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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN

OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

VOL. X.

NEW SERIES

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1896

THE

CHURCHMAN

OCTOBER, 1895.

ART. I.—WHAT WAS THE LANGUAGE SPOKEN BY OUR LORD?[1]

TOWARDS the close of the last century a controversy was opened in Italy, both the nature and the occasion of which were of an unusual character and interest. The great Empress Catherine II. of Russia, amid all the cares of empire, had given attention to the question which perhaps too little occupied the minds of the theologians of that day, "What was the language employed by our Lord in His public teaching and private intercourse with His disciples?" A Neapolitan layman of great learning, Dominico Diodati, who had received many favours from the Empress, acknowledged his obligation by endeavouring to prove that Greek, the sacred language of the Eastern Church, was the native and exclusive language used by Christ both publicly and privately, and propounded his reasons in a treatise entitled "De Christo Græcè loquente," dedicated in a panegyrical address to the Empress. The work was published at Naples in 1767, and does not appear to have met with much opposition until the year 1772, in which the great Oriental scholar, De Rossi, attempted its refutation in a treatise called "Della Lingua propria di Cristo," produced in that year at the royal printing establishment at Parma. It would be impossible in the narrow limits of these pages to give anything more than a sketch of these treatises, both of them replete with learning, and, even where failing in argument, suggestive of topics of surpassing interest to the Christian student.

To those who reflect that the language of the Jews was

[1] A brief examination of the treatise of Diodati, "De Christo Græcè loquente" (Neap., 1767), and of De Rossi, "Della Lingua propria di Cristo" (Parma, 1772).

bound up with their nationality, and, in a manner, with their life itself, it would seem, even at first sight, an incredible supposition that they could ever suffer it to fall into disuse, and that while their very thoughts were formed and moulded in the sacred language, they could give them utterance in one so singularly unlike it in all its essential characteristics. If they found it so hard a thing to "sing the Lord's song in a strange land," surely they would have found it a still harder one to "sing the Lord's song" in a strange language in their own land. They would in such a case, indeed, have forgotten Jerusalem, even when the temple was standing again before them. But a still weightier consideration has been suggested by Dr. Credner in his invaluable "Introduction to the New Testament." "A Greek-speaking Messiah," he writes, "was to the people of Palestine more than an abomination; it could not be even imagined" ("Einleitung," p. 186). In spite, and even in defiance, of these preliminary obstacles, the Greek advocate opens his cause with the boldness of one having before him the certainty of a triumph.

His fundamental propositions which he lays down almost as axioms are:

I. The language of the conquered changes into that of the conquerors.

II. The Egyptians in the age of Ptolemy Lagos spoke Greek.

III. The Syrians from the time of Seleucus Nicator employed the Greek language.

IV. The Jews received that language from the Greeks, the Egyptians, and Syrians.

From these premisses he concludes that Christ, the Apostles, and all the Jews employed the Hellenistic language.

I. The first of these propositions is met by De Rossi with an emphatic denial. The instances adduced are, as he shows, not only inadequate, but contrary to actual history. His own native country is admitted by Diodati to be an exception, and he vainly apologizes for the fact that Naples, Spain, Tuscany, though frequently changing their masters, retained throughout their ancient tongue. Still weaker is his argument from the case of England. Relying on an exaggerated and misunderstood passage of a fourteenth-century chronicler, he assumes that the Conqueror contrived to destroy the Saxon language, and to substitute for it the Norman-French. Upon which fiction he builds up the astounding assertion, "Thus by degrees the English language became altogether extinct." After glancing at the Oriental and Northern nations, whose languages, without the least proof, he concludes to have thus become extinct, he refers to the changes effected in the earlier

Hebrew language by the Babylonian conquest. Here he fails to see the distinction between the effect of a cognate language upon another of the same origin and family, and that of a language absolutely foreign and different in its entire structure and character.

De Rossi justly observes that it is not the mere conquest of a country, but its colonization which introduces the language of the conqueror among the conquered. And even where colonies are thus established among the conquered people they do not impose their language upon them, but in the natural course produce a mixed language, which gradually becomes distinct and permanent, and instances the beautiful language of Italy as an example of the mutual influence on each other of the language of the conqueror and the conquered; that of the Goths and the Lombards on the ancient language of the Peninsula. A remarkable proof of the tenacity of a native language is presented in the fact that on the expulsion of the Jews from Spain, they kept up in Africa, in Italy, and in Holland the Spanish language, and in Leghorn, Amsterdam, Constantinople, and Smyrna preserved it unchanged.

But if the Jews were thus tenacious even of a language they had acquired in the day of their persecution and dispersion, how firmly they must have clung to the language which to them was the sacred language, so closely allied to their religion as to be almost identified with it! The Greek advocate, in his proofs of the attempts made by the successive conquerors of Judæa to force upon the Jews the adoption of the Greek language and idolatry, is an unwilling witness against his own cause. For if these efforts had been in any degree successful, we should never have heard of the cruel persecutions which followed them, nor would the martyrs of the Maccabæan period have addressed and exhorted one another "in their native tongue" instead of in the Greek, which was the language of their persecutors. He is forced to admit that at this period the Jewish people were "bilingual" (p. 71), that their language in their intercourse with one another was the Chaldæan (which De Rossi more accurately terms the Syro-Chaldaic), and then, without the slightest authority, affirms that from the year 162 (B.C.) they threw off their old habit, and adopted the Greek language exclusively. Yet he admits that the "phrases and idioms peculiar to their earlier and native tongue were still retained," and of these he gives instances from the New Testament Scriptures. De Rossi traces with his usual clearness and judgment the gradual stages of decadence through which the original language of the Hebrews passed, chiefly through the admixture with it of other dialects, whose contributions to it were, however, recog-

nised and distinguished as words of foreign origin, the natives of Palestine being zealous to preserve as far as possible the integrity of their ancient language, and to secure "the Chaldee dialect of Babylon," as R. Elias Levita terms it, as the language of religion and of the synagogue, and in their more public and sacred writings. This would specially be the case in Jerusalem, where the language would be naturally purer, and the learned more influential than in any other part of Palestine. The language spoken in Galilee, where the Greek colonists abounded, was necessarily of a more mixed character than that spoken in Jerusalem. Yet here, again, De Rossi shows that a distinction must be drawn between the languages of Lower and Upper Galilee—Galilee proper and the Galilee of the Gentiles. Peter, whose occupation led him to mix constantly among the inhabitants of Galilee, was recognised by the bystanders as a follower of Jesus of Galilee by his speech, as we read in Matt. xxvi. 73. This is remarkable as the only place in which we have an indication of the kind of language employed by Jesus and his Apostles. This language is denominated by Zanolini the "Syriac of Jerusalem," and by the learned Oriental, Assemann, the "Syriac-Palestine" (*lingua Siriaca Palestina*). The early traditions of the Church embodied in the Apocryphal Gospels indicate the prevailing belief that our Lord not only used the language of His country in its then vernacular form, but that He was fully instructed in the Hebrew itself. And when St. Luke asserts that He "increased in wisdom," he points to that knowledge of the law which was involved by the Hebrews in the conception of the true wisdom, and which formed the text, as it were, of the "wisdom which is from above."[1] And without the knowledge of the sacred language this wisdom could not be acquired.

We may reasonably believe that the traffic of the Apostles on the Sea of Galilee rendered a knowledge of the Hellenistic Greek a necessity to them, while the occupation of St. Matthew as a tax-collector would require the same indispensable qualification, and thus admit that our Lord and His Apostles were in a certain degree bilingual. But that they used their native language in their intercourse with their fellow-countrymen in Jerusalem, Judæa and Samaria cannot be disputed for a moment. Unless they had formed for themselves a kind of tessellated language composed of separate fragments of the two dialects popularly spoken in Palestine, they must have adhered to the native language of Palestine. The universal tradition of the ancient Church that St. Matthew's Gospel (or, at least, the materials out of which it was arranged) was written in

[1] Vide "Maimonidis Moreh Nebnhchim," pars. iii., cap. 54.

Hebrew for the use of the Jews of Palestine, is a strong incidental proof that the words and teaching of Christ were conceived in the same language, that is, in the Syro-Chaldaic, into which the purer Hebrew had degenerated. It is, moreover, impossible that the words of Christ which are given in that dialect by the Evangelists, as "*Ephphatha*," "*Talitha cumi*," "*Aceldama*," "*Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani*," should be mere fragments, foreign and obsolete words mounted in a Greek setting. Nor can we imagine that the lowly family of Bethany, or the humble companions of our Lord during His progresses through Judæa and Samaria, could have used any other than the language which was the only one in which their religion was embodied. The assertion of Diodati that the citations of our Lord and the Apostles from the law and the prophets were made from the Septuagint is refuted by De Rossi, who proves that the quotations of our Lord are taken from the original Hebrew, and not from that strangely erratic translation. He compares the citation of Isaiah (xlii. 1) made by St. Matthew (xii. 18) with that of the Septuagint, from which it differs entirely; also that made from Deuteronomy viii. 3 by the same Evangelist (iv. 4). Still more discordant with the Septuagint version is the citation from the Prophet Zechariah (xiii. 7) by St. Mark (xiv. 27). A more signal example is that word uttered on the cross, "*Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani*," in which our Lord substituted for the original *hazavtani* the word in common use at a later age, which is found in one of the Targums, with which the public ear was familiar. On these words, so full of mysterious import, and so especially memorable as the words of David in his affliction, adopted by the Son of David in His agony, a controversy naturally arises between the learned Hebraist and the ingenious but too confident Hellenist. The latter exclaims of the ignorance of those who cried, "He calleth for Elias"—"En, quam bene Chaldaicam linguam intelligebant Judæi"—assuming them to have been Jews. Against this view almost all the greatest commentators are enlisted, holding that these were the words of the Roman soldiery. To this Diodati rejoins, "But how could the Roman soldiery know anything of Elias?" But surely, even if it were proved that no apostate Jews were admitted into the army of Herod, which is a point not capable of proof, the exclamation of our Lord would appear to any ignorant bystander to be an appeal to some person capable of assisting him who had failed to appear at the critical moment. Or, as De Rossi suggests, the utterers were Roman soldiers, who from their constant intercourse with Jews, had heard of the Elias who was yet to come and to work great miracles on behalf of His people. But a signal proof that our Lord employed the Syro-

Chaldaic language during His life is given us in the Acts, where the voice of Christ heard by St. Paul on his conversion is said to have been uttered "in the Hebrew tongue." No effort of skill or ingenuity can discredit a testimony so supreme in its authority and so clear in its statement. Carrying on the proofs that the Evangelists took their citations from the Old Testament, not from the Septuagint, but from the original Hebrew, De Rossi refers to Matthew i. 23 to ii. 6 and to the prophecy of Hosea xi. 1, where St. Matthew reads with the Hebrew, "Out of Egypt have I called my son," not "his sons," as the Septuagint has it. In Matthew ii. 18 "comforted" is in the LXX. turned into "rest." In ii. 30, "He shall be called a Nazarene," he shows that in the original Hebrew of Isaiah xi. 1, to which this name refers, it is lost entirely in the Greek version. In iv. 4, "Man shall not live by bread alone," our Lord follows the Hebrew original and not the LXX. In iv. 16, "The people that were sitting in darkness," which is the true Hebrew reading, is turned in the LXX. from a past tense into an imperative. In viii. 17 there is a still wider discrepancy between the Hebrew original and the Greek translation, and many others are pointed out by our author which space prevents us from describing.

The attempt of the Hellenist advocate to force the Septuagint version upon the Evangelists with the same unreasoning zeal with which he imposes the Greek language upon the Jewish nation is successfully refuted by the testimony of history and the uniform traditions of the Jewish people. The learned Jew, Azarya dei Rossi, the greatest ornament of Judaism in the sixteenth century,[1] writes, "The Chaldean language was then" (in the time of the Apostles) "the vulgar tongue and that used by the people. . . . The language employed in those times by the inhabitants of Palestine and the Evangelists was the Chaldean."[2] By them the Septuagint translation was regarded as the profanation of their most sacred treasure. However popular it was among the Egyptian Jews of Alexandria, the effect produced by it upon the pious inhabitants of Judæa was far different. "They feared not unnaturally," writes Dr. Grätz, their greatest modern historian, "that the law would be disfigured and perverted by its translation into Greek. "When the law was presented to them in a foreign tongue, the pious Judæans deemed Judaism itself altered and profaned. Consequently the commemoration of the translation which was celebrated as a festival by the Judæans in Egypt, was kept by their brethren in Judæa as a

[1] See Grätz, "Hist. of the Jews," vol. iv., p. 653.
[2] De Rossi, p. 125.

day of national mourning, similar to that upon which the golden calf had been worshipped in the desert, and this day became numbered amongst their fasts."[1] The clamour of the Jews when St. Paul was addressing them, which was hushed to silence when they found that "he spake in the Hebrew tongue to them,"[2] is a signal proof that that language was their native tongue, and that the language of the conqueror was regarded with repugnance. In the Talmudical tract *Sota* a tradition is recorded that during the invasion of Titus a law was passed that everyone should forbear to teach his son Greek, and the Gemara on this passage affirms that a similar law was promulgated under the Asmonæan kings. In the tract *Bava kama* anyone who dares to teach his family the literature of the Greeks is said to be accursed.[3]

With almost flippant contemptuousness the Hellenist advocate dismisses every Hebrew authority, relegating every Rabbinical writing to a later period than the sixth century, and treating with the contempt of a supercilious ignorance the Targums, the Mischna, the Gemara, and every ancient Jewish document.[4] The profound Hebraist, Dr. August Wünsche, whose "Illustrations of the Gospels from the Talmud and Midrasch" are one of the most valuable contributions to New Testament exegesis, observes with much force that though their production belongs to a comparatively late period, the traditions they embody ascend to a much earlier one, and represent materials which were current not only among the learned, but among the common people in the days when the Jews were yet a nation.[5]

It would seem, however, that the Hellenist advocate, anticipating the anti-Semitic violence of a later age, has determined rather to destroy every vestige of Judaism in Christianity, than to build up our faith upon the prophets as well as the Apostles, and to admit the continuity of the sacred and imperishable language in which their great revelations are embodied. To flatter the zealots of the Eastern Church, which has from early times shown the most relentless hostility to the scattered house of Israel, and in our own day, to the fatal injury of our religion, has almost renewed the afflictions of the Middle Ages, he has undertaken the task of depriving our Lord of His inheritance in the language of His ancestors, and of representing Him as a foreign claimant of the office of the Messiah. Yet a kind of misgiving occasionally presents itself

---

[1] Gratz, "Hist. of the Jews," vol. i., p. 531. [2] Acts xxii. 2.
[3] De Rossi, p. 84. [4] Diodati, pp. 177-181.
[5] Wünsche, "Erläuterung der Evang. aus Talmud und Midrasch Vorw.," p. 1.

to his mind, as when he writes: "But observe, reader, that here we are inquiring into the vernacular language of Christ, that, namely, which then obtained in Judæa. For otherwise who will deny that Christ was versed in all languages? Wherefore, if sometimes He used a Chaldee or a Hebrew word, it does not follow from thence that He always employed the Chaldee or Hebrew language, for both were vernacular to Him" (p. 134). To this we may rejoin, that this mixed manner of speech is of modern origin, and we do not find the ancients making their ordinary conversation a kind of tessellated pavement of different languages. Nor could the inexorable rigidity and different structure of a Semitic language like the Hebrew enable the fragments to fit in together. The Christian ought rather to be thankful that the laws and precepts of his religion were constructed on the basis of a simple and inflexible language rather than on one whose subtle refinements so seriously disturbed the simplicity of his faith in the ages of controversy which too soon succeeded its first promulgation. But the effort of the Hellenist is not without its moral lesson. It shows the excesses into which a mind of no ordinary learning and acuteness may be betrayed by the blind devotion to a theory, not to speak of the desire to flatter a great Sovereign, which gave it an additional impulse.

It would certainly greatly injure the ideal beauty which the words of our Lord derive from their belief that they were originally clothed in the sacred language of His nation, if we could conceive them as uttered in a foreign tongue and in the language of an idolatrous people from whom His country had suffered so much. "Greece was the object of the hatred of the Jews, on account of the sufferings they had endured at her hands, and the indignities she had inflicted on their sanctuaries."[1] And surely the belief that our Lord in His intercourse with His disciples, and in His discourses to the multitude, spoke in the national dialect (of which, both in the Scriptures, in Josephus, and in other writers, we have so many direct proofs), must contribute greatly to the removal of those prejudices and asperities which have so painfully separated the Christian from the Jew for so many centuries of alienation and distrust. If both the one and the other were to act up to the great principles of their faith, it would not be difficult for them to acquire the spirit of the great Apostle whose intense love to Christ led him to regard with a special affection those who were nearest to him in nature and relationship, his "brethren and kinsmen according to the flesh, to whom pertained the adoption and the covenants, and the giving of the law and the

[1] Grätz, vol. i., p. 531.

service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever" (Rom. ix. 3, 4, 5). When we contrast this profound sentiment of affection with the anti-Semitism which is so painfully developed on the Continent of Europe, we may well say of our degenerate Christianity:

"O buon principio
A che vil fine convien che tu caschi!"[1]

God grant that the social change in this respect, which has been brought about in England, may spread its influence over other lands, and that they who believe Christ to be "all and in all"[2] will remember that the "Greek and Jew" are alike included in this unlimited comprehension, and that they are equally bound to carry out the great principle upon which it rests, the love of that God who is "not only the God of the Jews, but of the Gentiles also."

ROBERT C. JENKINS.

ART. II.—REUNION, UNIFORMITY, AND UNITY.

WHITSUNDAY, 1895, is a red-letter day in the annals of our branch of the Catholic Church. On it, for the first time, the beautiful and most scriptural prayer for the unity of all Christians, in our Liturgy, was offered, we hope, in the greater number of the churches of the Anglican Communion throughout the world, and, by order of our chief Pastor, ought to have been offered in all of them. Shall we not look for, and expect, an answer to this grand concord of prayer which has gone up, and which we trust is still going up, from all parts of the world to the throne of Him who has Himself taught us to desire above all other things that we 'all may be one even as the Father and the Son are one'?

Our Blessed Lord's last prayer, the great High Priestly Prayer, which He offered the night before His crucifixion, contains these words: "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also that shall believe on Me through their word; that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me. And the glory which Thou gavest Me I have given them; that they may be one, even as We are one. I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that Thou

[1] Dante, "Paradiso," cxxvii. v. 60.
[2] Col. iii. 11.

hast sent Me, and hast loved them, as Thou hast loved Me" (St. John xvii. 20-23).

When we connect this, His last prayer, with His last prophecy, "This Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness among all nations, and then shall the end be" (St. Matt. xxiv. 14), and with His last command, "Go ye into all the world and make disciples of all nations," etc. (St. Matt. xxviii. 19), we cannot fail to see of what paramount importance the fulfilment of it must be to the success of mission work.

Note the difference between our Lord's method of revealing to us His desire for the unity of His disciples, and His method in the other two revelations. In His last prophecy and in His last command He addresses His disciples directly; in this He allows us to overhear Him pouring out the deepest longing of His soul into the ears of His Father and our Father. It is as though the subject were too sacred to be spoken of to human ears, so He adopts the more persuasive method of allowing us to overhear Him pouring out the most sacred and most earnest desire of His heart into His heavenly Father's ears. In doing so He also teaches us that this is one of those things which are impossible to man, but quite possible to God. The true disciple needs no command; he only needs to know his Lord's will that he may run and do it. Our dying Saviour could not have revealed His will to us in a more tender way than this. He has left us in no doubt that there is nothing for which He longs more eagerly than that His children should be one.

There are many blessed signs of the times in which we live which kindle in the hearts of all God's people the hope that the coming of the Lord is drawing nigh. Among these signs are the increased interest in the evangelization of Jews and Gentiles, the increased interest in the study of prophecy, and the efforts which are being made by so many different schools of thought, from the Pope of Rome to the humblest Nonconformist, to cultivate a spirit of unity among Christians more than has ever been cultivated before. At the same time, we cannot hide from ourselves the fact that while all may be said to pray for unity, there is a wide difference between the meaning of the prayer as it is used by different parties. The thing prayed for by all is not the same thing.

One prays for *the reunion of Christendom*, whatever that may mean. We should suppose that it means that all Christian Churches may be united under one visible organization, with or without one visible head on earth, and using the same liturgical form of prayers and the same rites and ceremonies in all particulars. The Romanist, following the example of the Pope when he prays for unity, *seeks for no change of heart or*

repentance in himself; he only prays that all other Christians may repent and turn to him. It is to be feared that many in our own beloved Church offer the prayer for unity with much the same meaning as the Romanist. How often have we heard the speaker say in effect, "Oh, that all Christians would agree with me, and then we should all be one."

In opposition to these and other similar errors our Church teaches us to look at home for the causes of our unhappy divisions, and to pray that God may take away *from our own hearts* all hatred, prejudice, and whatever else may hinder us from Godly union and concord.

There is one point on which we must all be agreed, viz., that it is our bounden duty to strive earnestly to know what is the mind of Christ, and when we pray for unity with other Christians, to do so *with God's great meaning, seeking to please Him, and Him only,* even though by doing so we may lose caste with those who are esteemed as pillars in the Church.

As the unity of Christians was the dearest of all things to the heart of the dying Saviour, and is now dearest to our Great High Priest upon the throne, so was it very dear to the heart of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, who wrote as follows to the Philippians from his prison in Rome: "If there be therefore any comfort in Christ, if any consolation of love, if any fellowship of the Spirit, if any tender mercies and compassions, fulfil ye my joy, *that ye may be of the same mind,* having the same love, being of one accord, *of one mind;* doing nothing through faction or vainglory, but in lowliness of mind, each counting other better than himself" (Phil. ii. 1-3).

One-mindedness is, then, possible for Christians. Nay, it is a most necessary grace, that we may fulfil the joy of Jesus and the joy of the blessed Spirit of the risen and glorified Christ, who inspired the great Apostle to write these words. This one-mindedness must be compatible with a wide room for differences of opinion and practice in many things which are not essential to salvation; but it cannot be compatible with any compromise between truth and falsehood, *i.e.*, with the neglect of any of the vital truths of Christianity, which are clearly revealed in Holy Scripture, or which may be proved thereby. We believe that it is the mind of Jesus that when we pray for unity we should seek for UNITY, AND NOT UNIFORMITY; and that as our Church teaches us that, "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation"; so also no other limit should be laid down to

separate us from the most perfect union and communion with all who love the Lord Jesus, and of whom we may have a well-grounded hope that He has accepted them unto salvation. Who, indeed, am I that I should reject one whom my Lord has accepted? How can I forget His words, "Take heed that ye offend not one of these little ones that believe in Me. It were better that a great millstone were tied about his neck, and that he were cast into the depths of the sea, than that he should offend one of these little ones"?

The various meanings of the different parties who pray for unity may be divided under three heads: I. The Reunion of Christendom; II. Uniformity; III. Unity.

I. The Reunion of Christendom.

Those who pray for this primarily in general seek *reunion* with what they call the great branches of the Catholic Church, and the *conversion* of those whom they regard as heretics, or schismatics, to the Catholic faith. One of them, a clergyman of the Church of England, lately told his hearers from a pulpit in my immediate neighbourhood that "the blessed company of all faithful people" was to be found in those who were in communion with Moscow, Rome, and Canterbury. We need not say that this is directly contrary to the teaching of our beloved Church, which teaches us to thank God "that we are very members incorporate in the *mystical* body of Christ, which is the company of *all* God's faithful people." It is in this *mystical* body of Christ, and not in any visible organization, or number of visible organizations, that we profess to believe when we say "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church"; and it is a spiritual union with all the members of this mystical body of which we speak when we say, "I believe in the communion of saints." If there were any visible body to which these terms referred, these would not be articles of our creed, for "faith is the evidence of things *not seen*," not of things which are visible to the eyes of the body; it is as true of faith as it is of hope, that "Faith that is seen is not faith."

(1) *Reunion with Rome.*

At the head of those who are making most earnest efforts for the reunion of Christendom stands the Pope of Rome. The holy Pontiff, the Vicegerent of God on earth, the Bishop of bishops, and the prince of the kings of the earth (*sic*), is sending forth his loving letters to all falsely-called Christians, Eastern and Western, entreating them to return into the pale of the one true Church, for there is no Church except the holy Roman, and there is no salvation outside her pale. Everlast-

ing punishment in hell is the certain portion of all who will remain separate from Rome. There is no hope for them that they shall have any part in the joys of heaven *or even in the pains of purgatory.* His letter to the English people is not addressed to any Church in England (there is no such Church except the Roman), but "to you all in England, to whatever *institution* or *community* you may belong," his desire is "that you may all *meet into* the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God (Eph. iv. 13), careful to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, one body and one spirit, as ye are called in one hope of your calling. . . . With loving heart we turn to you all in England, *to whatsoever community or institution* you may belong, desiring *to recall* you to this holy unity." On the principle of reunion or uniformity there is no hope for us here or hereafter unless we obey the Pope; we know of no other practical theory of uniformity; over 200,000,000 of Christians are members of that one body; hell is the certain portion of all who disobey. And to all Catholics who will pray for our conversion, not to the Father, nor to the Triune God, but "*to the blessed Mary, mother of God,*" he promises a deliverance of 300 days from the pains of purgatory. We know the means which were for many centuries used by the Popes to compel men to keep this holy unity, the sword, the stake, the galleys, the tortures of the Inquisition, etc. There is no expression of repentance for the use of those means in times past. Yet we believe there are, and have been in all ages, true saints of God within the pale of the Roman Church, and we trust that with them, even though they do not acknowledge us, we shall ever strive to hold fast the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

(2) *Reunion with the Greek Church.*

We believe that the present Czarina is the first person that has ever been admitted as a proselyte from any other body into the Greek Church, either in Russia or Greece, without being obliged to anathematize the members of the community which she left in order to join the so-called Orthodox Church. The same means, in kind at all events, if not in degree, are still practised in Russia that used to be in Rome, to compel all members of the Orthodox Church to continue in the holy unity of the faith. Thousands of Stundists banished to Siberia for "holding the Word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ" are proofs of this. The adoration of icons (pictures of saints) is the commonest form of worship in Russia. No railway restaurant, no saloon in a steamer, no private sitting-room is properly furnished without its icon. If a Stundist removes the icon from his sitting-room, he will soon receive a visit from a

policeman, who will say, "Where is your icon? I will call to-morrow." He does call the next day, and if the icon is not put back in its place, the poor Stundist will in all probability be sent to Siberia.

Kief is the holy city of Russia, the place of pilgrimage for all the inhabitants of all the Russias. It is beautifully situated on the high and well-wooded banks of the Dnieper. The first Russian of rank who became a Christian, Prince Vladimar, was a native of the holy city. The church to which all the pilgrims resort stands on a high hill, looking down on the noble river which flows beneath it. There are catacombs under the church, in which some hundred and fifty holy monks were miraculously kept alive for several months during a time of persecution of the Christians by the Pagan Tartars, who slew all the other Christian inhabitants of the city. On the Sunday previous to our visit to Kief, in 1887, 10,000 pilgrims from all parts of the vast empire visited the church. We accompanied a party of them to the holy place. On entering the courtyard of the church each pilgrim had to give a piece of money to a monk who acted as gate-keeper. A few steps farther on another monk received alms for prayers to be offered for the souls of dead relatives. After visiting the church, we were conducted by a steep path down the side of the hill to the entrance of the catacombs, where we had to pay four times the price for a taper, which each of us carried lighted in his hand into the place of the dead. The catacombs consist of long, narrow underground passages, every few yards along the walls of which were to be seen sarcophagi, containing what purported to be the bodies of the 150 monks, though nothing was to be seen but their robes, no part of the bodies being exposed to sight. Beside each sarcophagus was a box for alms. We left the catacombs by another gate, outside which a monk sold a phial of holy oil to each of the pilgrims, and they were given to understand *that the oil dropped from the heads of the monks.* Our guide whispered in our ears that the robes of the monks were stuffed with straw, and added, that if he said that to a Russian, he would be in danger of banishment to Siberia. The pilgrims are told that none of the bodies have been embalmed, but they have been miraculously preserved from corruption by the holiness of the monks.

Another anecdote.—When crossing the Caucasus in a railway-carriage in the spring of 1893, we had a long conversation with a most agreeable and highly educated officer of a good Russian family in St. Petersburg. He said, "It is very foolish to read the Bible, for all who do so leave the Orthodox Church." I am quite sure that this is an exaggeration, for I have known good Christians, members of the Orthodox Church, who, I feel

sure, did read their Bibles. He added: "My brother officers and myself have no religion; we believe there is a God, and no more. But we and all the soldiers in the Russian army are compelled by law to receive the Holy Eucharist once a year." I asked: "Have you to make confession to a priest before receiving it?" He replied: "Of course we have." "Do you confess all the sins of the year?" "Not one of them." "What, then, do you confess?" "Oh, I say, 'Holy father, I have broken all the commandments.' And he says, 'Your sins are forgiven you; go in peace.'" By a strange coincidence this happened on the Russian Easter Eve. We went that night to a large civilian church in Batoum, and found it thronged with soldiers, hardly any civilians being among the congregation. The soldiers were there to receive their annual communion according to the law—not of God, but of man. The service began at ten o'clock, and lasted till about three o'clock in the morning, though no ecclesiastic took any part in it till after midnight. The poor soldiers stood the whole time, and were most devout.

When we remember that there are some 2,000,000 soldiers in the Russian army living as a class in the grossest immorality, for which manner of life special provision is made by the State, and that gigantic institutions are kept up by the Russian Government for the rearing and training of illegitimate children for the army, we cannot sufficiently express the horror we feel at this desecration of the most solemn and sacred of all the ordinances of our holy faith.

And yet Russia is a land of paradoxes. The holy Synod of the Greek Church welcomes and helps forward the work of the British and Foreign Bible Society in disseminating the Word of God. More than half a million portions of Holy Scripture are sold in Russia annually by the society, with the full approval and aid of the holy Synod. Through the Christian kindness of officers and officials in high places free passes on the railways and steamers are frequently given to the colporteurs of the society, and access is given for the distribution of the Scriptures to the prisoners in the Russian prisons and to the convicts in Siberia. Surely in Russia also, both in the Orthodox Church and among the sects, are many of the company of God's faithful people, members of the mystical body of Christ, for whom we ought to feel the very deepest sympathy, and with whom we may strive to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.

(3) *Reunion with the so-called Heretical Churches of the East.*

These may be divided into (as they are called in Church history) Eutychian and Nestorian. Of the latter there is only

a comparatively small community, among whom the missionaries of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission are labouring in the most self-denying manner. Of the former there are a great number of different churches, no one of which, we believe, has communion with any other. As the Orthodox Church anathematizes all the Eutychian sects, so does each Eutychian church anathematize every other. In one point all the branches of the Eastern Church agree, viz., in the rules observed by them as to the marriage or celibacy of the clergy. According to them all, what we call a parish priest must be a married man, and no married man, as long as his wife lives, can be raised to the episcopate. They apply the words of St. Paul, "Let a bishop be the husband of one wife," to the presbyters, and no man can be ordained as a presbyter till he has taken a wife to himself; and if his wife dies, he cannot marry again. They have made a rule of their own, "Let a bishop have no wife." So none but monks can be raised to the episcopate. Such a custom degrades the parish priest both in his own eyes and in that of his flock, *makes ambition the chief motive for entering the monastic order*, degrades the people by teaching them to worship the long robes and handsome silken cowls (hoods) of the monks, irrespective of all regard for holiness of life, or even purity of morals, and degrades the episcopate by raising to it men who know nothing of family life, and who have no sympathy with their flocks. In the Nestorian Church there is a worse custom even than this, for the bishop, the archbishop, or patriarch, who must be a celibate himself, is, as a rule, succeeded by his brother's son, or by his nearest male relative. The boy, though he may have no spiritual qualifications for any office in the Church, is, from his earliest years, set apart and trained for the most spiritual and highest of all offices. Such is the apostolic succession or historic episcopate of the Eastern churches. Clergymen of our own Church come out to the East, and while they treat the most holy and devoted American missionaries and their flocks as schismatics, with whom they can have no unity of the Spirit, because they have neither apostolic succession nor the historic episcopate, regard the corrupt Churches of the East as branches of the True Vine, because they have the apostolic succession above described.

Julfa is an Armenian suburb of the Moslem city of Ispahan. It is the seat of an Armenian bishop or archbishop. It contains a population of about 3,000 Armenians, and there are some sixty villages of Armenian Christians, scattered through the mountains of Persia, under the care of the bishop. As a rule the priests of these villages have no education whatsoever, and are poor husbandmen. During the twenty-four years of

my residence in Julfa, from 1869 to 1893, there were three bishops successively residing in Julfa. The first was driven out by his own flock, on the accusation of having made so many priests at about £8 a head (the present which he demanded from each at his ordination) that he flooded the place with unworthy priests. The second was driven out twice, on the accusation of covetousness—I believe because he had no sympathy with his flock, nor they with him; the second time he did not return. After an interregnum he was succeeded by a third. During the whole of these twenty-four years not one of these three bishops ever visited one of the above-mentioned villages. Our blessed rite of Confirmation has with all Eastern Churches degenerated into the Chrism. The course of its degeneration seems to have been as follows: The anointing with oil was added to the apostolic rite of laying on of hands; it was changed into a sacrament, and therefore regarded as necessary to salvation. For this reason it became the custom to administer it to infants, and as a bishop could not be present at every baptism, it was administered by the presbyter. The laying on of hands was discontinued, and the human ordinance of anointing with oil, for which there is no authority in the Word of God, was substituted for the laying on of hands. In the Armenian Church the people believe that the oil is manufactured miraculously by the Patriarch, and that no other oil is efficacious for the purpose; the common people naturally regard it as the most essential part of baptism. This accounts for the neglect of the villages by the bishops in Julfa, the only office peculiar to the episcopate being ordination, and as in this case the mountain can come to Mohammed, Mohammed does not go to the mountain, and the poor Armenian Christians are left scattered among the Moslems as sheep without a shepherd.

THE WORSHIP OF PICTURES.

The following service, which was held by the third of the above-mentioned bishops in the "Church of the Mother of God," in Julfa, on September 6, 1891, will prove that the time for reunion with the Armenian Church has not yet come. The occasion of the service was the putting up of a picture of a saint in the church, and the following are quotations from the Form of Service which was used, taken from the Liturgy of the Church:

"*The Form of Consecration of Pictures of*——.

"*The Bishop and others who take part in the ceremony shall keep watch in the church the whole night till about* 3 *a.m.*

"*Then Psalm cxviii. shall be read.*

"*Then shall they ascend the bema (βήμα), and the picture shall be washed first with water, then with wine, and be wiped with a clean linen cloth.*

"*And the Bishop shall say:*

"O Lord God of Hosts, Creator of all creatures, we Thy sinful servants have made pictures and images of saints, and we are gathered in Thy holy temple and beseech Thee to send the grace of Thy Holy Spirit, as Thou didst in the upper room, to bless this picture, which we have made in the name of Saint ——.

"O Lord, our God, strengthen now by Thy holy might this holy picture, which we have anointed in Thy most Blessed Name, that it may be a speedy helper and saviour of those who put their trust in it; a preserver of travellers by land and sea. O Lord, bless this picture by Thy Divine power, and give it access to Thyself, that it may be an intercessor for mankind, a purifier of sinners, a healer of the sick, a caster out of devils, and a bestower of spiritual and bodily health, to the glory of Thy Divine Name. O Lord, endue this picture with the grace of the wonder-working power of Thy Holy Spirit, that it may give strength to our nation, liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; that it may destroy infidels and protect believers, etc.

"*Then the Bishop shall anoint the picture, and say:*

"Let this holy picture be blessed, anointed, and sanctified by the sign of the holy cross, the Holy Gospel, and the holy chrism, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Amen.

"O Lord God, Creator of all creatures, give grace to this picture, that it may help and strengthen us and all Thy faithful servants. And whosoever shall fall down before this picture and pray to Thee, whether for the conversion of sinners, or for atonement for sin, or for deliverance from unclean spirits, do Thou hear his prayer and grant his petition. And if any man come before this and pray to Thee for healing of disease or deliverance from enemies and dangers, then do Thou, O Lord, hear and save. And if any come before this picture and pray to Thee to plead the cause of the oppressed before their judges, then do Thou, O Lord, have mercy and save and help them. And if any worship this picture in Thy Name, and pray for the peace of the world or other necessities, then do Thou, O Lord, vouchsafe to hear their prayers, and show mercy according to their several necessities, etc. Amen.

"*When the Bishop consecrates a picture he shall anoint the several parts with the prayers suited to each, e.g.:*

"*The Forehead.*—Let the forehead of this picture be sanctified, anointed, and blessed by the sign of the holy cross and the holy chrism, that it may be a speedy helper and saviour of those who put their trust in the Lord, a preserver of travellers by land and sea, a healer of the sick, a purifier of sinners, and that it may give confidence to those that are in doubt, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

"*The Mouth.*—Let the mouth of this picture be, etc.,—and may it be endued with power to heal the sick, to cast out devils, to intercede for mankind, to give prosperity to families and bodily and spiritual health.

"*The Hands.*—May the hands of this picture, etc.,—and may its right hand give strength to our nation, deliverance to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; may it destroy infidels and protect those who believe in Thy most Holy Trinity."

There are special prayers to be added for the consecration of pictures of "God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit, and of the Mother of God." The strangest part of this sad ceremony is the following prayer, to be used

"*If the Picture be one of our Saviour:*

"O Lord God, who didst forbid us to make any likeness of anything in heaven or on the earth or in the waters to worship it, and now we Thy servants and Thy handmaids, who believe in Thy Name, have made this picture, not to worship the substance of it, nor to admire the skill of the artist, but we have made it in the name of Thy only begotten Son, whom Thou didst send into the word, Light of lights, and Life of life; who at Thy pleasure came, and by means of His body, which He took from the Virgin, clothed Himself in our likeness, that He might raise us in His likeness to Thy Godhead. But because men liked to worship wooden images of men made by carpenters, He became the image of man, that He might bring the makers and worshippers of images into obedience to His Divine image. And because men used to worship lifeless images of dead men, He became a dead image on the cross; He died and became lifeless that He might make men obedient to His image, and thus He gave the image of His Godhead to be an object of worship to those who loved to worship images. Therefore accept at our hands and bless this picture, that it may be worthy to be called the image of Thy only begotten Son, and be a means whereby we may worship Thy co-existent Trinity."

We have dwelt thus long on the first head of our subject, "The Reunion of Christendom," because we believe that many who use the prayer for unity make it the primary, and some make it the sole object of their desire. Much and most earnestly as it is to be desired, we cannot see in the signs of the times any hope of its being attained in our days. As far as we can understand "the more sure word of prophecy," we do not think it will take place till the Lord comes. But be that as it may, though it may be the final, it is not the primary, meaning of the prayer taught us by our Lord, St. Paul, and our Church, as, we trust, will be made more clear by a prayerful meditation on the other two heads of our subject, Uniformity and Unity.

ROBERT BRUCE.

(*To be continued.*)

ART. III.—OXFORD DURING THE REFORMATION.

THE most obvious monument of the Reformation to be seen in the streets of Oxford is the memorial which commemorates the death of the three men to whom, among the many leaders of the English Reformation, their fellow-countrymen have paid the fullest tribute of grateful memory. But the fact that Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer perished at Oxford, the knowledge of which comprises all that most perhaps know of the history of the town during the Reformation period, is no true index to the chief part which the University played in the great work of the sixteenth century, for they were none of them Oxford men, nor had their work been in any close degree connected with the University; and the fact that Oxford was the place chosen for their execution has little bearing on the real impetus which Oxford gave to the movement. Even if we take a wider view, and include within our range others whose names are next closely connected with the cause of Reform, we shall find that few of them either owe their training to the University or saw in it the proper sphere of their labours. Tyndale, indeed, was from childhood brought up in Oxford, and there the seeds were probably planted which in later life bore fruit elsewhere, and Jewel and Hooker, both of them Corpus Christi men, were true children of the University; but this was the case with few of those whom we are accustomed to regard as the heroes of the movement, and throughout the whole of the latter period Oxford's condition was somewhat torpid, and the transitions through which she was passing largely prevented her from assuming that prominence which has been her lot at many other times of spiritual revival.

But, on the other hand, it would be a mistake to suppose that to the Reformation Oxford contributed nothing; on the contrary, it did a great work; we must look for it, however, to the earlier years of the century rather than to the later, to the beginning of the movement rather than to its development. It was a work done by men who did not themselves foresee the results to which their work must necessarily lead; its connection with the later events is not always obvious, but it formed a foundation on whose firm basis the permanence of the subsequent structure largely depended. In short, to use the concluding words of the writer of the first article in this series, "it was at Oxford that the literary foundations of the Reformation were laid."

In the year 1497 or 1498 Erasmus, who had been for some time studying in Paris, resolved to move to some other home of learning. His longing desire was to visit Italy, but funds were scarce, and he was persuaded instead to come over to England and to visit Oxford. When he arrived he felt abundantly satisfied. The opportunities of learning which were afforded him and the society of Oxford scholars proved so congenial that he was quite content to let Oxford take the place of Italy. It is true that a year or two later the old wish revived, but for the present he found in Oxford all that he wanted, for Oxford had by now caught the light of the New Learning that had dawned first in Italy. There Oxford men had been and imbibed the spirit of the Renaissance, and, infusing into that spirit something which was peculiarly their own, they had wakened Oxford almost to a new life. It was one feature of this new life that Greek thought and Greek literature were now beginning to assume an importance in the studies of the Universities which they had never had before. In particular, Linacre, Grocyn and Colet, after studying for a time in Italy, had now returned to Oxford to import a new vigour and brightness into the triviality and monotony of its lecture-rooms. With all of them Erasmus was delighted, but especially with Colet, and between these two scholars there sprang up a warm and lasting friendship. Colet was perhaps not so proficient in Greek as some have supposed, but, without question, he was a learned and thoughtful man, and, moreover, a man of deep piety. He was one of the first to see in the hand of the new-risen Greece the gift which she had to bestow, and it was on the understanding of Holy Writ that he made all his learning converge. It would be interesting to trace, if we could, the human source of his unusual eagerness for real Bible study, but he tells us little about himself, and all we can safely say is that Colet went to Italy and brought back with him a spirit which was Italian in its fire and vigour, but

un-Italian in its purity, its noble aim, and its consecration to the service of God. It was largely through Colet that the Renaissance in England took a Christian and not a merely pagan tone, and showed itself in a yearning for truth instead of in a mere desire for beauty. At the time when Erasmus came to Oxford, Colet was lecturing gratuitously on the Epistles of St. Paul. Large numbers even of senior men flocked to hear him. Flinging aside the customary method of treatment by which the books of the Bible were regarded as a mere armoury of texts to be explained, or explained away, in all manner of senses, literal, allegorical, anagogical, and then hurled at an opponent's head, he tried, instead, to treat them as a whole, to put himself in the position of the writer and his first readers, to ask how profane literature illustrated the words and the truths which St. Paul taught. Little use did Colet make of the traditional authorities on which his contemporaries mainly relied. "With the single exception of one reference to a mystic writer, there is hardly a quotation from the Fathers or Schoolmen throughout his exposition of the Epistle to the Romans."[1]

No doubt Colet had not wholly freed himself from the weakness of mediæval methods, but lecturing such as this must have presented a great contrast to the style to which Oxford had long been accustomed and from which it was not yet wholly free. In the year 1497 the Lady Margaret, mother of Henry VII., appointed a new Divinity Professor at Oxford (six years later the professorship was permanently endowed), and it has been noted, as in sharp contrast to the method of Colet, that the new professor announced for the subject of his first course of lectures the "Quodlibeta" of Duns Scotus. In Colet's teaching there was no formal statement of reformed doctrine, still less anything which could be construed into an attack on the traditional dogmas of the Church: when, at a later date, his enemies tried to fasten upon him a charge of heresy, the worst they could bring against him was that he had spoken against images, and had translated the Lord's Prayer into English; but, nevertheless, a method of teaching which Erasmus could describe as "a contest for the restoration in its primitive brightness and dignity of that old and true theology which had been obscured by the subtleties" of preceding divines, could not fail to prepare the way for that rejection of mediæval superstitions and doctrines of men which in God's providence was soon to follow.

The most conspicuous of Colet's younger friends at Oxford was Thomas More, whose amiable disposition and great ability

[1] Seebohm's "Oxford Reformers," p. 15.

endeared him not only to Colet, but also to Erasmus. But More did not remain long at Oxford, and his subsequent career concerns us little here. A reformer the author of "Utopia" certainly was, in spite of that attitude of mind which made him ultimately part company with the newer reformers, and turned him finally into a martyr for the older cause, the noblest and most regretted of those who gave up their life for its sake. His career, however, makes it abundantly clear how little these early literary reformers saw the necessary result of their teaching, or were ready to accept the conclusions for which their labours prepared the minds of their contemporaries.

It is difficult to trace directly or immediately the results of Colet's teaching. We cannot ascertain whether any of those who afterwards led the way in religious reform had been in earlier years among his disciples, and had directly caught from him the spirit of studious and pious inquiry which ultimately developed into revolt against Rome and her doctrines; but there is reason for believing that Tyndale, at all events, had listened to his lectures. Nor can we forget that to the life-work of Erasmus the cause of the Reformation owed much, and that Erasmus himself was indebted to Oxford and to Colet for some of the most potent of the many influences that helped to mould his character. But at Oxford Colet seems to have left no immediate successors. When, after the lapse of a few years, Grocyn, Colet, and Linacre left Oxford one after another at the call of other duties, there was seemingly no one at the University to take up their work. Erasmus, who might have done it, had some time previously returned to the Continent, refusing Colet's invitation to remain at Oxford and lecture on one of the books of the Pentateuch, or on the prophecies of Isaiah. It is remarkable, moreover, that no trace of the influence of the Renaissance can be seen in the statutes for the regulation of Brasenose College, which was founded in 1509. But the impulse which had been given to the New Learning was not destined thus to die out, and its effect may again be clearly traced in the programme of study prescribed for the two other colleges which date from the first thirty years of the sixteenth century.

The earlier of these colleges, Corpus Christi, was founded by Bishop Foxe of Winchester. He had intended at first to build a house at Oxford which should serve to train monks for St. Swithin's Priory at Winchester, but he was dissuaded from his purpose by Oldham, Bishop of Exeter. "What, my lord!" he said to Foxe, "shall we build houses and provide livelihoods for a company of bussing monks whose end and fall we may ourselves live to see? No, no! It is more meet a great deal that we should have care to provide for the increase of learning, and

for such as who by their learning shall do good in the Church and commonwealth." Influenced apparently by these words, Foxe resolved to found a college. There is much of interest in the statutes of that "busy hive," as Foxe loved to characterize the college which his hopes and intentions pictured; but it is sufficient to notice that Foxe provided for the establishment of a professor of Greek, whose lectures were to be open not only to Corpus men, but to the University at large; that instead of prescribing Latin as the sole language in which the students might converse with one another, he permitted Greek as an alternative; and that he laid down most significant rules as to the course of instruction which the Professor of Theology was to give. "In his interpretation," Foxe directs, "let him always, as far as possible, follow the ancient and holy doctors, both Latin and Greek, and especially Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose, Origen, Hilary, Chrysostom, John Damascene, and others of that sort; not Nicholas of Lyra, nor Hugo of Vienne, and the rest who cannot be ranked with them either for antiquity or for ability."

The other college, Christ Church, owes its origin, as is well known, to Wolsey. Whatever were Wolsey's faults, he seems to have had a genuine desire to aid the cause of learning, and something more than an ambitious desire to leave a lasting monument of himself must have prompted the touching letters in which after his fall he pleads with the King that the college he has founded may be spared. Wolsey himself had been at Magdalen, where he had been bursar, and for a short time head-master of the college school. During the period of his ascendency in the King's councils, the University lost no opportunity of paying him obsequious court; and when in 1517, in company with Queen Catharine, he visited Oxford, a proposal was made to give him full authority over the University statutes, so as to reform, revoke, or reissue them as he pleased. The formal consent of the University to this unprecedented proposal was granted in the following year, in spite of the opposition of Archbishop Warham, the Chancellor of the University. The contemplated revision was never carried out, though in 1523 Wolsey obtained from the King a charter fuller and more favourable than any which the University had previously possessed. But meantime he was maturing a far grander project. In 1524 he obtained from the Pope a Bull authorizing him to suppress the priory of St. Frideswide at Oxford (its inmates being transferred to other houses), and to use its revenues for a new college at Oxford. A later Bull gave him permission to treat in the same way other English houses in which there were only a few inmates. To the funds so obtained Wolsey added donations of his own.

The site of St. Frideswide's and of Canterbury Hall was chosen for the structure, which was to be called Cardinal's College, and was devised on a vast and splendid scale, of which the present buildings are a totally inadequate representation. Wolsey intended to have a large central court, surrounded on all sides by a cloister; on one side was to be a spacious dining-hall, with kitchen below, while on the opposite, it would seem, was to be a stately church; for the present cathedral, then the chapel of St. Frideswide, was probably not intended to remain; indeed, part of it was demolished by Wolsey to make room for the college buildings. As regards the inmates, Wolsey meant to have a dean and sub-dean, a hundred canons of different degrees, six professors, and twelve chaplains.

The foundation-stone of the building was laid in 1525. Before the college buildings were ready, Wolsey seems to have found quarters for students and lecturers elsewhere. Some of these lecturers were also connected with Corpus, and perhaps lectured in common both for the Cardinal's students and for those of Foxe's college. At Wolsey's fall in 1529 the college was allowed to remain on sufferance for a time; three years later the King refounded it as Henry VIII.'s College; then he dissolved it, and finally refounded it in 1546 as Christ Church, attaching to it the new see of Oxford, which, founded two years previously, had hitherto been connected with Oseney Abbey. Dr. King, the former Abbot of Oseney, was the first Bishop of the new diocese.

Meantime the first sounds of the coming storm had been heard. It was in 1517 that Luther nailed his theses to the church-door at Wittenberg, and rapidly had the Reform movement gathered strength. Many in England were ready to lay hold of a purer faith, and the books of Luther, though forbidden from the first, are soon found to be increasingly circulated. They reached Oxford very early. Already in 1521 Warham, the Chancellor of the University, and Longland, the Bishop of the diocese, had written to Wolsey—the former, indeed, twice—urging him to take active measures for repressing the heresy with which the younger members of the University were beginning to be infected. Wolsey, however, was not a persecutor, and all he did with regard to the University was to summon certain Oxford divines to London, agree with them on a form of declaration condemnatory of Luther's tenets, and order it to be fastened on the dial of St. Mary's Church at Oxford. But the books continue to be read in secret, and before long we again hear of heresy at Oxford, particularly, as we might expect, in the new colleges which Foxe and Wolsey had founded.

The Cardinal had encouraged students to migrate to his

college, not only from other colleges in Oxford and from the Continent, but also from Cambridge; and among those who came over from the sister University were several who soon became adherents of the new doctrines, and had, perhaps, been already suspected while at Cambridge of heretical tendencies. Among the younger men, it would seem that zeal for the New Learning already implied a tendency to the acceptance of reformed views on doctrinal matters. One of those who came from Cambridge was Clark, who after his arrival at Oxford was accustomed to gather together a little band to study the Holy Scriptures. Of this company was Anthony Dalaber, to whom we owe a graphic account of the persecution which arose in Oxford in the year 1522. One Thomas Garrett had come to Oxford, bringing with him prohibited books; the authorities traced him out, and his arrest was ordered. Being warned in time, he fled. Dalaber had a brother who was a clergyman in Dorsetshire, and it was arranged that Garrett, under an assumed name, should go thither and serve him as curate. The arrangement wears an ugly look, for Dalaber's brother was "a rank Papist." Garrett, however, never reached Dorsetshire; for some reason or other he returned, and was arrested; but making his escape, he fled to Dalaber's rooms, who had migrated from St. Alban's Hall to Gloucester College, which occupied the site of the present Worcester College, but was then separated from the chief parts of the town by many crooked lanes and winding streets. After the two had prayed, Garrett fled into the country in disguise, where, after some adventures, he was at last captured and taken to London. Meantime Dalaber had hurried off to commune with the rest of the company, whom we find were mainly Christ Church or Corpus men. On his return he found his room ransacked, and he himself had to undergo various cross-questionings, which, unhappily, he answered with more regard for immediate expediency than for truth. Eventually the names of the band was discovered, and they were dealt with in various ways. Dalaber himself was set in the stocks, we know not for how long; some submitted, and on doing penance were released; others, including Clark, were imprisoned, their prison, it is said, being a cellar where salt fish was commonly stored. Here Clark died, through the foul odour of the place, according to some, through a pestilence that visited Oxford, according to others; nor are the two accounts necessarily at variance. When before his death he was refused the Communion, he quietly met the refusal with the words "Crede et manducasti."

Meantime the question of the divorce had begun to agitate England and Europe generally. The opinion of Oxford Uni-

versity, as of the other European Universities, was asked, and the King and Warham both sent down letters on the subject, the former requesting the members of the University to declare their minds "sincerely and truly without any abuse," but at the same time expressing his belief that the result would tend "to his high contentation and pleasure." But it was well known that considerable opposition was to be expected on the part of the younger Masters of Arts, and an attempt was made to allow a small committee of graduates in Divinity to give judgment in the name of the whole University. This proposal met with strong opposition, but Warham and the King were urgent, the latter significantly reminding the opposition that "non est bonum irritare crabones," and ultimately the plan was carried out. But even this packed committee were somewhat cautious in their reply, qualifying by certain conditions their statement that "marriage with a deceased husband's brother was contrary to the law of God," and in no way touching on the question whether the Pope could dispense with Divine law. Less opposition was encountered when in 1534 the University was called upon to renounce the Pope's supremacy. They did so in the same terms as had been adopted by the Convocation of York.

The suppression of the monasteries exercised a very potent influence on the condition of the Universities. Hitherto one large portion of the students at Oxford consisted of young men who were dwelling in the various religious houses which were to be found in the city. Often they were poor students supported out of the funds of religious bodies either in Oxford or elsewhere. By the suppression the University was cut off from one of its most fruitful recruiting-grounds, and it is not surprising that a considerable diminution of members ensued. There is not much of special interest in such records as we have of the visits paid by the commissioners to Oxford houses; but the visitor to Oxford, as he walks along the banks of the upper river, and sees the ruins of Godstow Nunnery, may like to remember that here the commissioners found nothing to censure. Previously, however, to their visitation of the religious houses, Layton made an official visitation of the University. He boasts that he made many reforms both in the discipline and in the studies of the University, and exults with great glee over the fate of Duns Scotus, whom he says "he had set in Bocardo, and utterly banished from Oxford for ever with all his blind glasses," so that the pages of his works were to be seen littering the quadrangle of New College. He also established some professorships, but seems to have abolished that of Canon Law.

The reign of Edward VI. is not a brilliant period in the

history of the University. But though the decline of the University then became specially conspicuous, it is certain that it had begun at an earlier date. As early as 1523 the University wrote to More and complained that abbots had almost ceased to send their monks to the schools, nobles their sons, and the clergy their relatives and parishioners. The causes, too, of this decline were numerous, and though some of them date from about the time of Edward's accession, many of them had been in operation many years before. Thus, the insanitary condition of Oxford, which had caused epidemics to be of almost annual occurrence, and the growing trade of the country, which attracted men who might otherwise have been students, had been already for some time operating to the detriment of the University.

Again, it has been pointed out by the Warden of Merton that the invention of printing would at first militate against the fortunes of the University. When valuable writings were to be read only in manuscript, students had to go where the manuscripts were to be found. The art of printing now brought the books into their hands. Moreover, the founding of grammar schools, such as Colet's school of St. Paul's, grew more and more frequent throughout the reigns of Henry VIII. and his successors; and this would also, strange as it may at first sight appear, keep men away from Oxford. Formerly, the boy whose pale face and inability to drive the plough straight marked him out as the scholar of the family, was sent to Oxford to school, and there he would remain till he graduated; now there were other schools nigh at hand, from which very often he would not pass on to the higher studies of the University. But undoubtedly some causes of the decline had their beginnings in the years immediately preceding or following the accession of Edward. Apart from the direct effect of the dissolution of the monasteries which we have already pointed out, men began to fear that the Universities would go the same way as the religious houses, and, indeed, unsuccessful attacks on their revenues were made both in Henry's and in Edward's reigns. One more cause of the decline which first began in Edward's reign, was the removal from the University at the accession of Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth, of such men as were specially hostile to the religion which was for the time dominant. These men went abroad, and often did not afterwards return. In particular, a Papist seminary at Douai, founded by a former member of Oriel College, received in Elizabeth's reign many who had formerly been scholars and lecturers at Oxford.

The visit of certain commissioners to the University in the beginning of Edward's reign is chiefly remarkable for the reck-

less destruction which in their anti-Papal zeal they made, not only of church organs and other ornaments, such as the handsome reredos at All Souls', but also of the contents of several valuable libraries. Some new statutes which they made were duly repealed when Mary came to the throne.

Among the more prominent members of the University in Edward's reign were Peter Martyr (whom Cranmer brought over from Strasburg to be Professor of Divinity), and Jewel. In his lectures Martyr devoted himself mainly to the discussion of passages of Scripture bearing on the Holy Eucharist, and his teaching involved him in controversies with Smith, Tresham, and Chedsey, who met with some rather rough treatment for their opposition to the Professor. On the death of Edward, both Martyr and Jewel left England. Martyr's first wife had died in Oxford, and had been buried in the cathedral near the relics of St. Frideswide. In Mary's reign Pole gave orders to the Dean to exhume the body and bury it in unconsecrated ground. The Dean had it taken up and flung under a dunghill. In Elizabeth's reign it was again decently interred. Jewel, on his return to England after Mary's death, did not again reside in Oxford, but became Bishop of Salisbury.

In Mary's reign two new colleges were founded at Oxford in the reactionary interest—Trinity and St. John's. Though Oxford was the place where Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer perished, yet neither the city nor the county suffered very grievously in the Marian persecution. Probably Romanist feeling was predominant both in University and town, and it was very likely on this account that Oxford was selected for the disputations and trials which preceded the execution of the three bishops. They were brought from London to Oxford and incarcerated in the city prison, Bocardo, which formed the upper part of the north gate of the city, situated near St. Michael's Church. Subsequently Latimer and Ridley were removed, and were each committed to the custody of an Oxford citizen. After their arrival at Oxford, a week of hot disputations ensued, held sometimes in St. Mary's Church, sometimes in the Divinity School, in spite of the unwillingness of Latimer, who declared that he had forgotten his Latin, and felt as fit to argue as to be the captain of Calais. The bishops were then asked to sign the articles against which they had been arguing, and on their refusal were pronounced to be heretics. Still, nothing more was done for over a year, during which time the reconciliation with Rome was effected. Then the bishops were again tried, Cranmer by Brooks, Bishop of Gloucester, acting as the Pope's sub-delegate, and Ridley and Latimer by a commission empowered by Pole as Papal Legate.

All were condemned to death, and the sentence passed on Ridley and Latimer was soon carried into effect.

On October 16, 1555, Ridley was led forth. As he passed Bocardo, he looked up at the windows of the prison in the vain hope of catching a last look and receiving a last blessing from Cranmer. As he turned the corner of the street, he looked round and beheld Latimer following. "Ah, be ye there, Master Latimer?" he asked. "Yes, here I have after you as fast as I can," Latimer replied; and so the two stood side by side, and the older man strengthened the younger with the prophetic words that, thank God, England has never yet forgotten; and then, after commending his soul to God, Latimer quickly died, while, in God's mysterious working, Ridley lingered on a while longer, till the faggots were loosened, and the flame was able to rise and kindle the gunpowder that was hung about his neck.

It was some months later that Cranmer's end came, and we know that its glory was marred by the recantation which in a time of weakness he signed. Indeed, he signed more than one, though we may doubt if all the forms of recantation that are extant really received his signature. The truth concerning his end will probably never be known: whether, when he went forth to St. Mary's on that stormy March morning, he was resolved, whatever the issue, to withdraw his recantation, or whether his resolve to speak the truth was only consequent on the knowledge that a lie could no longer save him. We can but follow the narrative of the events; how, as Cranmer was brought into the church, the choir sang the *Nunc Dimittis;* how, after a long sermon, Cole turned and bade Cranmer fulfil the promise he had made, and openly express the true and undoubted profession of his faith; and how Cranmer's response was heard with surprise and indignation, though by some, perhaps, with thankfulness and joy. "I will do it," he said, "and that with a good will." First he knelt and prayed. Then he rose, bade the people obey the King and Queen, and live in brotherly love, and give alms to the poor. He paused, and then, as all breathlessly waited, he went on in a few words to abjure all such bills and papers as since his degradation he had signed, and declared that his offending right hand should be the first member in his body to suffer. With these words on his lips he went forth to the spot where Ridley and Latimer perished, and soon through the last fiery trial Cranmer passed from the failures and shortcomings of earth to the land where men are weak no more. Thus was it that at Oxford the fires were kindled which did most to purge the land of Romanism. True, the martyrs of Smithfield were more numerous than those of Oxford, and among them were men whose lives may have been

more steadfast than that of any one of the three bishops; but it was the death of Ridley and Latimer, and especially the burning of the Primate of England himself, which, beyond any other martyrdom of the time, filled England with horror, and left the deepest impression on the minds and hearts of Englishmen.

Oxford's work in the Reformation was well-nigh done. The reign of Elizabeth was not without importance to the University, but the history of Oxford during her reign links itself with the future rather than with the past; it was a time of preparation for future work. It was only toward the end that Oxford began really to recover from the torpor into which it had sunk. The chancellorship of Dudley, Earl of Leicester, which lasted from 1564 till 1588, was most beneficial to the University. Though he acted at times in a somewhat arbitrary manner, what he did was in the main useful; and to him the University owes its incorporation by a charter, on which the liberties and privileges it now enjoys chiefly depend.

W. G. S. WHICKER.

ART. IV.—JOHN HUS.

JOHN OF HUSINETZ, better known as John Hus (*i.e.*, John the Goose), was born on July 6, 1369, in the small town of Husinetz, in Southern Bohemia, not far from the Bavarian frontier. He died at Constance, in Germany, on July 6, 1415. So his birthday and his martyrdom, or second birthday according to early Church ideas, were on the same day of the same month. He used the name of John Hus from 1396.

His parents were in fairly comfortable circumstances, and when John had become a youth, he went to the schools at Prague, where we are told he helped to maintain himself by chanting and performing other minor offices in the churches of the city. After some time spent in the primary schools, he went at last to the University of Prague, and in September, 1393, the jubilee year at Prague, he took his degree of B.A. This was followed by his B.Th. in 1394, and his M.A. in 1396. In 1398 he delivered his first lecture, in 1401 became Dean of the philosophical faculty, and in 1403 Rector of the University of Prague. There is no reliable record of his ordination, but it is certain that he was a preacher in 1401.

We find him very early in his career noted as a constant and diligent student of the writings of John Wiclif, our English reformer. It may have been simply from the fact that a Bachelor of Arts in Prague was allowed to lecture on the writings of Masters belonging to Prague, Paris, or Oxford only,

that the attention of Hus was thus early directed to Wiclif; or it may have been that something in the method and matter of the last of the Schoolmen "found" Hus (in the Coleridge sense of the word) in a way that other books did not. That he did study Wiclif, and study him deeply and to some purpose, is, however, the great fact we have to bear in mind, if we wish to understand at all the inner purpose of his life. A manuscript containing five of Wiclif's philosophical writings, written out by Hus in 1398, is still extant, and preserved at Stockholm.

The year 1402 is one of the guiding dates of his life. In that year the preachership at the chapel Bethlehem, in Prague, became vacant, and Hus was presented to it. The foundation-deed was a very curious one. Dated May 24, 1390, it declares "that it was an institution of the old fathers that the Word of God should not be fettered, but be as free and beneficial as possible to the Church and her members, and deplores that there was as yet no locality in Prague set apart for the office of the preachers; yea, that preachers, especially those who preached in the Bohemian tongue, were for the most part compelled to go about from house to house, and from secret place to secret place. John of Mitheim, therefore, to make better provision for this need for the future, ordained that the incumbent of the new chapel should be a secular priest, whose duty it should be to preach in the Bohemian language in the morning and afternoon of every holy day, except in Lent and Advent, when there was only to be a morning sermon." There were other strict and precise regulations in the deed, including one concerning the endowments and offerings. "A priest who was a preacher ought not to thirst for riches. The preacher was not allowed to appropriate the offerings or gifts collected in the chapel, which were to be kept under three keys, and used for repairs and other requirements, and after a certain time for the maintenance of poor students connected with it, at a rate of five kops each per annum."

It was, then, partly in the University of Prague as teacher and rector, and partly in the pulpit of this Bethlehem church, that John Hus made his mark, first upon the city of Prague, and then upon the Church of Christ at large. I need hardly remind you, that at the beginning of the fifteenth century the Church in Europe, though outwardly one united body, was internally full of dissension, corruption, and rottenness, from head to foot. There was a general feeling abroad that a reformation in doctrine and morals, in head and members, was imperatively necessary if the Church was to do the work she had had committed to her by her Divine Lord, and to preserve her hold upon the world. And it was the mission of

John Hus to do something, not very much, perhaps, but to do something towards preparing the way for this reformation. He belongs rather to the period just before the Reformation, than to the Reformation itself, since we generally and rightly connect the actual movement with the great name of Luther.

The work of Hus as a reformer divides itself into two great parts; the first from 1402 to 1410, during which he prosecuted reform with the countenance and sanction of his ecclesiastical superiors; and the second from 1410 to 1415, when he found himself in deadly antagonism with them, culminating in the tragedy of his death.

I. In 1403 the authorities at Prague forbad the promulgation at the University of forty-five theses of Wiclif. These had been selected by John Hubner, partly from Wiclif's works, with the addition of the twenty-four theses that had been already condemned by the Synod in London.[1] It would seem that up to 1403, only Wiclif's philosophical works were known in Bohemia, and that his much more important theological writings were but little read or understood. These forty-five theses were, however, condemned by the majority in the chapter, and five years later the interdiction was confirmed, but only to the extent that no one should give them an heretical construction, implying that the theses themselves were inoffensive and colourless. Hus had the full confidence of the Archbishop, and in 1405 was appointed by him Preacher to the Synod; at the opening of which he preached a sermon (as memorable in its way as Dean Colet's famous discourse before Convocation in 1512), in which he laid bare the errors and denounced the sins of the clergy. No one was excluded from the range of his withering denunciations. The Pope, the cardinals, the archbishops and bishops, as well as the clergy and monks, were alike regarded as needing reform. In this he again followed closely in the footsteps of his master, the "doctor of deep thoughts," as he called him, though Hus did not agree with all that Wiclif taught, and in many ways was not so advanced on the road to reform.

He was appointed with two others to investigate some miracles alleged to have been wrought by the blood of Christ in the Church at Wilsnach, near Wittenberg, and they reported that the whole thing was a deception. "A lad was said to have had a miracle of healing performed on his foot; it was proved that his foot was worse than before. Two blind men were asserted to have regained their sight; they admitted before three commissioners, the public notary and other wit-

[1] For John Wiclif, see the splendid work of Mr. Lewis Serjeant in the Heroes of the Nations Series: Putnams, 1893.

nesses, that they had never been blind at all, but had merely been afflicted with a painful affection of the eyes." Hus wrote a Latin pamphlet on the matter called "All the Blood of Christ is glorified," in which he denied the existence anywhere of the natural blood of Christ, the whiskers of Christ, the milk of the Virgin Mary, and other similar absurd relics. And if you think that this is merely ancient history, and of no practical importance to us in this closing decade of the nineteenth century, let me remind you that many of the very things that were exposed as frauds in the fifteenth century are still believed in to-day, and visited by thousands of pilgrims, as at Einseideln, in Switzerland, Naples, and elsewhere.

As it was a great part of the work of Wiclif in England to translate the Bible into the language of the people, so it was part of the work of Hus in Bohemia to take men back to the same Divine fount of truth. He urged them continually to search the Scriptures, that in them they might find the things that belonged to their eternal peace, and not to seek for signs and miracles. And here I wish you to note, as indeed all through Hus's work, the extreme moderateness of the positions he took up. He did not, like Wiclif, believe that the substance of the bread and wine remained in the Eucharist after consecration, *i.e.*, he did not so far reject the doctrine of transubstantiation, but, on the contrary, he always and clearly refused to accept Wiclif's teaching on the point. He did not to the same extent as Wiclif reject the traditions of the Church and patristic teaching, but maintained that Holy Scripture should always be explained by reference to both. He was quite clear as to the authority and infallibility of Scripture as the final source of knowledge with regard to Christian doctrine, but he held that Christian doctrine had been authoritatively and fully expounded by the Fathers of the early Church. It was against more modern phases of teaching that he protested. He regarded as silly blasphemies the utterances of some priests who "boasted their superiority to the Virgin Mary, because she only once conceived and bore the Saviour, whereas every priest both could and did create Him daily." So, too, they "boasted that at their will they forgave and retained men's sins, and that thus they sent whom they would to heaven and whom they would to hell. Hus taught that the priest did not himself remit sins, but that God remitted them by the agency of the priest, even if an unworthy one; yea, that circumstances might occur under which remission might be had even without priestly absolution." We see, therefore, how very far John Hus was from what we have come to know as the full Reformation movement, and it is his moderation that makes the concluding years of his life the more remarkable, and his

death the less justifiable, from the Roman Catholic point of view.

It was in 1408, while Hus was Rector of Prague University, that the first breach came between him and the Archbishop, and the good feeling which had existed between them was embittered, for in that year he was prohibited from exercising his priestly functions within the diocese, though the final rupture was still to come.

In 1409 there came a Papal bull prohibiting the use of Wiclif's writings in the University. The Archbishop burnt two hundred volumes of them, in spite of the adverse opposition both of the University and of Hus, who continued to preach and to defend Wiclif, whom the Archbishop denounced as heretical. His congregation increased, and Hus became bolder. And so we enter upon the second phase of his quarrel with Rome.

II. On March 15, 1411, he was excommunicated, and the city laid under an interdict. This Hus ignored, and the Archbishop was engaged in arranging a compromise when he suddenly died, September 28, 1411. In 1412 Hus was roused by the preaching of a crusade against Naples and of indulgences commanded by the Pope John XXIII., one of the worst occupants of the Papal throne, and both the crusade and the indulgences were commended by the King. The University was somewhat divided, but ultimately determined that neither the Pope nor the Bishop had the right to draw the sword, because it was said to Peter, "Put up thy sword."

Against this new wickedness Hus thundered from his pulpit. He preached strenuously against the iniquity of the Pope in urging men to take part in a war which had no justification but to secure his own personal ends, and, like Luther at a later date, denounced vigorously the traffic in indulgences as a means of replenishing the Papal coffers. A word in passing as to the meaning of indulgences. There are two phases of the question, which should always be carefully distinguished. The Church has the right to impose certain discipline upon her members. We in the Church of England hardly know what this means, but the Church of Scotland, and many of our Nonconforming brethren, know it full well. Now, a sentence which the Church, in the due exercise of her right of discipline, has pronounced, the Church may, for a proper cause, by indulgence or otherwise, remit. A penalty which the Church has inflicted, the Church can take away. This is one phase, and if indulgences meant no more than this no fault could be found with them. But when she goes further, and claims to remit penalties that God has imposed, and to remit penalties not only in this life, but in the life to

come, and claims to remit them on the ground of the performance of certain things which have no spiritual relation either to the offence or the punishment, but which consist mostly of the payment of sums of money, then she goes beyond her prerogative, interferes with the prerogative of Christ Himself (Who did not say, "Whatsoever *I* bind in heaven *thou* shalt loose on earth," but only promised to respect the binding and loosing of His Apostles, and did not give them authority over His acts), and claims an authority which can never be exercised by any man or any Church. Hus accordingly declared that not money, but true repentance, was the condition of forgiveness—that the Pope could not know who are the elect, and that the elect only can be saved. The doctrine, therefore, that the Pope cannot err is blasphemous. The people sympathized with Hus, and burnt the Papal bulls in the market-place. Three young men who declared the indulgences to be humbug were executed. Hus and a number of students took up the bodies and buried them in Bethlehem Church. The Cardinal Peter of St. Angelo now interdicted Hus's house, and threatened him with the civil ban; so he left the city at the King's request, and spent his exile in writing his book on the Church, which followed that of Wiclif on the same subject.

The demand for reform had led to the summoning of a council, which met at Constance, a German town in Swabia. Before this council Hus was summoned to appear. He obeyed the summons, and arrived at Constance under a safe conduct on November 3, 1414. He was allowed his liberty for some four weeks, and then the cardinals, on a charge of attempted flight, confined him in a Dominican convent. The Council on May 4, 1415, condemned Wiclif, his writings, his person and his doctrines. On June 5, 7, and 8, Hus was heard. He stated his agreement with Wiclif on the question of the Church, but denied that he agreed with him on the question of transubstantiation.[1] We have not space to go into the details of the trial—if trial it can be called—but must content ourselves with stating that Hus did not have even the semblance of justice awarded to him. The most absurd charges, unsupported by any shadow of evidence, were brought against him. His condemnation was a foregone conclusion. Hus knew this, and would not retract. A specimen may be given of the kind of charge brought against him after he had refuted the graver items. It is taken from the printed proceedings of the

[1] For the whole proceedings against Hus in the Council of Constance the reader is referred to Mr. Wratislaw's excellent monograph published by the S.P.C.K., to which in many other points we are much indebted. This and the articles in Herzog, and the "Encyclopædia Britannica," will furnish fairly complete information on the man and his times.

Council. "That Magister John Hus granted this proposition, that John Hus was a person in the Godhead, and that there were more persons than three in the Godhead; proved to be true by one Doctor of Theology from common report and fame, by one abbot from common fame, and by a vicar of the cathedral at Prague, who said he had heard it from the mouth of John Hus as articled." The proof was demanded and was not given. He claimed that his views on the Church were the same as those of St. Augustine of Hippo. He based his reform of the Church on conscience and on the Scriptures, and not on ecclesiastical authority. But it was of no avail. Ecclesiastical authority asserted its supremacy over conscience then as so frequently before and since, and on July 6, 1415, his sentence was read, and John Hus was burnt at Constance, his death being, according to the very laws by which he was tried, a judicial murder.

We grant that he was not a great man, that he was not an original thinker, that he gave the world no constructive theology. He was, regarded in these aspects, but a shadow and echo of Wiclif. But this defect does not diminish the glory of his martyrdom. His moral tenacity, his inflexible firmness, his indomitable constancy, his purity, humility, fear of God, fidelity to his conscience as though it were his king—these give him a moral splendour that far outshines mere speculative intellectual brilliancy. He was a martyr for conscience' sake, and faced his doom with a power and endurance "born of" a faith deeply rooted in the Divine Christ. He represents historically a transition period, belongs to the close of the scholastic epoch, being a disciple of Wiclif, "the last of the schoolmen," as Mr. Serjeant so finely calls him. The time of the fulness was not yet. That was to come in Luther and in Cranmer, and the martyrs of the English Reformation.

What is, in conclusion, the lesson of his life to us? Is it out of date? Has its necessity passed away? Would I could think so. But I cannot in the face of the Papal Encyclical addressed to the English people a few months ago. With the spirit of that letter I have no quarrel. I sympathize with it. I agree with it. But in the closing portion (addressed, it is true, to English Roman Catholics and not to the nation at large, but showing us, all the same, what we should be expected to acquiesce in if we made terms with Rome in her unchanged condition) there are three matters dealt with that indicate very plainly that the battle which John Hus fought is not yet ended, and it is because the conviction grows upon me with daily increasing force that the battle of the Reformation will have to be fought over again, and fought, it may be even to the death, that I urge the consideration of the points, upon you.

We are invited to pray, but our prayer is to be addressed to the Virgin Mary. The prayer is partly to take the form of the Holy Rosary, a form of senseless prayer akin to the praying-wheels of Thibet. And if we pray to the Virgin in this way, we are promised three hundred days' indulgence. If it were not meant in all seriousness by the holy man who sits in the chair of St. Peter at Rome, I should characterize it as a jest, though a jest which approaches very nearly to an insult to the English people. But it is meant seriously, and we must so treat it. I refuse the Pope's indulgence and repudiate it with all my soul. I know that whatever punishment my Heavenly Father may see fit to impose on me for my sins, will be remedial chastisement intended to influence me for good and to fit me for the enjoyment of His presence; and I decline for my own good to have that remedial work shortened by one hour, let alone by three hundred days, here or hereafter; and especially when the indulgence is to be gained by such unspiritual means as the use of the Rosary. I will pray with the spirit, but I will pray with the understanding also, and my intellect revolts against any such mechanical means of prayer as that recommended by the Holy Father. And again, if I am to pray, I will pray to Him who has promised to hear me, and not to her, however great and exalted and blessed she may be, of whose power to hear I have no sure warrant in Holy Writ, and of whose power to answer, I venture to indulge in a strong scepticism. Such are not the means whereby reunion will be achieved. They involve tampering with truth and conscience; and, since fidelity to conscience was the watchword of the Reformation and has been the secret of all our progress ever since,[1] I call upon you to remember this and live by it, and, if necessary, to die for it. "Stand fast in the liberty for which your fathers were content to suffer and to die, the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage."

FREDERIC RELTON.

ART. V.—ARCHBISHOP PARKER'S CONSECRATION.

PART I.

THE REV. SYDNEY SMITH (S.J.) has published a pamphlet by the Catholic Truth Society, 1895, entitled "The Doctrine of Intention." His main object appears to be to prove that the consecration of Parker, the first Archbishop of Canterbury under Queen Elizabeth, was invalid by reason of the want of

[1] Delivered, in substance, as one of the series of lectures in St. Margaret's, Westminster, on "The Leaders of the Reformation."

"intention" in Bishop Barlow, who consecrated Parker. This is a "new departure" from the usual reasons assigned for the alleged invalidity of that consecration, viz., that Barlow himself had not been duly consecrated as a bishop; but now the Rev. Sydney Smith adds the further objection that Barlow, when consecrating, had not a right intention to perform that ceremony according to the requirements of the Roman Church, and therefore did not convey to him sacramental and sacerdotal powers. It is this phase to which our attention is mainly drawn. If on either of these accounts Parker's consecration was invalid, then the same objections extend, with double force, to the valid consecration of Roman bishops and the ordination of their priests. Their title to "Apostolic Succession" is made dependent on precise forms and ceremonies.

Priests' "orders" were first declared to be one of their seven Sacraments by the Council of Florence in 1439. Cassander, an eminent divine of the Roman Church, after considerable research, came to the conclusion that, previous to the time of Peter Lombard, Bishop of Paris, in the twelfth century, the number of the Sacraments as being seven (including Orders) had not been proposed.[1] Dominicus Soto (Bishop), according to the testimony of Cardinal Bellarmin, said that "Episcopal ordination is not truly and properly a Sacrament."[2]

The so-called Catechism of the Council of Trent says:—

> Every Sacrament consists of two things: *matter* which is called the element, and *form* which is commonly called the word. The *form* is so definite that any, *even a casual deviation* from it, renders the Sacrament null. These, then, are the parts which belong to the nature and substance of the Sacrament, and of which every Sacrament is necessarily composed.[3]

Wanting, therefore, either the prescribed *form* or *matter*, the ordination of a priest would be invalid, and such a priest could not be lawfully consecrated a bishop; and in that line, at least, Apostolic Succession would be broken.

The Council of Florence, in 1439, first authoritatively decreed the present *matter* in conferring ordination of a priest should be the delivery of the chalice with wine and water, and a paten with a host lying on it; and that the *form* should in future be:—

> Receive thou the power to offer sacrifices to God and celebrate Masses both for the living and the dead.[4]

The Trent Catechism (p. 309) lays down the same *matter* and *form*:—

---

[1] Cassan. de Numer. Sacram., art. xiii., p. 951; Paris, 1616.
[2] Bellar., Dispt., tom. iii., p. 718; Paris, 1721.
[3] Donovan's Translation, pp. 145, 146; Dublin, 1829.
[4] Decret. Unionis. Concil. Florent. Labb. et Coss., Concilia, tom. xviii., col. 550; Venet., 1728.

The Bishop, handing the candidate for priest's orders a chalice which contains wine and water, and a paten with bread, says: "Receive the power of offering sacrifices," etc., words which, according to the uniform interpretation of the Church, impart power, when the proper matter is supplied, of consecrating the Holy Eucharist, and impress a character on the soul. He next anoints his hands with sacred oil, reaches him a chalice containing wine with a paten with bread, saying: "Receive power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate Mass as well for the living as for the dead." By these words and ceremonies he is constituted an interpreter and mediator between God and man, the principal function of the priesthood.

He is not, therefore, ordained to preach the Gospel.

Peter Dens, in his "Theologia," (accepted as a text-book), of these alleged essentials said that:—

Neither Scripture nor tradition makes any mention of these ceremonies (*i.e.*, delivery of the cup and paten), nor is the use of them found at this day among the Greeks, nor was it even among the Latins for the first ten ages of the Church.[1]

Morinus, a priest of the congregation of the Oratory, a learned author, wrote an exhaustive work entitled "Commentarius de sacris Ecclesiæ ordinationibus," etc., Antwerp, 1685. After examining all the ancient Greek forms of ordination, in none of which is found either of the above *form* or *matter*, he proceeds to enumerate the ancient Latin forms of ordination, commencing from that prescribed by the Fourth Council of Carthage, A.D. 398 (p. 211), and after giving that and other forms, including what is called "The Sacramentary of Pope Gelasius" (p. 217), he gives the English form, which he says was the same as the first Latin form of the Council of Carthage (p. 233), viz.:—

When a presbyter is ordained, the Bishop, blessing him, and holding his hand on his head, let all the presbyters also who are present hold their hands beside the hand of the Bishop on his head.[2]

After quoting other forms, in none of which are to be found the *form* and *matter* prescribed by the Council of Florence, 1439, he then mentions the first form of ordination, in which the present *form* and *matter* are named, and this was in the middle of the tenth century (p. 257). It was in the possession of Constantine, Abbot of Caeta; and here we find the words, "Receive power to offer sacrifice as well for the living as for the dead in the name of the Lord" (p. 262). If, therefore, the present form is essential to the ordination of a priest, all previous ordinations were irregular, and the Order of Roman Priests dates only from 1439. Roman priests pretend to derive their orders in direct succession from the Apostles. It is alleged that our Lord's words "Do this" constituted the

[1] Dens, "Theol. Moralis ad usum Seminorium," tom. iv., "De Ordine," p. 57; Dublin, 1832.

[2] For this form see Labb., Concil., tom. ii., col. 1199; Paris, 1671.

twelve sacrificing priests. But there was no "laying on of hands," which ceremony has always been deemed an essential in all the ancient forms, and these words are not used in the present form. The Greek word ποιέω occurs in the Septuagint translation thirty-nine times, and refers principally to *keeping* or *celebrating* the Passover, and is so translated in the Douay version, and six times in the New Testament as "Do this." The learned Roman Catholic Estius did not accept this theory. He said, "It does not appear at all solid or agreeable to ancient interpreters," and he adds, "Do this, *hoc facite*, belongs to the common people, eating and drinking of the Sacrament, and that St. Paul refers it to them."[1]

There is not the slightest justification for rendering the words "sacrifice this," as sometimes pretended, since there was no sacrifice at the Last Supper, nor, indeed, in any part of the Mass service. The transmission of "Apostolic Succession," insisted on by the Rev. Sydney Smith, was not perpetuated by any such forms and ceremonies as now adopted by the Roman Church. The first transmission of "Apostolic Succession" occurred on the death of Judas, and the succession in that office was effected by the simple process of casting lots!

If, then, *matter* and *form* and *ceremonies* are deemed essentials in the case of Parker, then for one thousand years or more there was no such *matter*, *form*, or *ceremony* as now practised in the Roman Church, and deemed essential; and according to the *dictum* laid down by the Trent Catechism, all ordinations and consecrations previous to 1439 were "null and void," and the claim to Apostolic Succession in the Roman Church hopelessly forfeited. But God is "no respecter of persons," and the forms now insisted on have neither Scripture nor Tradition to support the claim. It is marvellous to find men, otherwise endowed with reason, in this latter end of the nineteenth century, making our salvation—for that is practically the outcome of the argument—depend on forms and ceremonies of man's invention. If Parker was not consecrated in the Roman form, what then? All they can allege is that he was not a Roman bishop, and this he did not pretend to be.

The Rev. Sydney Smith, in p. 7, says: "Our Lord gave to His priests the power of order over the Sacraments, attaching to it the employment of certain words and ceremonies, the character of which He Himself determined." When or where do we find this recorded? The word Sacrament does not appear in the New Testament, but he subsequently admits (p. 8) that our Lord did not impose any form of words in

[1] In lib. iv., Sent., tom. iv., p. 105, col. 2; Paris, 1638.

administering the Last Supper, which is now called the "Mass," when they celebrate it; and he adds: "The same must be said in reference to the other Sacraments, and inclusively to Holy Orders, the Sacrament with which we are primarily concerned." The objection as to *matter* and *form* and *precise ceremonies* on Parker's consecration is therefore practically abandoned. We come, then, to the objection insisted upon, namely, the want of intention in Barlow when he consecrated Parker as Archbishop.

"Intention" in administering a sacrament was first shadowed forth at the Council of Florence, 1439.

The origin of this theory is rather humiliating. It is attributed to the extreme ignorance of certain priests of the Latin tongue; hence the unintentional mutilation of the form of words now declared necessary in order to the administration of a valid baptism. This gave rise to a discussion among schoolmen whether a priest who corrupts the sacramental words celebrated a valid Sacrament. The opinion seemed to be that, though the priest knew nothing of what he was saying, if he had the *intention* of doing what the Church required, it was sufficient. But then they came foul of the modern requirement of the exact adoption of the prescribed *form*, as asserted by the Trent Catechism. This appears to have been the reasoning of Pope Zachary in his answer to Boniface[1] about the ignorance of a priest in Bavaria, who had baptized "*in nomine Patria, Filia et Spiritua Sancta*," although it is now asserted that the slightest deviation from the prescribed *form* would invalidate the Sacrament.

The necessity of *intention* of a priest in administering a Sacrament was not a doctrine of the Roman Church until the year 1547, at the seventh session of the Council of Trent, when the theory excited a hot debate. Catherino, Bishop of Minori, stood up in the Council, protesting vehemently against the theory; his protest is recorded by Father Paul Sarpi in his history of the Council,[2] in these words:—

> But suppose the necessity of mental intention. If a priest charged with the care of four or five thousand souls was an unbeliever, a hypocrite who, whether in the baptism of children, or in the absolution of penitents, or in the consecration of the Eucharist, had no intention of doing what the Church does, we must say that all the children were damned, the penitents not absolved, and all those who have received the Communion have received no advantage from it.
>
> . . . If any said these cases were rare, would to God that in this corrupt age there were no cause to think *that they are very frequent!* But even admitting them to be very rare, or even unique, yet suppose, for example,

[1] Avent., Annal., lib. iii., p. 297; Ingolst., 1554.

[2] Tom. i., lib. ii., cols. 432, 433; Amst., 1751. Translated by Courayer.

a bad priest who is a hypocrite, and who has no intention of administering true baptism to a child, and that afterwards this child should become a bishop of a great city, and during a long succession of years has ordained a great number of priests, we must admit that this child, not being baptized, will not have received ordination, and, consequently, all those whom he may have ordained will have received nothing; and that thus there will be in this great city neither sacrament, nor penance, nor Eucharist, since these cannot exist without ordination, nor ordination without a true bishop, nor any bishop, if he has not been previously baptized; and thus by the malice of a single minister a million of Sacraments will be rendered nugatory.

Notwithstanding this warning, the Council confirmed the theory *as a doctrine*, to be accepted under pain of anathema. The eleventh canon (Session VII.) declares:—

If any shall say that there is not required in the ministers while they perform and confer the Sacraments, at least the intention of doing what the Church does, let him be accursed.

These words are precise, and do not admit of private interpretation or evasion. Father Sydney Smith, as we shall presently see, attempts to minimize the risk incurred by a wicked priest not exercising a right intention. That there is a risk, and a very considerable risk, is evident, for they now tell us that the officiating priest, though himself in mortal sin, without sanctity or faith, effects a valid Sacrament, provided the forms are retained; and, as Father Smith asserts, "that the vast majority of pastors to whom we have recourse renders them absolutely incapable of thus deceiving us." Why, then, was it necessary for the Council of Trent to pass the following canons? The twelfth canon of the seventh session of the Council of Trent, on "Transubstantiation," declares: "If anyone shall say that a minister in mortal sin cannot perform or confer a Sacrament, provided he observes all the essentials which appertain to the performance of a Sacrament, let him be accursed." And in cap. vi. of the fourteenth session we read: "The synod teaches that even priests who are bound in mortal sin exercise, as the ministers of Christ, the power of remitting sins, by the power of the Holy Ghost conveyed to them in ordination, and those err in their opinion who contend that wicked priests have not this power." And Peter Dens tells us that "Every priest can validly consecrate, should he be even wicked, degraded, or excommunicated."[1]

And in "The Handbook of the Christian Religion for the use of the Educated Laity," by the Rev. W. Wilmers, S.J., edited by the Rev. T. Conway, S.J., p. 34, 1891: "For the valid administration of a Sacrament, neither *sanctity* nor *virtue*, nor even *faith*, is necessary," and the contrary opinions "were condemned by the Church as heretical."

[1] "Theol.", tom. v., No. 28, "De Ministro," p. 293; Dublin, 1832.

Intention is thus defined in Ogilvie's Dictionary: "Act of stretching or bending the mind towards an object, hence uncommon exertion of the intellectual faculties, closeness of application, fixedness of attention, and earnestness." I would ask whether any of such wicked priests, without faith, could have such an earnest and right intention? Indeed, the divines assembled at the Trent Council seemed quite alive to this moral defect in the priesthood, for they earnestly enjoined a penitent seeking absolution in the confessional, unless he should be negligent of his own salvation, that he should select a priest who would not absolve him in a joke, and who would act seriously, and would not carefully seek a priest who would act seriously.[1]

It is rather "hard lines" to throw the responsibility on a lay penitent to ascertain, at the risk of his salvation, whether the priest has a right intention or is only joking. But the laxity in this requirement of *intention* in the priest is very remarkable, and gives a wide margin for infidel priests. In the "Catholic Dictionary," edited by the priests Addis and Arnold, in the edition sanctioned by the late Cardinals Manning and Newman, p. 738, we are seriously told: "It is enough (for the validity of a Sacrament) if a minister merely performs the external rite in a serious manner, even if internally he withholds his intention, *i.e.*, even if he say to himself, 'I don't intend to consecrate.'" This is repeated, in the same words, in the edition of 1893, p. 811, bearing the imprimatur of Dr. Vaughan (Cardinal). Is not, then, the whole theory a solemn farce?

The Cardinal Archbishop Bellarmin felt the force of these objections, which he thus states:—

None can be certain, by the certainty of faith, that he receives a true Sacrament, since a Sacrament cannot be celebrated without the minister's intention; and no one can see the intention of another.[2]

Andreas Vega, another illustrious divine of the Roman Church, lays down the following:—

It cannot be through faith assured to anyone that he has received the least Sacrament, and this is certain from faith as it is manifest that we are living. For, except through the medium of a direct revelation, there is no way by which either evidently or through certain faith we can know the intention of him who ministers.[3]

Further, "Orders" depend on the validity of the *intention* of the Bishop, as well as the validity of his own consecration.

---

[1] "Nec si esset, nisi salutis suæ negligentissimus, qui sacerdotem joco se absolventem cognosceret, et non alium serio agentem, sedulo requireret." (Sess. xiv., c. vi., "De Ministro.")

[2] "De Justific.," lib. iii., cap. viii., col. 846, tom. iv.; Paris, 1608.

[3] Opuscula, "De Justific.," lib. ix., cxvii.; Compl., 1564.

The same Cardinal Bellarmin puts the question in its proper light when he says:—

> If we consider in bishops, their power of ordination and jurisdiction, we have no more than a moral certainty that they are true bishops.[1]

So that had Parker been consecrated by Roman bishops, according to Roman forms and requirements, his consecration would have been equally doubtful as when consecrated by Barlow, who, by the way, was not trammelled by the now stringent rules required by the Roman Church. But how does Father Sydney Smith meet these dangers? In pp. 8-10 he labours to show that "the risk, the possession of such a power (of conferring a Sacrament) by an unworthy priest, exposes us; the general character of the majority of pastors to whom we have recourse renders them incapable of thus deceiving us." Why, then, warn a penitent, at the risk of his own salvation, carefully to seek a priest who would not absolve him in a joke? Then he tells us "to bear in mind the lynx-eyed watchfulness with which the Church guards her Sacraments as have a far-reaching effect," and that "it is the very spirit of intense anxiety to be secure against any risk which makes us intolerable to risk the chance of maladministration by those over whom the Church has control; and the same spirit would cause us to refuse baptism or ordination from the hands of one whom there were *overt reasons* for distrusting." And yet we are also told that if priests in mortal sin, without faith or sanctity, suspended or excommunicated, who mentally do not intend to consecrate or validly administer a Sacrament, only adopt the prescribed forms and appear serious, such consecrations are valid! And he adds: "Thus we are brought to the conclusion previously announced, that although there may be some risk through the possibility of bad priests, it is not very large;" and he admits that such cases of "malpractices may have occurred, but rarely." How does Father Sydney Smith know that his own claim to Apostolic Succession may not, during the long series of years, be derived through such a priest? One break in the chain would be fatal. As to this "minority," he bridges over the difficulty that his Church "has discovered in our Lord's promise to sustain the Apostolic Succession in His Church" (p. 14), and that "we must infer that He meant to sustain it, in virtue of the Lord's promise to work through the instrumentality of His ministers" (p. 16). This is a slender reed to rely upon, that a priest in mortal sin and without faith is recognised by our Lord as "His minister."

Though our immediate subject is the alleged want of inten-

[1] "De Eccl. Milit.," lib. iii., c. x., tom. ii., cols. 139, 140; Paris, 1608.

tion in Barlow in his act of consecration of Parker, I may mention that the Roman priest and historian, Dr. Lingard, fully admitted that Parker's consecration was perfectly valid. Referring to the appointment of bishops under Queen Elizabeth, he admits :—

> The consecration (of Parker) was performed, though with little variation, according to the Ritual of Edward VI.

Which, by the way, was according to the ancient practice. He continues to say :—

> Two of the consecrators, Barlow and Hodkins, had been ordained bishops according to the Roman Pontifical, the other two (Scory and Coverdale) according to the reformed ordinal (Wilkins' "Concilia," iv., p. 193). Of this consecration there can be no doubt ; perhaps in the interval, between the refusal of the Catholic prelates and the performance of the ceremony, some meeting may have taken place at the Nag's Head, which gave rise to the story.[1]

In the edition of 1855, vol. vi., appendix D.D., the Nag's Head incident Dr. Lingard pronounces to be "a fable." The story made its first appearance in 1604, that is, forty-five years after Parker's consecration, published at Antwerp, the work of an exiled Roman priest, John Holywood. In Dr. Lingard's letter to the *Birmingham Catholic Magazine* (vol. v., p. 712), he says, "No such ceremony (as the Nag's Head fable) had ever taken place." And in p. 782 he wrote, "Of the consecration of Parker I never entertained a doubt." Courayer, the editor of Sarpi's "History of the Council of Trent," said: "Everything occurs to set the truth in so great a light, that if the fact of the Lambeth ordination is not above all doubt, one must renounce acknowledging anything contained in history."[2] Dr. Döllinger (and modern Rome has not produced a more learned writer), said :—

> The fact that Parker was consecrated by four rightly consecrated bishops, *rite et legitime*, with imposition of hands and the necessary words, is so well attested that, if one chooses to doubt this fact, one could doubt ten thousand facts. . . . The fact is as well established as a fact can be required to be. Bossuet has acknowledged the validity of Parker's consecration, and no critical historian can dispute it. The Orders of the Roman Church could be disputed with more appearance of reason.[3]

The Council of Trent was by Pius IV. asked to declare the Elizabethan bishops unlawful, but they expressly refused to do so; they declared that the Anglican bishops "had due vocation, election, consecration and mission." The Irish Bishop, Fitzmaurice of Aghadoe, discussed the question at that Council,

---

[1] "History of England," vol. vii., p. 500 ; London, 1823.

[2] "A Defence of the Dissertation on the Validity of the English Ordinations," vol. i., p. 285, English translation, 1728.

[3] "Report of Conference at Bonn, 1875," p. 96 ; London, 1876.

asserting that the recognition by the Pope constituted the only distinction between Roman and Anglican ordination, and this was universally accepted.[1]

During Edward's reign bishops were consecrated and priests ordained under the Edwardian Ordinal. On Mary's accession the breach with Rome was temporarily healed. Cardinal Pole was sent by the Pope, as his Legate, to reconcile the Anglican Church with Rome. The question was how these bishops and priests were to be regarded. Mr. Haddon on this observes :—

> It may not be clear what precisely were the conditions imposed, but it is clear that under conditions certainly short of re-ordination, both Julius III. and Paul IV., and Cardinal Pole acting with their sanction, did accept English orders under Mary's reign, by whatever ordinal conferred, wherever the persons so ordained submitted and were reconciled to the Pope.[2]

In fact, no new ordination or consecration was required.

Again, on two occasions in the seventeenth century, when a reunion was sought to be effected between the Anglican and Gallican Churches, the question of Anglican Orders was closely examined, and on both occasions it was admitted that they were perfectly regular, in which the illustrious Bossuet agreed.

Barlow's consecration was never disputed until eighty years after the event.

Now as to the *intention* of Parker's consecrators. We read in the Preface of the Edwardian Ordinal:

> It is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scriptures and ancient authors, that from the Apostolic time there hath been these three orders of ministers in Christ's Church : bishops, priests, and deacons. . . . Therefore, *to the intent* these orders should be continued and reverently used and esteemed in the Church of England, etc.

The intent, therefore, was that the order of Bishop as a "minister in Christ's Church" should be continued in Parker, though he was ordained priest under Roman forms, and consecrated under the Edwardian Ordinal, which was the ancient form. The question then remains, What is a sufficient intention on the part of the officiating Bishop as consecrator, not being a member of the Roman Church ? This is answered by "the Angelic Doctor," St. Thomas Aquinas :[3]

> The minister of a Sacrament acts as the representative (*in personâ*) of the whole Church *of which he is a member ;* in the words which he utters the intention of the Church is expressed, which suffices to the perfection of a Sacrament, unless the contrary is expressed outwardly on the part of the minister or the recipient of the Sacrament.

---

[1] "Quæ sententia omnibus placere maximè visa est" ("Le Plat. Mon. Concil. Trid.," tom v., p. 578).

[2] "Apostolic Succession in the Church of England," 1883, pp. 240, 201.

[3] "Summa," pars iii., qu. lxiv., art. viii., vol. vi., p. 545 ; edit. London, 1875.

Nay, the modern Roman Church goes farther than this: as we have seen, the consecration would be valid although the consecrator may say to himself that he does not intend to consecrate. But Cardinal Bellarmin's testimony is more to our point. He said:—

It is not necessary to intend to do what the true Church does, whatever it may be, or what Christ instituted. You ask, What if anyone intend to do what some particular false Church, as that of Geneva does, and intends not to do that which the Roman Church does? I answer, Even that suffices. For he who intends to do what the Church of Geneva does, intends to do what the Church Universal does. For he intends, therefore, to do what such Church does who thinks it to be part of the Church Universal, although he is mistaken in his opinion of the true Church; but the error of the minister as to the Church does not take away the efficacy of the Sacrament.[1]

If this theory is good for a so-called heretical Church—Geneva—why not extend the same principle to the consecration of bishops in the Anglican Church, and to the orders of the ministry of Christ's Universal Church? And with reference to the allusion to the "Universal Church," it was Pope Innocent III. who furnishes us with this definition:—

The Church, indeed, is called Universal, which consists of all churches everywhere, which by a Greek word is denominated Catholic; thus the *Roman Church* is not the Universal Church, but a part of the Universal Church.[2]

And Tostatus of Avila, the learned Salamanca doctor, wrote:

The Church of the Latins is not the Universal Church, but a certain part of it; thus, even if the whole of that Church erred, the Universal Church would not have erred, because the Universal Church would have remained in those parts which have not erred, whether those parts are many or few.[3]

And as to the title "Catholic," the Roman Canon Law quotes the law of the Emperor Justinian[4]:—

We order that all who follow this rule (that is, who believe in the Deity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, in their co-equal majesty and Triune Godhead, according to the Apostolic teaching and Gospel doctrine), shall adopt the name of Catholic Christian.

This is the language of the so-called Athanasian Creed, which is equally clear and explicit: "This is the Catholic faith, that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity." And if the voice of antiquity is to be heard, Roman Catholics cannot deny the title of Catholic, or members of the

---

[1] Bell, "Disp. de Controv.," "De Sacram. in Gen.," lib. i., cap. xxvii., tom. iii., p. 27; Coloniæ, 1628. For further examples, see Denny's "Anglican Orders and Jurisdiction," 1893, S.P.C.K., p. 95.

[2] Lib. ii., Ep. 209, tom. i., p. 474; edit. Paris, 1682.

[3] Quæst. vi. in Matt. ad Prolog. 2; Venice, 1596.

[4] *Vide* "Cod. Just.," lib. i., tit. i.

Universal Church, to all those who hold, with the Church of England, that doctrine of the Trinity.

But Father Sydney Smith oversteps his mark. He says :—

With regard to the consecration of Archbishop Parker, Barlow had no intention when consecrating Parker to impart to him any such Sacramental power as according to Catholic doctrine is the distinctive possession of a Catholic bishop, and for this reason alone he could not have imparted any such power (p. 1).

Parker was consecrated in 1559. He was ordained a priest June 15, 1527, according to the Roman form, as a sacrificing priest, the form prescribed by the Council of Florence, and therefore a sacrificing priest. He received the title of Doctor of Divinity in 1535, when he was made Chaplain to Henry VIII.[1] In doctrine Henry VIII. was a thorough Roman Catholic. The Roman Catholic paper, the *Tablet*, of February, 1895, p. 203, states :—

Henry VIII.'s attitude towards religion was a combination of Conservatism and laxity. On one hand, while vehemently rejecting the Pope's supremacy, and relentlessly enforcing his own, he maintained the observance of the chief points of Catholic doctrine and discipline, and *preserved the use of the Catholic Liturgy.*

And in a note the same paper adds :—

This is shown in the King's Book of "the Articles" (July, 1536), and the publication of the "Godly and Pious Institution of a Christian Man." Also (June 16, 1539), by the Act of the Six Articles (31 Henry VIII., c. 14), maintaining, 1. Transubstantiation ; 2. Communion under one kind ; 3. Celibacy of the clergy ; 4. Observance of vows of chastity ; 5. Private Masses ; 6. Auricular confession.

Once a priest, always a priest, the character is said to be indelible; even, as Peter Dens assures us, though he be suspended or excommunicated, he can confer a valid Sacrament. In the present "Pontificale Romanum," the ceremony of consecrating a bishop-elect, the details of the whole process, are most minutely described, and cover several folio pages. The office of bishop is not specified in the words of consecration, neither is it in the Roman Pontifical. After administering the Pontifical oath, we read these remarkable passages :—

Dearest Brother, we ask thee with unfeigned charity if thou wilt accommodate all thy skill, to the utmost of thy natural abilities, to the sense of the Divine Scriptures.

The elect answers : So I will with all my heart consent thereto in all things, and obey the same.

Interrog.—Wilt thou, both by word and example, teach the people, for whom thou art to be ordained, those things which thou dost understand out of the Divine Scriptures ?

Answer.—I will.

This is remarkable, for the Roman Church now declares that

[1] See Rev. F. G. Lee's "Validity of Anglican Orders," p. 147.

the Holy Scriptures are an incomplete and insufficient rule of faith, and I quote here the remarks of our Bishop Burnet on this declaration :—

> This alone, were there no more, may serve to justify those bishops who got orders in the Church of Rome and afterwards received the Reformation ; since by the very sponsions given in their ordination, they had engaged themselves to instruct their flocks according to the Scriptures.[1]

The functions of a bishop are stated to be "to judge, to consecrate, to ordain, to offer to baptize, and to confirm."

But throughout the service there is no "imparting" to the "bishop-elect" any or additional "Sacramental powers," for these Parker had already received at his ordination, thirty-two years before, as a priest in the Roman Church.

The fact is, the whole of the Roman system, when we come to examine its parts critically, will be found to be a mass of inconsistencies, if not contradictions.

But what does it signify if Roman priests deny the validity of the consecration of Parker, or of any of our bishops, or that Anglican orders are invalid? Were it worth the time, we might with much more reason question the validity of their own orders and consecrations, since the ancient forms have been abandoned. And as to the succession of their Popes, not to mention three infant Popes, the succession has been repeatedly broken by numerous schisms, and the chair occupied by so-called Anti-popes ; and, as Dr. Newman remarked, no one at the present day can say which was the legitimate Pope. These rival claimants had their supporters, and they cursed and anathematized each other, and their respective adherents, with that particular force and unction which appears to have been the special privilege of Popes. To take one notable example, the "Great Western Schism." In a popular work, "The Church and the Sovereign Pontiff," by two Jesuit priests, Antonio Maurel and Patrick Costello (1879), which we are told "has passed through twenty editions," and has the approbation of eighteen archbishops and bishops, in p. 238, we read :—

> The Great Western Schism is the division which took place in the fourteenth century in the Roman Church, when there were two, or even three, Popes placed at one time in the Holy See, without it being possible to distinguish which of the two or three Popes was the most canonically elected. It commenced after the death of Gregory XI., in 1378, and lasted for forty years. At this sad epoch, Christianity was divided into three obediences, that of John XXIII., Benedict XIII., and that of Gregory XII. Now, on the one hand, it was very difficult, or even impossible, to discern the true and legitimate Pope ; on the other, the three competitors, at least John XXIII. and Benedict XIII., were not disposed to abdicate.

---

[1] See Gibson's "Preservative," etc , vol. ii., p. 209.

The schism, in fact, lasted nearly seventy years.

The moral to be drawn from this episode is summed up by Coluccio Salutato, Papal secretary, writing to Jodocus, Margrave of Brandenburg and Moravia:—

> After the death of Gregory XI., of happy memory, no person belonging to the party of the invalidly elected Pontiff has obtained the priestly dignity, seeing that the jurisdiction for conferring priestly orders has failed. Consequently, those who are in the obedience of a false Pontiff, though in good faith and a pure conscience, if they fall in with anyone ordained by the new bishops, if they adore the Host and Chalice, will not adore the Body and Blood of Christ, but the mere substance of bread and of wine mingled with water, as it were an idol.[1]

Therefore all ordinations of priests, or consecration of bishops, by such bishops, would be equally invalid, and the consequences, according to Roman theory, disastrous.

C. H. COLLETTE.

Short Notices.

Principles of Biblical Criticism. By Rev. J. J. LIAS, M.A. Eyre and Spottiswoode.

FOR intelligent readers who are not experts in the science of Biblical Criticism and who are too busy to study the *opera majora* of the critics themselves, the present work will prove of real and lasting service. "The object of this volume," says the writer in his preface, "is to place before the reader the principles on which the criticism of the Bible has been carried on, as well as the results which are supposed to have been attained." With the reckless and revolutionary spirit manifested in recent Biblical criticism Mr. Lias has no sympathy; he adheres, in the main, to the traditional view, modified, however, in the light of research, and corrected in accordance with the just demands of temperate criticism. Negative criticism, says Mr. Lias, is arbitrary as resting largely on conjecture instead of proof; and he concludes that, far from the history of Israel being a thing of shreds and patches, it forms a coherent whole; while, as for the sacred records in which that great history is embalmed, it stands before us a "consistent whole, the product of One Divine Mind, inspired by one Spirit, teaching one and the same truth throughout, though with ever-increasing clearness as the years roll on." Besides the fact that the volume Mr. Lias has given us is written in an interesting manner, it is full of sound learning, as the scholarlike footnotes—of which there are a considerable number—abundantly show. We hope it will be very widely circulated, as it deserves to be.

The Biblical Doctrine of Sin. By Prof. J. S. CANDLISH, D.D. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

We wish to call attention—though all too late, for the book now noticed has been out some time—to the admirable series of "Handbooks for Bible-classes and private students" issued by the enterprising firm of

[1] Apud Martene, "Thes. Anecd.," ii. 1160. Quoted by Dr. Littledale, in his "Petrine Claims," cap. viii., p. 335. S.P.C.K.

Messrs. T. and T. Clark, in which series Dr. Candlish's little work appears. Some of the numbers in that series are already known and prized, *e.g.*, Dr. Stalker's "Life of St. Paul." The present volume is on so important a subject that a word of special notice must be accorded it. Without a just conception of the awfulness of sin, there can be no real recognition of the need for the world's redemption. It would hardly be too much to say that the body of Christian theology is centred upon that doctrine—the doctrine of sin. Dr. Candlish's treatment, if brief, is entirely adequate, so far as it goes, and we hope that it will be carefully studied by those for whom it was designed, in conjunction with the same writer's excellent little treatise on the work of the Holy Spirit in the same series of class-books.

The Divine Life of the Church (Scottish Church Society Conferences). In 2 vols. Edinburgh: Gardner Hill.

A series of "twenty-minute papers," contributed at the Second Annual Conference of the Scottish Church Society, held in February of this year. One paper, however, breaks the "twenty-minute" rule, for it fills up nearly 200 pages of the first volume. Its subject is the "Sacrament of Baptism," by the Rev. J. Macleod, minister of Govan, Glasgow. With the exception of this paper, and a short one by Professor Flint (vol. ii., p. 171) on the attitude which the Church should assume towards the leading phases of modern thought, there is nothing to attract special attention in either volume. Professor Flint's paper is just what we might expect from a man of his clear-sighted erudition and practical sagacity; we should like to see his paper sown broadcast over the land. Its only fault is its brevity.

The Great Question answered. By the Rev. A. METCALFE. Nisbet and Co. Second edition.

We are glad to see this devout little work has reached the honours of a second edition. We trust it may have a wide circulation.

Bishop Guest: Articles XXVIII. and XXIX. By Rev. G. F. HODGES (with a preface by Rev. A. J. Mason, D.D.). London: Percival and Co.

A very able, though brief, historical disquisition, the value of which is in inverse proportion to its bulk. Mr. Hodges' contention is that Bishop Guest is rightly claimed as a maintainer of a Real (Objective) Presence in the Sacraments; that Article XXVIII. was so worded by him as to cover this belief, *but* that Convocation did not accept Article XXVIII. in the sense attached to it by the Bishop.

How to read the Prophets. By the Rev. BUCHANAN CLARKE. Part V. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

The value of this series is now well known. The present volume brings it to a close, embracing the "second" Isaiah, Daniel, and the Post-Exilian Prophets. The usual characteristics are of course reproduced, including a translation in good plain English, useful exegetical notes, and a glossary of names. The claim is made that these volumes will be especially serviceable to the Christian laity, and have been prepared almost exclusively for their benefit. This may be so, but there will be many ministers who will find more perhaps that is helpful and stimulating than in any similar treatise.

The Gospel on the Continent. Incidents in the life of James Craig. Edited by his daughter. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Dr. Craig was a Presbyterian minister who did much devoted work in continental fields. This narrative of his labours forms a sufficiently interesting biography. Many of the anecdotes that are contained in its pages possess a peculiar value.

The Works of the Rev. Griffith Edwards. Edited by the Rev. ELIAS OWEN, M.A. London: Elliot Stock.

The late Mr. Edwards, Vicar of Llangadfan, Montgomeryshire, wrote three parish histories possessed of unusual merit. These, with some fugitive poems in Welsh and English, have been collected into the handsome volume before us, to which an appropriate memoir has been prefixed.

The Highway of Sorrow. By HESBA STRETTON. London: Cassell and Co.

In this story all the powers of the well-known authoress are used on behalf of the persecuted Stundist sect of Russia. These poor Protestants are treated probably rather more severely than the Jews, but with the exception of Tolstoi and Hepworth Dixon, very few voices have been raised on their behalf. Hesba Stretton's pathetic tale is therefore all the more welcome.

Crowned, not Crushed. By MARY H. P. CUNLIFFE. London: S.P.C.K.

A series of charming and sympathetic addresses to those whom the authoress calls "Family Incapables," with many sound hints as to how even the weakly and deformed can make themselves of real value to those about them.

Luther Anecdotes. Compiled by Dr. MACAULAY. Pp. 189. Price 6d. R.T.S. Library.

These anecdotes of the great German Reformer have been gathered from his books, letters and history, by Dr. Macaulay, of the "Leisure Hour," with great care, and, in the words of the editor, they give his (Luther's) own account, in his own words, of the chief events of the great movement of which he was the leader; and the book thus forms, in some measure, a fragment of autobiography.

Tourist Guide to the Continent (with illustrations). Edited by PERCY LINDLEY. Pp. 158. Price 6d. London: 30, Fleet Street.

This little guide, which is in its sixteenth year of issue, is published in the interests of the Great Eastern Railway Company; but it contains information of considerable usefulness to any who may be intending to visit the many places of interest in the North of Europe. Specially helpful features are the excellent maps and the hints for cycling tours. It is written in a pleasant and chatty style.

The Christian Traveller's Continental Handbook. Edited by the Rev. G. H. GIDDINS, with an introduction by F. YEATS EDWARDS. Pp. 162. Seventh edition revised. Elliot Stock.

This well-printed and popular guide-book has long ago established its reputation as a standard work. Of the new edition there is little to be said save that much new information has been added, and its usefulness has thereby been extended. This new matter includes, besides hints common to all books of this character, much that will be of interest even to experienced travellers. The list of the chief Protestant agencies in Europe appears very complete.

The White King's Daughter. By EMMA MARSHALL. Seeley and Co. Price 3s. 6d. Pp. 298.

Mrs. Marshall's historical stories are always interesting and graphic, and this account of the Princess Elizabeth—who is by no means the principal figure in the tale—is no exception. But the book shows signs of somewhat careless and hasty writing, and we cannot understand why the beautiful and touching story of the Princess's death alone with the open Bible should have been suppressed, and the fictitious account of an apparition substituted.

Home Questions. By Rev. CLEMENT BLAKELOCK. S.P.C.K. Price 1s. Pp. 80.

We can most cordially recommend this unpretending little work as a wedding gift-book, in the words of the preface, "from the clergy and others to old Sunday scholars and servants."

Our Little Ones. By Rev. WALTER SENIOR. *Home Words* Office. Price 1s. 6d. Pp. 69.

This well-got-up little book contains some useful hints and excellent advice to mothers, and will be a valuable help to Mothers' Meetings.

MAGAZINES.

We have received the following (September) magazines:

The Thinker, The Expository Times, The Religious Review of Reviews, The Review of the Churches, The Anglican Church Magazine, The Church Missionary Intelligencer, The 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.*

THE MONTH.

THE NEW BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.

THE Rev. Edward Stuart Talbot, D.D. (says the *Times*), was born in 1844, and is the second son of the late Hon. John Chetwynd Talbot, Q.C., the fourth son of the second Earl Talbot, his mother being the daughter of the first Lord Wharncliffe. Canon Talbot had a distinguished University career, taking a first class in the Final Classical Schools in 1865, and a first class in the School of Law and Modern History in the following year. On the foundation of Keble College in 1870, he left Christ Church to preside over the new society, and acted as Warden till 1888, when he was appointed by the Crown to succeed Dr. Jayne, the Bishop of Chester, as Vicar of Leeds. The new Bishop has served two terms of office as Select Preacher at Oxford, was a public examiner from 1874 to 1876, and acted as chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury from his translation till 1889. He became an honorary chaplain to the Queen in 1890, and a chaplain-in-ordinary last year, and since 1891 has been an honorary Canon of Ripon. Dr. Talbot contributed an essay on "The Preparation in History for Christ" to *Lux Mundi.* He married in 1870 the Hon. Lavinia Lyttelton, the third daughter of the late Lord Lyttelton. He is a most amiable and self-denying man, a very able and thoughtful preacher, and a devout Christian. He is a High Churchman.

NEW CANON OF CANTERBURY.

The Archbishop of Canterbury has appointed the Rev. A. J. Mason, D.D., to the canonry in Canterbury Cathedral vacated by the appoint-

ment of Canon Fremantle to the deanery of Ripon. Dr. Mason will leave Allhallows', Barking, in November. The Archbishop intends to provide for the continuance of the mission-work connected with Allhallows. Dr. Mason was a scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge, and graduated (eighth classic) in 1872, being elected a Fellow in the following year. He was ordained in 1874 (when he was Hulsean Essayist), and was for three years assistant-tutor of Trinity, for the last two years of that period being perpetual curate of St. Michael's, Cambridge. From 1878 to 1884 he was Canon Missioner of Truro, and afterwards, until 1893, an honorary Canon of that cathedral. Since 1884 Dr. Mason has been Vicar of Allhallows', Barking, which under his direction has been an important centre of home-mission work. He acted as examining chaplain to the Archbishop when his Grace was Bishop of Truro, and to his successor, Bishop Wilkinson, and to the present Bishop (Dr. Gott) until 1893, when he was appointed examining chaplain to the Archbishop and honorary Canon of Canterbury. Dr. Mason was Select Preacher at Oxford from 1892 to 1894. He took the D.D. degree in 1890. He is the author of "The Persecution of Diocletian," "Commentary on Thessalonians and First Epistle of St. Peter" in Bishop Ellicott's "New Testament Commentary for English Readers," "The Faith of the Gospel —a Manual of Christian Doctrine," and "The Relation of Confirmation to Baptism."

"The removal of Dr. Mason from Allhallows', Barking, to a stall at Canterbury," says the *Times*, "gives occasion to notice the remarkable work which he has directed there for nearly twelve years. The parish being very small, and in the gift of the Archbishop of Canterbury, with an endowment in the gross of £2,000 a year (though with very large deductions), suggested the 'maintenance of a small body of clergy, who should not only supply the needs of the parish and parish church, but should also be available for the benefit of the Church at large.' Dr. Mason devoted his income to retaining four assistants, on quasi-fellowships, to reside with him in a house which he obtained on Tower Hill. He thus gave to selected men, who had already shown conspicuous ability in preaching or other work, periods of time for study and advanced training, as well as for conducting by mutual counsel wider operations. Besides providing very complete parochial organisations and a noble restoration of the very interesting church, of which Archbishop Laud was rector, the other work accomplished has been immense. A return made Christmas, 1893, showed that between fifty and sixty full missions, twenty extended courses of historical and theological lectures at Cambridge, St. Paul's, and in many towns much literary work (including Dr. Mason's own important treatises), several prolonged itinerant missions of many weeks, much outdoor preaching, with sermons in many scores of churches, thirty-five full retreats and one hundred and fifty shorter gatherings for clergy and others (of which missions and retreats Wales has had a very full share), as well as many other important works not easy to particularize, have emanated from the little voluntary college of Allhallows', few suspecting whence all this came. Among other leading men who availed themselves of this training, and carried on these works under Dr. Mason, may be named Professor W. E. Collins, the Revs. G. C. Fletcher (Vicar of All Saints', Clapton), W. Bellars (late Vicar of Margate), Cyril Bickersteth, Reginald and James Adderley, Arthur W. Robinson," etc. He is a High Churchman.

NEW VICAR OF THE PARISH CHURCH, LEEDS.

Prebendary Gibson, principal of Wells Theological College, has been appointed to the parish church of Leeds, vacated by Dr. Talbot. The

trustees are High Churchmen, and the Crown has naturally appointed a High Churchman.

NEW VICAR OF ST. GEORGE'S, LEEDS.

The trustees have offered the Vicarage of St. George's, Leeds, to the Rev. John Charles Wright, M.A., Vicar of Ulverston, who has accepted the offer. Mr. Wright was for several years curate and lecturer at the parish church of Bradford, is a graduate of the University of Oxford (formerly postmaster of Merton College), and took a second class in the honours list, both in moderations and in the final public examination in Litt. Hum.

The Rev. H. Hensley Henson, Vicar of Barking and Rural Dean, has been offered by the Marquis of Salisbury the chaplaincy of the Hospital of St. Mary and St. Thomas at Ilford, and he has accepted it. He will resign the Barking living in October, but will retain the position of Rural Dean. He is a High Churchman.

THE APPOINTMENT OF THE REV. H. E. J. BEVAN to the Vicarage of Holy Trinity, Chelsea, by Lord Cadogan, is of the happiest omen. As first Vicar of St. Andrew's, Stoke Newington, and Gresham Professor of Divinity, he has been eminently useful and successful. No congregation in London are more enthusiastic about their Vicar than the people of St. Andrew's. They are chiefly educated people belonging to the City and to the professional classes. Mr. Bevan has built the church and parish from the beginning, as well as a vicarage and many institutions. He is a liberal Evangelical, untinged by sacerdotalism, of wide sympathies and reading, and devoted to music. The choir has been a great feature at St. Andrew's; and Mr. Bevan has found at least two hundred and fifty hearty supporters and workers amongst the laymen of the congregation. As a preacher, he is most interesting and original, with a strong fund of humour. His sermons are specially attractive to intelligent men. His Gresham Lectures on the "History of Religions" have been so well attended that many have been unable to get in. It was the same with his Evidential Lectures at Grosvenor House. He has a property of his own in Shropshire, Quatford Castle, and he married a daughter of Viscount Molesworth.

BIBLE SOCIETY.

From the ninety-first annual report of the British and Foreign Bible Society, lately issued, it appears that the Society's income for the past year has been sufficient not only to meet current expenditure, but also to more than expunge the remainder of the deficit of 1889-92. The general and special funds amounted to £139,810 8s. 7d., being a decrease of £2,734 7s. 10d.; the sales, however, have realized £93,552 18s. 1d., an advance of £1,812 14s. 2d. The total receipts for 1894 were £233,363 6s. 8d., only £921 12s. 8d. less than in the year preceding. The home issues of Bibles, Testaments, and portions for 1894 were 1,651,566; those distributed abroad reached a total of 2,185,656. The total issues for the year showed an increase of 28,264 copies in whole Bibles. With regard to translation work, the editorial sub-committee have had to deal in some measure with over one hundred versions during the year. The most important work of the Society has been revision of the versions in the languages of India and China. It is hoped that the year 1895 will see the first Pashtu Bible completed for the people of Afghanistan, and that the Malagasy people will be equipped with their first marginal reference Bible, which is now passing through the press at Oxford.