is to have an adequate effect and to bring together under the wholesome ties of a common social influence the worthiest, most substantial, and most eminent of her sons, cannot be discharged even by the most patriotic

[1] James Ellis. [2] Washington Irving.

individual, but must be undertaken by some great public body or organization.

Now, in a community of congregated cities numbering no less than five millions, how could this binding social tie of large and distributive hospitality be better supplied than by the great City Companies? What ingenious scheme could have been devised by the wit of man superior to that of associations of grave, intelligent and responsible citizens, with immemorial traditions of dignity in the past, and property at first small in value, but constantly increasing in a direct ratio with the growth of the City itself? Besides the august Corporation of London itself, there are seventy-six City Guilds or Companies. Of these twelve have considerable properties used with spirit for public purposes, and thirty-six have halls for social purposes. The twelve great Companies are the Mercers, Merchant Taylors, Grocers, Drapers, Fishmongers, Goldsmiths, Skinners, Haberdashers, Salters, Ironmongers, Vintners, and Clothworkers. The trust and corporate income of the whole has been estimated at between £750,000 and £800,000, and the capital value of their property at £15,000,000. Of this the income that has to be spent regularly on fixed trusts is reckoned at £200,000, and their corporate income at upwards of £500,000. The contributions of existing members are between £15,000 and £20,000 a year. Admirably are these great sums disbursed. Of the £200,000 which forms the charitable or trust income, £75,000 a year is spent on almshouses and the relief of poor members, another £75,000 on education, and £50,000 on well-chosen charitable objects of a general character. Many of the charities of the Companies are for the benefit of the inhabitants of provincial towns and villages where their estates are situated. The cost of the hospitality annually given by the Companies is estimated at £85,000. Much of it is paid for out of fees. That is no large sum for a community so gigantic and unprecedented as London. The hospitality is as varied and as widely distributed as it is handsome and dignified; and I believe no banquet is given without great numbers of the poor being benefited by what remains.[1] And, further, the lead in Technical Education has been set by the Guilds. The Merchant Taylors have always been distinguished by their care for their own great classical school. The sister company of the Mercers has with no less zeal nurtured St. Paul's School, the noble foundation of Dean Colet. The Clothworkers' Company has promoted the establishment of

[1] This by no means mere "crumbs" and "scraps;" but the meats and dishes which were not required by the guests. The recipients would have been most uncomfortable if they had been invited to occupy seats at the tables, and much prefer this method of sharing.

Yorkshire College at Leeds, where instruction is given in the manufacture of woollen goods, and similar institutions at Bradford, Huddersfield and elsewhere. The excellent City and Guilds of London Institute has been formed for the advancement of Technical Education. It has a Technical College at Finsbury, and a central parent institution at South Kensington. The Corporation of London has the famous Guildhall School of Music, the best managed institution of the kind in the world, with more than 3,000 pupils. None of these great civic duties could have been performed, had there not been wealthy civic corporations to undertake them, and wise and experienced men of business to devote their time, knowledge, and public spirit to their conception, direction and management.

A few words may be said as to the history of the Merchant Taylors, one of the twelve great Companies, merely as a specimen of the others, from their earliest mention in 1267 A.D., and their first charter in 1326. Six centuries and a quarter of usefulness and public spirit present no mean record. Even the site of their present hall, from which has emanated so much benevolence, they have possessed for more than five and a half centuries. "Hospitality and benevolence are two virtues which never appear to such advantage as when they are associated together." From earliest times they have been actuated by religious motives and principles. In 1361 they obtained their chapel on the north side of St. Paul's, dedicated to St. John Baptist, for daily service, and prayers for the preservation of the members of the fraternity. In 1406 they became patrons of a City Parish.[1] As early as 1415 land was entrusted to them for benevolent purposes. In 1455 Pope Calixtus granted the chapel of their hall the full privileges of celebrating Communion. Their almshouses are as early as 1415. In 1555 the great college at Oxford (St. John's) was founded with which they are so closely connected, with thirty-seven fellowships attached to their own school. In 1561, the twin foundation of the school was inaugurated. In 1618 they were entrusted with another school, that of Great Crosby, near Liverpool. In 1825 the almshouses were rebuilt at Lee, in Kent, and now contain thirty-two widows and daughters of freemen of the Company.

It should, I think, be widely known that in 1874, of their own accord, the school was enlarged to twice its numbers, so that it has since had a minimum of 500 pupils, and removed to a more convenient situation at the Charterhouse. It should be clearly known that the entire cost of that great school is borne out of the corporate funds of the Company, as was the

[1] St. Mary Outwich.

purchase of the Charterhouse, and the necessary outlay on rebuilding; that the Company expend a sum of £1,000 a year in supplementary exhibitions and scholarships to those obtained by their scholars at the universities; that the school costs the Company between £7,000 and £8,000 a year; and that, in addition to all this, they spend money when required on their schools at Great Crosby, which since their enlargement contain 400 boys and 250 girls; nor should it be forgotten that they contribute more than £200 a year to the Merchant Taylors' School at Ashwell. Who would venture to say that these are not wise and good works, for which we may well be grateful to God, and which could ill be spared to our city and country?

I spoke of the efforts of the City for technical education. We may well express our obligation to the court of the same Company, who, since 1889, have contributed annually at least £2,030 to the City and Guilds Institute. And all the friends of knowledge amongst our working classes must rejoice to know that the amount which they have expended on education generally in the last twelve years has averaged 28 per cent. of the corporate income.

For other kind deeds the Christian Church is indebted to them; the large number of pensions to poor freemen, and widows and daughters of freemen; to whom also, when required, grants are made of sums for present relief; and the numerous and generous donations to charitable institutions, hospitals, convalescent homes, works of public beneficence, and cases of great distress. Very admirable, too, and justly famous are the two convalescent foundations at Bognor, one, out of trust funds, with fifty beds, for men recovering from accidents or illness in the London hospitals; the other containing thirty-six beds for ladies in reduced circumstances. Nothing could be on a more generous scale than this: it is supported entirely out of corporate funds; convalescents are entertained for three or four weeks; no charge whatever is made; even the expense of travelling is included.

We recognise with the keenest and warmest sympathy that the Company, like some of the others also, have always been supporters of the ancient branch of Christ's Church in this country, through all its varying fortunes and vicissitudes. In their early days we are told that all their proceedings were opened with prayer, and a minute of 1564 shows that the first prayer was for Church and Queen. Amongst their other contributions to churches and for church purposes, they must be heartily thanked that within the last two years they have voted the noble sum of £3,500 for the restoration of St. Helen's, Bishopsgate, a church replete with varied wealth of

associations, of which they became patrons instead of their original parish; and for the foundation of a scholarship for the choir school of St. Paul's Cathedral, as their acknowledgment of the vitality of the present cathedral life and an encouragement to the choristers, when they have for a few short years been delighting the citizens with their voices, to pass on to a higher education.

It is the urgent duty of all of us, whether in our corporate or individual capacity, to be ever more sincere in cultivating public spirit, philanthropy and the spirit of self-denying love. Our ideals should ever be higher, our objects wider.

> God loves from whole to parts: the human soul
> Must rise from individuals to the whole.
> Self-love but serves the virtuous mind to wake,
> As the small pebble stirs the peaceful lake;
> The centre moved, a circle straight succeeds,
> Another still, and still another spreads;
> Friend, parent, neighbour, first it will embrace,
> His country next, and next all human race;
> Wide and more wide the o'erflowing of the mind
> Takes every creature in, of every kind:
> Earth smiles around, with boundless bounty blest,
> And heaven beholds its image in his breast.[1]

It is from the spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ alone that true philanthropy has sprung, and ever will spring. Wipe out that spirit from the earth and the dominating selfishness of previous ages returns. Extend the knowledge and reception of that Divine spirit throughout our country, and throughout the earth, and each in turn becomes paradise; the kingdom of heaven is established amongst men.

> Once o'er this painful earth a Man did move,
> The Man of griefs, because the Man of Love.
> Hope, Faith, and Love at God's high altar shine,
> Lamp triple-branched, and fed with oil divine.
> Two of those triple lights shall once grow pale,
> They burn without, but Love within the veil.
> Nothing is true but Love, or aught of worth;
> Love is the incense which doth sweeten earth.
> O merchant at heaven's mart for heavenly ware,
> Love is the only coin that passes there.
> The wine of Love can be obtained of none
> Save Him who trod the winepress all alone.[2]

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

---

[1] Alexander Pope.

[2] Archbishop Trench.

Short Notices.

Introduction to the New Testament. By F. GODET, D.D. Translated by William Affleck, D.D. Pp. 621. Price 12s. 6d. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

This delightful volume from the venerated author of the "Introduction to the Gospels" will give great satisfaction to students of the New Testament. Monsieur Godet sums up in an admirable manner the results of modern criticism, and the issue is wholly favourable to the orthodox believer.

"My desire," he says, "has been to present, with entire frankness and perfect fidelity the different opinions which have been stated on the origin of the Epistles of St. Paul, and to discuss them with a loyal impartiality. Would some desire that that impartiality on my part should have gone so far as to remain entirely neutral? Absolute neutrality can be required of him who commences the study of a question, but not of him who finishes it. 'I have believed, therefore have I spoken,' said the Psalmist. It is because a sincere examination has brought me to certain results, because these results appear to me not only true, but useful to the Church, and because I desire to impart them to all those who can exert an influence on her progress, professors or pastors, students or laymen, that I have taken up my pen. I lay it down praying that God may accompany with His Spirit all that is *of the truth* in these pages, and may use it to confirm in the hearts of my readers, and to fructify on their lips, the testimony they are called to render to the Gospel of the grace of God preached for his part by the Apostle Paul."

He has placed the Epistles of St. Paul in their chronological order, dividing them into four groups, and the arrangement almost speaks for itself.

The House of her Prison. By E. S. CURRY. S.P.C.K. Price 1s. 6d. Pp. 128.

The writer is evidently at home among the London poor. The story is simple and true to life, and we can cordially recommend this warning on the dangers of London life to the country poor as a useful addition to the lending library or the Mothers' Meeting.

The Great Prophecies of the Centuries Concerning Israel and the Gentiles. By C. H. PEMBER, M.A. Hodder and Stoughton.

Some years ago Mr. Pember, widely known for that admirably suggestive work "Earth's Earliest Ages," published a volume of studies entitled "The Great Prophecies." The present work is a very considerably enlarged and revised edition of the earlier book; it is more comprehensive in scope, and somewhat modified in detail. Indeed, the additions and improvements are so numerous that more than two-thirds of the work are occupied by new matter.

Mr. Pember's prophetic views are very well known; he distinctly belongs to what is known as the Futurist School. Those principles of exposition upon which Futurists rely he adheres to as firmly in the present work as in his former books. In calling attention to this enlarged edition of a work of deep and vital interest to all students of Scripture, we would desire to emphasize our thankful appreciation of Mr. Pember's labours. We shall await with interest the two volumes he hopes to publish shortly—one on "The Great Prophecies of the Centuries Concerning the Church," a second on "The Great Prophecies of the End." Devoutness and reverent thoughtfulness are noteworthy features of all Mr. Pember's writings.

Faith in Relation to Creed, Thought, and Life. Three addresses by H. B. SWETE, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. S.P.C.K.

In 48 pages of large type Dr. Swete has crowded an amount of clear, helpful thinking upon an important subject quite disproportionate to the amount of space occupied. The way in which the relations between faith and thought are put before the reader is in every way admirable. These three addresses exhibit a strong grasp of the difficulties raised by "modern thought."

An Illustrative Scripture Reference Book. By Rev. G. S. BOWES. London: Nisbet, 1895.

This is not the first book of Scriptural illustration which Mr. Bowes has written. He has in past years given us several useful manuals having a direct or indirect bearing on this subject; but, in some respects, the present work is the best of all his books. The student who looks for novelty of view or for brilliant exegesis in its pages, will, it is true, be disappointed, for these things do not fall within the scope of Mr. Bowes' manual. Besides, novelty and brilliance are not everything in theology by a very long way, and one would be glad to see far less of what is new, and a little more of what is true, in the writings of not a few latter-day theologians.

The student, however, or the preacher, might do worse than keep the present unpretending little volume close beside him while working at the sacred text. It will be found really serviceable as a supplement to Cruden's time-honoured Concordance.

Education and Life in the United States. By SELINA HADLAND. Elliot Stock.

This is a most instructive little pamphlet of notes made after an educational tour, and is full of "things not generally known." Although it gives, on the whole, a favourable picture of American life, it is an incomplete one. The chapter on schools and colleges should be read by all school managers, though it will probably come as a surprise to those whose admiration of American methods leads them into a vigorous denunciation of the methods adopted on this side of the Atlantic. The chapter entitled "Sabbaths and Sermons" gives a bird's-eye view of the diversity of spiritual activity in the big cities. In the course of her travels the authoress seems to have gained such an insight into the way the educational problem is being tackled across the Atlantic, as falls to the lot of but few. Save when she endeavours to summarize sermons she is always readable, and is often entertaining.

The Great Problem. By "J. S." Elliot Stock. Price 1d. Pp. 55.

The anonymous author of this pamphlet endeavours to trace, rapidly, yet succinctly, "the progress of the spiritual education and development of the human race" in four distinct periods corresponding with the four periods in individual lives—childhood, boyhood or girlhood, youth and maturity. In many cases his illustrations are apt, and his style is a distinct advance upon the ordinary pamphlet of this class. "J. S." is worth reading.

The Best of Both Worlds. By THOMAS BINNEY. Pp. 182. London: Edward Knight.

This is a reprint of Dr. Binney's famous work written specially for young men, and full of practical thought and wisdom. It is only by religious principle that the present life can be lived happily and satisfactorily—a principle sanctioned by the austere philosophy of Emmanuel Kant.

Counsel and Comfort. By JANE PELLY. London: Elliot Stock.

Contains in a very brief compass much that is exceedingly helpful. An anxious searcher after "the truth as it is in Christ" will not seek in vain for it in this devout and suggestive little book.

Whether of the Twain. By Rev. J. D. W. WORDEN. Liverpool: J. A. Thompson and Co. Pp. 138.

This book is a collection of simple sermons written with a view to contrasting "the man of the world and the man of God," as illustrated by Scriptural biographies. The sermons or essays—for such they are—are fresh and readable, and are tinged with the working of an original mind. The sermon on "The Pharisee and the Publican" is remarkable for a convincing defence of the usually much-abused Pharisee. This is just the book for what is called "the respectable working man." Mr. Worden is always vigorous.

Nineteen Centuries Ago and Now. By the late J. C. H. MEHL; with biographical sketch by E. M. RUSH. Pp. 220. Robert Banks and Son.

This is a collection of essays, mainly upon different aspects of the Anglo-Israel question, by a German lady, who, during a life of much conflict, spiritual and material, developed a character of refined beauty. The story of her life as told by E. M. R. is most touching, not the least pathetic passage being the description of how, after a long spiritual pilgrimage, Miss Mehl found her home in the Church of her adopted country—our own National Church. The essays are clearly written and display a deep knowledge of the Scriptures. The argument for the Anglo-Israel theory is put very persuasively.

Animals' Rights. By H. S. SALT. Also an essay on Vivisection in America, by ALBERT LEFFINGWELL, M.D. Pp. 176. New York: Macmillan and Co.

This book, the work of a thinker of the Humanitarian school, is a strong plea for the rights of our dumb companions, and as such is worthy of the thoughtful perusal of all who feel a real interest in the application of Christian principles to our relations with the brute creation. Mr. Salt is an "advanced" writer, as the following passage will make clear: "If we are ever going to do justice to the lower races, we must get rid of the antiquated notion of a 'great gulf' fixed between them and mankind, and must recognise the common humanity that unites all living beings in one universal brotherhood." Of Dr. Leffingwell's essay we can only say that it is food for most painful reflection. If the cruelties of the dissecting-room be as the writer states, it is time the conscience of the Christian public was roused on the subject.

MAGAZINES.

We have received the following (August) magazines:

The Thinker, The Expository Times, The Religious Review of Reviews, The Review of the Churches, The Anglican Church Magazine, The Church Missionary Intelligencer, The Evangelical Churchman, The Church Sunday-School Magazine, Blackwood, The Cornhill, Sunday Magazine, The Fireside, The Quiver, Cassell's Family Magazine, Good Words, The Leisure Hour, Sunday at Home, The Girl's Own Paper, The Boy's Own Paper, Light and Truth, The Church Worker, The Church Monthly, The Church Missionary Gleaner, Light in the Home, Awake, India's Women, The Parish Helper, Parish Magazine, The Bible Society's Gleanings for the Young, The Bible Society's Monthly Reporter, The Zenana, The Cottager and Artisan, Friendly Greetings, Little Folks, Our Little Dots, The Child's Companion, Boy's and Girl's Companion, The Children's World, Daybreak, Day of Days, Home Words, and *Hand and Heart.*