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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

APRIL, 1896.

ART. I.—THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH.

NO. V.—THE SUPPOSED JEHOVISTIC ACCOUNT OF CREATION.

THE priestly account of creation is supposed to end in the middle of Gen. ii. 4, at the word "created." Then the redactor is supposed to have turned from his priestly (P) to his prophetical guide (JE), and to have copied out a long passage from this last author, beginning at the words "in the day that Jehovah Elohim made the earth and the heavens." Before finally leaving P's account, we may briefly observe that the allusion to the Sabbath in connection with the work of creation, so rare in the other books of Scripture, seems rather to point to identity of authorship between P and the author of the Fourth Commandment, than to a period of from eight to ten centuries having elapsed between the giving of the commandment and the reference to it, especially as such reference is altogether foreign to the practice of the Hebrew writers, who hardly ever mention the Sabbath. It is generally admitted that the Decalogue, "in its original shape," whatever that might have been, is from the hand of Moses.[1] We have thus a presumption in favour of the theory that P was also from his hand.[2]

When we come to the Jehovistic section which follows, we are struck by the fact that the extract appears to have been begun in the middle of a sentence. Why this should have been the case it will be found hard to explain. Next, the

[1] The Sabbath, as we learn from the monuments, is also a Babylonian institution. But the form it assumed in later Babylonian history is very different from the form which meets us here.

[2] A consideration of the difference between the Hebrew and Babylonian conception of the Sabbath will suggest that here, as elsewhere, the author is refashioning the ancient traditions of his race in harmony with Mosaic institutions.

portion of the sentence which has been thus detached fits in very well with the passage from the priestly writer which precedes, but does not fit in with verse 5 which follows, if properly translated. The sentence, as severed from the context by the critics, runs thus: "In the day that Jehovah Elohim made the heavens and the earth. And every herb of the field was not yet in the earth, and every herb of the field was not yet grown up," etc.[1] To what do the words "in the day . . . earth" belong, if not to what precedes? Or if these words are due to the redactor, why has he written "Jehovah Elohim" here, and here only? Moreover, we find precisely the same construction, "These are the generations of . . . In the day when," in chap. v. 1, specially assigned to P. In each case we have ביום, followed by an infinitive construction. This is, to say the least, a curious coincidence. We may fairly infer that the whole of chap. ii. 4 and chap. v. 1 are by the same hand. Another point is that P is as often accustomed to precede his remarks by the words אלה תלדות (these are the generations), as to follow them by these words, as may be seen in chap. v. 1.[2] Besides, as we have seen,[3] the Jehovist is here quoting a Sumerian hymn, thus displaying his acquaintance with pre-Abrahamic Babylonian tradition. Nor is this all. The critics have asserted the passage which follows to be from the Jehovist, partly because the style of the narrative is different, and partly because of the use of the words "Jehovah Elohim" here instead of "Elohim," as in Gen. i. 1, ii. 4. But criticism has utterly failed to explain why in this narrative in Gen. ii., iii., and *only* here, we have "Jehovah Elohim." Elsewhere we have Jehovah or Elohim, but never in the Pentateuch, if my memory does not deceive me, have we both combined, as used absolutely, except here. The real truth is, that the critics are quite right as to the style of this narrative being different from what precedes; quite wrong in their explanation of the phenomenon. The author has given the account of creation in Gen. i. in a shape which is mainly his own; in Gen. ii., iii., his account is mainly in the shape in which it has come down to him. As to the use of Jehovah Elohim, it sometimes had a purpose and sometimes not, exactly in the same way as the use of "Jesus" and "Christ" in St. Paul's Epistles or in a modern

[1] If, with A.V., we translate טרם, "before," the incoherence is just as great, as will be found by substituting "before" for "not yet" above.

[2] The words in chap. v. 1 are זה ספר תולדת (this is the book of the generations). But this, of course, does not affect the argument, as these words, as well as those in chap. ii. 4, are supposed to be characteristic of P.

[3] CHURCHMAN for January, p. 195.

sermon. The author of this narrative, it is reasonable to suppose, *had* a purpose here. There is a transition in Gen. ii. 5, from creation as it came forth from the hand of God, to creation as it affected man. And so the author reminds those he is addressing that the great Force or Power which lay behind all that is, was also the eternal pre-existing One, the Covenant-God of Israel, who had revealed Himself to His servant Moses in the wilderness as the Guide and Protector of His chosen people. He it was who had made man, and His care and love for those whom He had made, as well as their ingratitude to Him, is carefully depicted in the narrative which follows. But whereas in chap. i. the account of creation, whether in accordance with ancient tradition or not, is cast into the form in which we have it by the author himself; in Gen. ii. 5 to xi., he is relating *the primitive tradition handed down among the descendants of Abraham.*[1] Whether that tradition was oral or written, whether it was the work of Abraham himself, or a half-forgotten tradition among the moon-worshippers of Ur, rescued by him from oblivion, is a question which may be debated. The latter seems at least a reasonable theory. There is an old Rabbinic tradition that Abraham was driven from his native land in consequence of his hatred of idolatry, and it may well have been a true one. For we now know that the statement in Josh. xxiv. 2, 14, is correct, that the inhabitants of Ur were idolaters. The inscriptions in the temple of the Moon-god have been discovered, and date from a time anterior to that of Abraham. But as the best authorities are usually of opinion that the religious ideas of primitive man were monotheistic, it is not unreasonable to suppose that Abraham may have been a religious reformer who desired to return to the earlier and purer worship of his forefathers, and that he was expelled from his home by the party of superstition.

This view is corroborated by the tone of the earlier chapters of Genesis. There is a childlike simplicity about them which points unmistakably to the infancy of the race. They are not the utterance of civilized, but of uncivilized, though not of course of savage, man. They recall the stories told by the inhabitants of Central Africa at their camp-fires, as recorded by Mr. H. M. Stanley in his recent work "Our Dark Companions," and may be paralleled in the case of many other barbarian tribes with whom explorers have come into contact. All such stories are not, of course, on a level in *tone*. But their character is precisely similar. They are the utterances of

[1] It is not contended that the choice of the words is not very often the writer's own. But he certainly reproduces the ancient traditions with scrupulous, and often even with verbal, accuracy.

men to whom abstract ideas are unfamiliar. Their notions of God are anthropopathic, and their conceptions are cast in the form of allegory or imagery.

This will be abundantly evident if we carefully examine the passage before us. We will pass by the second narrative of creation with the remark that it simply turns from the ideal to the practical side of the question. It supplements the account of the creation of things by one relating to their appearance and growth. It speaks of the way in which the things which had been brought into being manifested their existence.[1] And it concerns itself with the moral and spiritual condition of man rather than with the fact of his existence. Hence its unquestionable change of tone.[2]

We proceed to notice a few points in the rest of the story. First of all, the existence of the fertile country of Mesopotamia, in which nearly every account agrees in placing primæval man, is described in childlike phrase in the words "God planted a garden in the East." Then the gradual invention of language, as man's needs involved the coining of words to describe the phenomena with which he came into contact, is indicated by the simple words, "God brought them to the man to see what he would call them, and whatsoever the man called each of them, that was the name thereof." The invention of clothing is described in equally childlike phraseology: "The Lord God made coats of skins and clothed them." The earnest but as yet uncultured piety of the authors of the story displays itself in its custom of attributing directly to God every incident in human development it had to relate.[3] And

[1] Mr. Stanley, in his article in the *Fortnightly Review*, June, 1893, says: "An African legend describes the earth as at first covered with sweet water, but the water dried up or disappeared somewhere, and the grass, herbs, and plants began to spring up above the ground, and the water was confined into streams and rivers and lakes and pools." According to these legends, the herbs and plants were, as Gen. i. and ii. assert, created before they sprang up and became visible facts on the earth's surface.

[2] The use of the word יצר in the Jehovistic narrative of the creation of man may be explained by the fact that the object of the writer is to view the work of creation from man's side, as Gen. i. had viewed it from God's side. The use of the various words will be found to have been guided by a delicate discrimination. ברא refers to the archetypal conception in the mind of the Creator, עשה to the creative act, יצר to the "fearful and wonderful" nature of the human organism the creative act had called into being.

[3] The author of the account of creation in Gen. i. follows this precedent, it is important to notice. Writing for a people whose ideas were still primitive, he speaks of the Hebrew names for day, night, heaven, earth, seas, as given by God. This is hardly consistent with the idea of the post-Exilic origin of Gen. i., unless we consider that he designedly imitated the language of JE. But, *ex hypothesi*, the difference of style is so great that it can be recognised without any difficulty.

nothing is more in accordance with probability than the significant hint of these early traditions, that the use of clothing was in some way connected with the consciousness of guilt—of the abuse of those laws which God had implanted in the conscience of primitive man—of the fact that man had deliberately chosen to have experience of evil as well as of good. Nor need it for a moment be supposed that the Christian is bound, in these days of scientific investigation, to believe implicitly in the literal truth of the account of the creation of woman. The form the story here assumes is simply the mode in which primitive culture, in its habit of personification of abstract truths, expresses the fact of the intimate union between the sexes which God has ordained in holy matrimony —a tie like in kind, but how infinitely higher in degree, to that which unites the rest of the animal creation!—a tie fitly described in those noble words, whether penned by Moses himself or handed down by him from the remotest antiquity: "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and they twain shall be one flesh." Which is more likely, that this noble and withal truly scientific passage was evolved, no one knows by what process, in the period between Jehoshaphat and Jehoash, or that it was an expression of the idea embodied in a sacred tradition, handed down by God's providence from very early times—an idea placed by Moses in the forefront of his system, as marking the consecration of family life ?[1]

The account of man's fall is obviously allegorical. There are no such trees in existence as the tree of knowledge of good and evil and the tree of life, and their mention among the trees of the garden is merely the way in which the primitive tradition before us describes the truth that God had given life to man, and that experience of evil formed one of the facts of his life at this period. Nor need we insist on the personification of the serpent, or the literal accuracy of the language supposed to have been used by Adam, his wife, and the tempter. We may regard the curse pronounced on the serpent as in keeping with the allegorical description of the knowledge of good and evil as a tree, and see in it a vivid description of the degrading effects of sin. We may even claim the liberty to suppose that Adam and Eve themselves ("the man" and "living," as their names imply) need not be literally the very first man and woman who were placed on the earth, but simply personifications of the human race in those prehistoric times. The

[1] It may be observed that family life, as described in Genesis, is held from the first to involve this principle of consecration, though no doubt, to some extent, cast in the shade by the growing practice of polygamy.

literalists have most irreverently—I will venture even to say profanely—substituted here an apple for the words of the sacred historian, the "fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil," and have thereby wrought far more harm than has been wrought by any other single misstatement known to me. They have given point to the cheap sneer of every infidel who desired to throw discredit on the first principle with which Holy Scripture starts, namely, the fact that man has fallen.[1] Nor can we fail to observe how primitive were the conceptions of God, as Dr. Watson has also observed,[2] in Genesis throughout, and especially in these early chapters of Genesis, and how strongly they contrast with the conceptions in the later books of Moses, where we are told that none can look on God and live.[3] Here God speaks familiarly with man as with a friend. He is said to "walk in the garden in the cool (or breeze) of the day."[4] The idea of a plurality in the Godhead, again, so far as the Old Testament is concerned, is confined to these early utterances,[5] suggesting the idea that,

---

[1] Mr. Pinches, of the British Museum, in a paper read this year before the Victoria Institute, speaks of an early Babylonian tablet, relating to a tree of life, in which the following words occur:

"In Eridu there grew a dark vine—in a glorious place was it brought forth.
Its form bright lapis-stone, set in the world beneath.
The path of Ea in Eridu is filled with fertility.
His seal is the centre-place of the earth.
His couch is the bed of Nammu.
To the glorious house, which is like a forest, its shade is set—no man enters into its midst.
In its interior is the Sun-god, Tammuz,
Between the mouths of the rivers which are on both sides.'

The antiquity of the legend handed down in this tablet is evidenced by the fact that it is bilingual, and therefore dates from the earliest times. The author of Genesis has apparently deliberately spiritualized this legend, so familiar to his race. The vine of the tablet has become with him a fundamental spiritual fact, man's knowledge of evil as well as good, and the dire results of that knowledge on his spiritual, moral, and even physical well-being. It is odd that modern so-called orthodoxy, in substituting the apple for man's spiritual experiences, has returned to the mythological and polytheistic teaching of pre-Semitic times, with considerable injury to the faith of many in these days of universal inquiry. In Professor Sayce's translation in "The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments," p. 61, the vine becomes a palm-stalk, and there are many other variations. But Mr. Pinches claims to have deciphered another line, which brings in the rivers of Gen. ii. 10, 11.

[2] "The Book Genesis," chap. vi.

[3] Exod. xx. 20; Deut. iv. 33; *cf.* Gen. xxxii. 30.

[4] "Auram post meridiem."—Vulgate.

[5] Gen. i. 26, iii. 22, xi. 7. There is no reason to doubt that we have here an indistinct shadowing forth of the great truth of the Trinity in Unity.

even in his opening account of creation, Moses is embodying earlier tradition. And the dire consequences of sin in making labour, which once was a joy and a pleasure,[1] to become a sorrow and a cause of misery,[2] are declared in simple yet pregnant phrase to have been stamped on the whole life of man after the Fall. Moreover, in the pangs of child-birth, which may reasonably be believed to have grown more acute as the race departed more and more widely from primitive innocence, we are taught to discern another of the sad results of sin. And its last result is to make the earth no longer a garden of God in the land of delight (Eden), but a place of exile from man's true happiness.[3]

I pass over the narrative in chap. iv., which seems to indicate that antediluvian mankind were divided into two classes: primitive and pastoral man, who retained some of his primæval innocence; and selfish and aggressive man, whose selfishness made him turn his abilities to the best account, though he sadly misused his knowledge. And I come to chap. v., which appears to me to be an integral part of these early traditions. It cannot possibly have been an invention of the priestly writer in post-Exilic times. Such an invention would have found no favour with the Jews after the Captivity. And if it be contended that it is not an invention, but that it was copied by the author from primitive records, which have since perished, then it is certainly not the work of a post-Exilic writer, but that of some ancient author no longer extant. And it is sheer absurdity to pretend that there can be anything in the style of a genealogy which stamps it as the writing of any particular author. The genealogy in chap. v., then, was either invented by the post-Exilic writer, or the matter of it is not his at all. The critical analysis of this chapter, moreover, is as careless and one-sided as it will very frequently be found elsewhere. First of all, the genealogy in chap. iv. is assigned to JE, and that in chap. v. to P. Consistency would require that they should be assigned to the same writer. And certainly if we are to sever chap. v. 29 from P, in which it is imbedded, we ought, on like principles, to sever chap. iv. 18 from JE, and assign it to P. Genealogies are certainly "juristisch, pünktlich, und formelhaft" enough, and the most rigid critic in style would be disposed to admit that if that be the ground on which criticism proceeds, they ought all to be assigned

[1] Gen. ii. 15.

[2] Gen. iii. 17-19.

[3] Gen. iii. 24. Can it be possible, as has sometimes occurred to me, that in Gen. iii. 10 man's early dread of the thunderstorm is regarded as a consequence of his consciousness of sin? The thunder is called the "voice of God" in Exod. ix. 28 and in Ps. xxix.

to the Priestly writer. But, instead of this, we are told that a "stylistic criterion" has been discovered, which makes a distinction necessary here. This criterion consists in the fact that, whereas the Prophetic writer (or JE, as he has been called) invariably uses ילד (beget) in the Kal voice, or the passive (Niphal) יולד ל (was born to), or the Pual, as in iv. 18, the Priestly writer (P) invariably puts the word "begat" in the *Hiphil* voice (הוליד). If so, no doubt a point is made. But let us further examine the matter. Gen. xlvi. 6-27, is assigned by the critics to P; but in xlvi. 20 יולד ל (was born to), the remarkable phrase which we have seen to be so specially characteristic of JE, *occurs in a passage assigned to P.* This is also the case in chap. xvii. 17, where יולד ל occurs again. *This passage, too, is assigned to P.* Once more, we have the same voice and sense, though in the plural, in Gen. x. 1. *This also is assigned to P.* See also Numb. xxvi. 60. Thus a word assigned by the critics to JE occurs *four times* in P to *once* in JE. Nor is this all. A more careful study of the matter shows that the use of the causative voice (caused to be born—begot) is more reconcilable with the sense of ילד involved in the Niphal or passive when translated *to be born*, than is the use of the active voice ילד in the sense of "to beget."[1] In other words, P's use of the verb is more reconcilable with JE's than JE's with itself. And there is even more to be said. JE in chap. iv. uses *two* forms of the passive (to be born), the Pual as well as the Niphal. The former occurs in chap. iv. 26. It occurs again in chap. xxiv. 15, also assigned to JE. Moreover, chap. iv. 26 is said to be stamped unmistakably as belonging to JE by the words גם הוא (he also), which the critics tell us is one of the most marked characteristics of JE. We might take it, therefore, that this indiscriminate use in one passage of two forms of the passive of this verb is a distinct characteristic of JE. Perhaps on the whole, however, it might be well to carry our examination a little farther. And if we do so, we shall find that this indiscriminate use of the same two forms of

[1] In P, ילד is used for the mother "she *bare*." The Niphal "to be born" is the ordinary passive of this, *i.e.*, P's, use. P has the Niphal *infinitive* with ל in Gen. xxi. 5, and the *participle* in Gen. xxi. 3, and in this last case it is distinctly used *as* the passive of the Kal ילד. Moreover, in this passage, assigned to the post-Exilic writer, we have a remarkable instance of that repetition for the sake of emphasis, which the best authorities, and with reason, have regarded as characteristic of a very early date.

the passive also occurs in the passage Gen. xlvi. 6-27, which, as we have seen, *is assigned to P.* This double form of the passive occurs in *no other passage* in the Old Testament. And once more, neither of these forms is the passive of the Hiphil or causative voice, in which we are asked to see the hand of P in chap. v. Thus, then, we have made two discoveries: the one, that variety of expression does *not* involve diversity of authorship; and the other, that *the same* peculiarities of construction are found *both in JE and P,* and *nowhere else,* and thus tend to indicate *identity of authorship* between them, as far as these particular passages are concerned. It must not be forgotten, too, that the critics, as may be seen, have dealt most arbitrarily with the genealogies, assigning portions of them to JE, and portions to P, just as their preconceived theories appeared to demand. We are entitled to add at least as much as this, that a great deal more trouble will have yet to be taken with the analysis before the assignment of the various portions of Genesis to their respective authors can be regarded as satisfactorily established. Then the critics have once more arbitrarily separated verse 29 from the rest of chap. v. as containing a portion of narrative, and have assigned it to JE. They may have jumped to conclusions here again, as they have done about the form in which the genealogies are drawn up. The truth is that the author of Genesis, like almost every other author we know of, prefaces the mention of a person who is to play a considerable part in his story with a few words of introduction. The real reason for the introduction of this genealogy here would seem to be twofold. First of all, the author desires us to understand that Noah was descended from the family or community in which purity of faith and life were preserved; and next, to call our attention to the fact of the ravages of sin in shortening the duration of man's life. We need not insist on the literal accuracy of every word in this account. The numbers and dates in Scripture are a source of much perplexity. In this particular passage the numbers in the LXX., and in the present Hebrew text, do not always agree. And the LXX., we ought not to forget, represents the earliest direct evidence we have concerning the Hebrew text. The numbers in the Samaritan Pentateuch differ from the Hebrew in the opposite direction. If numbers were in very ancient times represented in Hebrew by signs, as they frequently are now, this would account for the discrepancies and improbabilities in numbers found throughout the Old Testament as we now have it. And the dim antiquity from which these traditions emerge may reasonably be held to preclude any certainty on our part that the details before us are historically correct in every particular. We may there-

fore venture here to prefer the spirit to the letter, and discern, not minute accuracy in detail, but the assertion, on authority of high antiquity, of a great and important moral truth, that the duration of human life will very largely depend on our observance of the laws which God has laid down for our guidance in relation to it.

There may be some who will consider this handling of the early chapters of Genesis as too free, and will ask what is gained by rejecting the new criticism, unless the exact historical accuracy of the Old Testament down to the minutest detail is rigidly to be maintained at all hazards. I reply, first of all, that it seems to me unwise to invert the Christian faith, and to demand as implicit a belief in the assertion that Methuselah lived nine hundred and sixty-nine years as in the fact that Christ rose from the dead. The Scriptures were not given us to teach us astronomy, or geology, or even human history and chronology, but to testify of Christ. And so long as their main facts are unquestioned, and the great spiritual principles they enshrine are firmly held, there is no real danger in admitting in them a human element.[1] The πρῶτον ψεῦδος of the new criticism is that it represents the writers of the Old Testament as deliberately stating in the interests of religion what they knew to be false, and as entirely misrepresenting the facts which they had undertaken to hand down, and this not only in their secular, but in their religious aspect. We care comparatively little who wrote the Pentateuch, or when it was written, so long as it tells us the true history of God's dealings with His people Israel. But it is incompatible with common honesty and common-sense for a writer in the reign of Hezekiah or Manasseh to represent Moses as uttering words and giving precepts which he never dreamed of, or for a still later writer to pretend that institutions which were never heard of until after the Exile were given to the Israelites in the wilderness before they entered the Promised Land, and that God severely punished them for disobeying such statutes when they had never received them. If the critical theory be true, then the Old Testament Scriptures represent God as palpably and shamefully unjust, and their account of God's teaching and moral education of His people is a tissue of absurd fabrications. With whatever honesty and good faith such views are put

[1] The Rev. D. Greig, in an admirable paper on "Biblical Criticism," read before the mission clergy of the diocese of Ely, says: "All that is necessary to the Christian view is that *we have in the Bible an authentic record of this Divine history*" (*i.e.*, of the special providential guidance of God's people from the days of Abraham onwards).

forth, it is certain that they will ultimately be destructive either of our honesty and good faith, or of our reverence for the Sacred Volume, the contents of which have been shown to be incompatible with those qualities. Men cannot pin their faith on pious frauds without injuring their moral sense thereby, as the history of the Roman Communion has very plainly shown. The alternative theory which I have suggested, while recognising the possibility that there may have been a measure of human infirmity in the transmission of records from a past which is practically at an infinite distance from us, nevertheless recognises the good faith of the writers, and the substantial accuracy of the accounts they have handed down. The Scriptures were given us to instruct us in the ways of God to man. And however much on other points they may have reflected merely the belief of their age, we may be sure that they have faithfully reported to us the dispensation of God, as made known to His servants the patriarchs, Moses and the prophets, and that they have truly unfolded to us the steps of God's spiritual education of the people He had chosen.

J. J. LIAS.

NOTE.—The above paper was written before I received from the Rev. A. Kennion a copy of his interesting volume entitled "Principia." He has, I find, anticipated me in several points.

ART. II.—CONCERNING THE LORD'S SUPPER, AND THE ORDER FOR THE ADMINISTRATION THEREOF.

BY whom was the Lord's Supper instituted? It was ordained by Christ Himself. What is the Lord's Supper? It is one of the two (two only) Sacraments ordained by Christ and declared to be *generally* necessary to salvation. What is the meaning of the word "Sacrament"? It means an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, *given* unto us, ordained by Christ, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof. It follows that in a Sacrament are two parts: the outward and visible sign and the inward and spiritual grace. This is the doctrine of the Church Catechism.

Two words require comment—the words "generally" and "given." "Generally" in olden times was frequently used in the sense of universally. It is therefore to some extent ambiguous; and there are some who contend that it is used in the latter sense in the Catechism. The ends of their contention are twofold: (1) They desire to maintain other five

so-called Sacraments of the Roman Church as true Sacraments, albeit not universally necessary to salvation—viz., Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction (see p. 238 of that disloyal book falsely called "The Catholic Religion"). But the Church says (Article XXV.) those five are not to be counted as Sacraments of the Gospel.

The second end is the undue exaltation of the Sacraments. They aver that the actual reception of the Sacraments is universally necessary to salvation. This is not the doctrine of the Church. The Church does teach that such reception is generally necessary to salvation, inasmuch as those who wilfully disobey any command of Christ cannot expect salvation; but the Church disclaims this universal necessity in the case of infants who die without actual sin, unbaptized, by its rejection, some three hundred years ago (1562), of an article which had stated this awful doctrine; and as regards the Lord's Supper, the Church postpones the reception of the Sacrament until after Confirmation. Does the Church condemn to perdition all who die in youth before they have been admitted to Confirmation, though they have learned to believe in their Creator, their Redeemer, and Him who sanctifieth them? We are taught by a rubric in the office for the Communion of the Sick that spiritual manducation of the Body and Blood of Christ may well be, though a man without fault of his do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth

So much for the Church doctrine; but then the adversary refers to the discourse of our Lord in St. John vi., when He says, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." This does not refer to the Feast of the Last Supper; it refers to the spiritual feeding on Christ's body by means of faith, of which the Supper is a sign. Jeremy Taylor says, "It is certain that Christ here spoke of spiritual manducation, not of sacramental"; and Bishop Beveridge says, "Our Saviour hath no particular reference to the representations of His Body and Blood in the Sacrament, but only to the spiritual feeding upon Him by faith, whether in or out of the Sacrament." The feeding upon Christ is made here an absolute condition of salvation, but no such condition is connected with the Lord's Supper in the accounts of its institution given by St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, nor in the references made by St. Paul. If this discourse is to be taken literally as a reference to eating the bread and drinking the wine, it follows from verse 54 that all who receive the Sacrament—*i.e.*, the Sign—have eternal life, and from verse 53, that there is no life in any man who does not receive this Sacrament. This is not the truth nor the doctrine of the Church. Our Lord then, speaking to His disciples, who

had complained of His words, refers to His ascension (verse 62), and on this Lightfoot comments: "But the expression seems very harsh when He speaks of eating His flesh and drinking His blood. He tells us, therefore, that these things must be taken in a spiritual sense. Do these things offend you? What and if you shall see the Son of man ascending up where He was before?—that is, when you shall have seen Me ascending into heaven, you will then find how impossible a thing it is to eat My flesh and drink My blood bodily; for how can you eat the flesh of one that is in heaven? You may know, therefore, that I mean eating Me spiritually. For the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life."

The second word that I noted for comment is "given." What is given? It is the sign, not the grace signified. Clearness requires a stop after "grace," but the omission is a printer's mistake. The MS. book, annexed to the Act of Uniformity, now in the Public Record Office, Dublin, has a comma after "grace." The meaning is made clear in Durel's Latin version (1660), where "given" is translated *quod nobis datur*, the neuter *quod* necessarily referring to the neuter substantive *signum*, a sign given, a sign ordained by Christ, a sign, a means, and a pledge. The sign in both Sacraments is necessarily given to every person who receives it, but the grace offered to all is not received by all; it is not received *ex opere operato* by any, for it is only offered on the condition of faith, and, as we shall see, in the Lord's Supper the grace is only received by the means of faith.

Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained? Again I refer to the Church Catechism, because, as Bishop Davidson has well said in a recent Charge, "we find in our Church Catechism the best compendium in Christendom of our Divine Master's teaching, and of His legacy of Word and Sacrament." It was ordained by Christ for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of His death, and of the benefits which we receive thereby. To the same effect we read in the prayer of consecration: Jesus Christ did institute, and in His holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of His precious death until His coming again. And such are our Lord's words of institution quoted in this prayer from the writings of St. Luke and St. Paul: "Take, eat, do this in remembrance—drink ye all of this in remembrance of Me;" and in the words of administration commanded by our Church we have, "Eat this in remembrance, drink this in remembrance." This perpetual remembrance, to secure this remembrance in faith, is the reason *why* the Lord's Supper was ordained; and the mental law of the association of ideas, by the continued

use of the appointed sign, has doubtless been a means by which Christ has preserved in His Church a faithful remembrance of His perfect sacrifice. Such, then, being the doctrine of Scripture and the ordinance of our Church, is it not deplorable that some Anglican ministers, in administering this Sacrament, should dare to use only one part of the prescribed forms, omitting and ignoring the remembrance? Bishop Davidson, in the Charge quoted above, calls the attention of the clergy of Rochester to the fact that a minister "in so doing is not merely disobeying the letter of the Prayer-Book, but is disregarding one of the most significant and important portions of its history." Is not such conduct disloyal to the Church?—nay, disloyal to the Head of the Church, who had used the very words thus treated with contempt?

Three names are given to this Sacrament. The primary name in the order, the only name used in the Catechism and Articles, is "The Lord's Supper"—a name given because the Sacrament was instituted by our Lord during a feast in the upper chamber, begun "as they were eating," and completed immediately after supper, "when He had supped." This Sacrament is also named "Holy Communion"; for when the Lord's Supper is received by the faithful, then these members of the mystical body of Christ, the Catholic Church, have in a special sense union with Christ their Head and fellowship one with another—the communion of saints. This Sacrament is also sometimes called the "Eucharist": not, indeed, either in Scripture or the Prayer-Book; nevertheless, it does not seem to be a misnomer. "Eucharist" signifies thanksgiving, and the Sacrament is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving wherein the partakers offer themselves, their souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ. For myself, I prefer the first of these names.

The outward part of this Sacrament is bread and wine; the thing signified is the Body and Blood of Christ. Our Church, following St. Paul, speaks of the sign as bread and wine after their consecration. The Body and Blood of Christ are verily taken and received in the Sacrament: not, indeed by all who may receive the bread and wine, but only by the faithful. It is a heavenly and spiritual reception, and the means—the only means—by which it is received is faith. Christ, very God, of very God, is present at the administration of the Lord's Supper, for God is omnipresent. Christ the Saviour is present at the Lord's Supper, for He has assured His presence wherever two or three are gathered together in His name, whether for the Eucharist or for confession, for prayer or praise. Any other presence of Christ in or at the Lord's Supper we know not nor believe. Doubtless the Divine presence of Christ

may be realized more confidently, with more profit to the soul of a receiver, at the Sacrament than on any other occasion. By this heavenly and spiritual food the souls of the faithful are strengthened and refreshed, for their hearts' faith is increased, spiritual life fostered, union with Christ more fully realized, and love cherished or revived. Ussher writes thus: "The Lord's Supper is a monument for the memory, a support of faith, a provocation of love, a quickening to obedience, the signet-seal of all God's mercies to us in Christ Jesus."

The Catechism concludes with the inquiry: "What is required of them who come to the Lord's Supper?" Repentance and a steadfast purpose to lead a new life, faith in God's mercy through Christ, with a thankful remembrance of His death and charity. The faith of confidence and trust—"the faith which worketh by love," noted thus by Bengel "*In his stat totus Christianismus.*" This faith is a condition precedent to the reception of the Body and Blood of Christ, not to that of the elements of bread and wine (Article XXIX.), and necessarily so, for, as we have seen, the means of reception is faith. And, accordingly, the invitation of the Church is, "Draw near with faith."

May I refer to the summary of the "Consensus Tigurinus," given in an appendix to Principal Moule's valuable edition of Bishop Ridley's "Brief Declaration of the Lord's Supper"?

The order may be divided, for the purpose of discussion, into two parts, viz., 1. The Introduction; 2. The Consecration, Administration, and Sacrifice.

Ecclesiastical discipline is the first subject of the introduction. Discipline in the Church of Ireland is expressed in the rubrics and Canons 49 to 53, which are incorporated with the rubrics and printed in our Prayer-Book. The exercise of discipline is so rare that its importance is not appreciated. Discipline is the authority of every Church to excommunicate scandalous offenders, and upon repentance to restore them to communion. It is the power of the keys, given by Christ to His visible Churches. It is mentioned in the second Homily for Whitsunday as one of the three notes of a true Church, the others being pure doctrine and the due administration of the Sacraments; and to the same effect are the Catechism of King Edward VI., Noel's Catechism, and Rydley's definition quoted by Bishop Browne on the Articles. In St. Matt. xviii. 18 and 1 Cor. v. 5, 2 Cor. ii. 10, we find illustrations. Then follow, in the order, the Commandments, with prayers for grace to keep them; the Creed, with its words of belief and trust; the offertory, expressive of love to God and our neighbours. Compare these with the conditions of the invitation,

given a little further on in the introduction, "Draw near with faith," etc.

We now come to the comprehensive prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church militant here on earth. It is not a prayer for the holy Catholic Church, the mystical Body of Christ; it is a prayer for that part of the Catholic Church which here on earth fights under the banner of the Cross against sin, the world, and the devil. It contains no petition for that part of the Catholic Church which with Christ in Paradise rests from its labours. In this prayer is an appropriate petition that Bishops and curates may rightly and duly administer the Sacraments—rightly and duly, "with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him," as expressed in the resolution of the Lambeth Conference; rightly and duly rejecting idle and Roman ceremonies forbidden by the Church, and finding no sanction therefore in the Divine institution. Such are prostrations, crossings, bowings, elevation of the vessels, back-turnings, incense.

Then exhortations follow, with precious words to encourage and warn, to comfort and help broken and contrite hearts by the ministry of God's holy Word. Public confession to God of sin comes next after the invitation already mentioned, and then "the Absolution." The Absolution so called; for our Prayer-Books do not contain any formula in which any minister professes to forgive any sin against God, or to convey forgiveness to the sinner, or to pronounce a sentence of judicial acquittal of such sins. The formula in the visitation of the sick relates to ecclesiastical offences. *Cf.* the following collects. In this form, as well as in the forms given for Morning and Evening Service, the minister preaches the Gospel, proclaiming God's pardon to all who truly repent and unfeignedly believe, and offers up intercessory prayer for the people, to whom the comfortable words of Christ and His Apostles are then addressed. Then comes the appeal: "Lift up your hearts" (*Sursum corda*). "We lift them up unto the Lord." And then the glorious words, not surpassed in literature for holy sublimity: "Therefore with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify Thy glorious Name; evermore praising Thee, and saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of Thy glory: Glory be to Thee, O Lord most High." The introduction of the order concludes with the prayer of humble access: Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, at this Thy table, "so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed through

His most precious blood, and that we may evermore dwell in Him and He in us." And such, says the exhortation, is the great benefit, if with a true, penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy Sacrament; for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood, then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us; we are one with Christ and Christ with us.

The Prayer of Consecration.—The law of our Churches requires that this prayer should be read only by priests or presbyters. That is to say, the statute called the Act of Uniformity so enacts. The law is not founded upon the use of the word "priest" in the rubric, for in the rubrics throughout the Prayer-Book the words "priest," "minister," "curate" are used indifferently to denote the officiating clergyman, whether priest or deacon.[1] For instance, the word "priest" is used in the rubrics of the Baptismal Service, and yet it is undoubted that a deacon may administer this Sacrament. The law was within the authority of the Church, for every particular Church has a right to allocate amongst its officers special ministerial functions as it shall think proper. The *Prayer* of Consecration—not an incantation, not the formula of a physical miracle, but a prayer. A prayer of *consecration*. What does consecration mean? Not change, but dedication. It is the setting apart of the elements of bread and wine for the service of God in the celebration of His Supper. Selden says by consecrating any we only set it apart to God's service; and so in Heb. x. 20 the Authorized "consecrated" is rendered in the Revised Version by the equivalent "dedicated." In this prayer the minister proclaims the perfect sacrifice which Christ once—once for all—offered on the cross. He narrates the institution of this Sacrament, to be observed in remembrance of Christ's death and passion until His coming again; he sets apart by pious words and gestures the bread and wine thus dedicated to the celebration; and he prays that "we receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine . . . may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood."

In the Roman Church this Sacrament is called a Mass, and represented as a Sacrifice of Christ's Body and Blood offered upon an altar by a sacrificing priest; and ever since the Reformation, and especially during the last half-century, efforts have been made by Anglican clergymen—alas! not a few—to pervert the true signification of this prayer, and invest it with the character of a sacrificial incantation. Some say

[1] "In general, the words 'priest,' 'minister,' and 'curate' seem indiscriminately to be applied throughout the Liturgy to denote the clergyman who is officiating, whether he be rector, vicar, assistant-curate, priest or deacon.' —Phillimore, "Eccl. Law," p. 109, ed. 1895.

that in this prayer we plead with God the death of His Son, and that this may be called a sacrifice; but such pleading cannot naturally be called a sacrifice. Who pretends that the pathetic pleadings of the Litany, "By Thine Agony and bloody Sweat; by Thy Cross and Passion; by Thy precious Death and Burial . . . good Lord, deliver us," is a sacrificial ceremony? Others allege that the Greek words translated "Do this" mean, "Offer (or sacrifice) this," and ought to be so translated. Professor Abbott has shown that this assertion will not stand the test of sound criticism; but for Churchmen it is a sufficient answer that the translators of the New Testament, in both the Authorized and Revised Versions, and the writers of the Prayer-Book, rejected the words "Offer this," and used the words "Do this." Now, the word "do" has no sacrificial tendency. Another answer is well expressed by the learned Archdeacon Quarry; he says: "The repetition of the words 'do this,' as in 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25, with the delivery of each of the elements, shows plainly that the doing specially intended was the eating and drinking. It was not to offer or sacrifice Christ, our Passover, but to partake of the Paschal Lamb already sacrificed. He bids us to *do*." Neither in this prayer nor in the formulas of administration does the word "sacrifice" occur except in express reference to the Sacrifice upon the cross. Moreover, the Reformers and our Church, as already noticed, rejected altars necessary for sacrifice, and substituted tables proper for feasts.

The Roman Church says that the elements, by the word and intentions of a man, are changed into the very Body and Blood of Christ, the separation of bread and wine denoting the separation of Body and Blood, and thus mystically the death of Christ. This is transubstantiation, but our order by its final rubric declares: "The natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here, it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one." Irving in his "Discourses on Daniel" says forcibly: This invention maketh void incarnation, sacrifice, faith, spirit, worship; a wafer at the will of a man is at once a morsel for a bird to peck at or a mouse to nibble, and the Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity of the King of kings—is Emmanuel.

A doctrine taught in some Anglican Churches — that after the words of consecration our Lord Himself enters into the bread and wine, and so in receiving them we receive that same Body He had on earth, and which is now in heaven (Usher's "Simple Church Teaching," p. 11, Ventnor). This rivals transubstantiation in absurdity, and has no countenance in our order.

The prayer of consecration is followed by the administration of the bread and wine; when the minister delivers the dedicated bread unto the receiver, he proclaims that the Body of Jesus Christ was given for him, he prays for his everlasting life, and adds, "Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving." So plain are these concluding words, so futile all attempts to explain away the doctrine of Scripture and our Church—to wit, that Christ ordained the Lord's Supper as a remembrance of His sacrifice—that, as a last resort, and, as it were, in despair, Romanizing and disloyal Anglican clergymen presume to omit these words.

In this Sacrament there is not a sacrifice of Christ; there is no sacrifice offered by a priest sacerdotally, intervening between God and man; but, still, there is a sacrifice—a sacrifice by minister and people in unison, all alike joining in this sacrifice, priests to God and His Father (Rev. i. 6). The sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, the sacrifice of our souls and bodies, the true Eucharistic sacrifice, culminating in that glorious song of praise, the *Gloria in Excelsis*: "Glory be to God on high, and on earth peace, good will towards men. We praise Thee, we bless Thee, we worship Thee, we glorify Thee, we give thanks to Thee for Thy great glory, O Lord God, heavenly King, God the Father Almighty." Finally, the minister closes the order with intercession, prayer for peace and blessing—a prayer, not a gift. Clergymen, by the ministry of God's holy Word, may assist and guide men into the way of peace and blessing; they can pray for, but they cannot give either. Put not your trust in priests. Peace and all spiritual blessings are the direct gift of God, and of God alone.

I conclude this paper with some notes on Prayers for the Dead, Auricular Confession, Fasting Communion, and Non-communicating Attendance. All these are Roman practices, and supported by Romanizing Anglicans. Are they sanctioned by the Reformed Churches of Ireland and England in their order for the administration of the Lord's Supper or elsewhere? These are questions upon the construction of the words of the order, assisted by reference to other services and the history of their composition.

The subject of Prayers for the Dead, in its legal aspect, was discussed in 1893, in an English Ecclesiastical Court (Egerton *v.* All of Ould, L.R., 1894, Probate 15), when the erection of a window in a parish church, with a Latin inscription, including words translated "Of your charity pray for the soul of F. H., deceased, and for the soul of L. C., deceased," was not permitted. The Church of England discourages such prayers, but does not expressly prohibit them. "The definite

forms of such prayers, which were found in the first English Prayer-Book, 1549, were withdrawn in 1552, and not restored in the revisions of 1559, 1603, 1661." The reason for caution is clear. Out of the ancient prayers for the departed grew the notion that they need to be succoured by the prayers of the living; hence that they are undergoing sufferings and torments; and so by rapid steps we reach the Romish doctrine, condemned by Article XXII.

No direct or personal prayer for the dead is to be found in the Book of Common Prayer. It is childish to assert that the petition, "Remember not, Lord, the offences of our forefathers," is a prayer for the dead—no, we entreat God not to visit the sins of fathers upon their children (see second Commandment); so also it is childish to say that in the prayer for Christ's Church militant a place is left to be filled up by the supplicant with prayer for the dead. It is a prayer for a Church here on earth; it includes thanksgiving, not prayer for departed saints.

But while our Church gives no sanction to prayer for blessings for the departed during the interval between death and resurrection, or any countenance to the notion that during the intermediate state those who rest with the Lord in Paradise suffer want or torment, or could there derive benefit from the prayer of the living, our Church, and all its members do pray for departed saints. The Burial Service is the place where *à priori* such prayer might be expected, and accordingly there we find those beautiful words: "Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of those that depart hence in the Lord, and with whom the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burden of the flesh, are *in joy and felicity* . . . . We beseech thee of Thy gracious goodness shortly to accomplish the number of Thine elect, *and to hasten Thy kingdom;* that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of Thy holy Name, may *have our perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul,* in Thy eternal and everlasting glory." This is not a prayer for the suffering, or a prayer for improvement in the intermediate state of saints; it recognises their present state as one of felicity, and would hasten for all Christ's Church perfect bliss, when His kingdom comes; and so in the order itself, immediately after the administration of the bread and wine, we find the petition, "Thy kingdom come." In the next prayer of the order we humbly beseech our heavenly Father "that by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His Passion." Doubtless this cumulative expression was intended to include both the living and the dead, but it must be read distribu-

tively. Our Church does not pray for the remission of the sins of saints in joy; for them she prays for speedy perfect bliss, the consummation of the benefits of Christ's Passion.

I have not discussed the objection felt by many to prayers limited to an affectionate remembrance of a dear departed relative or friend. Mr. Collette says (CHURCHMAN, 1894, p. 366): "As a sentimental and pious custom, there would appear to be no objections to the practice;" and the Judge in Egerton's case refers to natural sympathy "with sentiments of affectionate respect in the bereaved, fired as they often are by a strong realizing of the truth of the communion of saints." But I venture to suggest that these sentiments of pious emotion and affectionate respect may find adequate expression in the prayer quoted from the Burial Service, and those quoted from the order, and such-like prayers for a speedy union in consummated bliss; and that the practice of prayers for the dead, in a sense not recognised by our Church or Holy Scripture, requires caution almost equivalent to actual abstention, when we recall the history of the doctrines of purgatory, indulgences, and Masses for the dead. Dr. Wiseman once observed: "I have no hesitation in saying that the doctrines—praying for the dead and purgatory—go so completely together that if we succeed in demonstrating the one, *the other necessarily follows.*"

Auricular Confession has been defined as "the systematic enumeration of individual sins to a priest for the purpose of absolution." In the Roman Church absolution means the forgiveness of sins. We read in Furness' "What every Christian ought to Know," with the imprimatur of Cardinal Cullen: "Remember that in the moment when the priest says over you the great words of pardon and absolution, your sins are forgiven, the pains of hell are taken away, your soul is made bright and beautiful, like an angel of God." The Anglo-Roman notion of absolution may be found in such books as "How to make a Good Confession." The form is this: "I confess to Almighty God, to the whole company of heaven, and to our Father," etc. And then, when the priest says, "I absolve thee," the precious Blood of Jesus Christ flows sacramentally upon your soul, and cleanses you from all your sins. It is this Blood alone which cleanses you, and *no one but the priest has the power of applying it to your soul.*

What is the character of the auricular confession which is to precede this absolution? It is to be found in the Roman manuals of Denns and Sanchez, in Anglican manuals such as the "Priest in Confession," and in Law Reports. I dare not quote the unspeakable abominations which are to be found in these manuals. They are such that Archbishop

Magee once described them as "a museum of spiritual iniquity at which fiends may shudder and blush, where murderers may learn cruelty, where hoary-headed convicts may be taught fraud and satyrs impurity—an infernal catechism of iniquity;" a system of which Lord Plunket, Archbishop of Dublin, declared in public synod, "I abhor auricular confession."

These shocking characteristics are not accidents. They are of its essence, involved in the theory of auricular confession. For by this theory confession of a sin must precede absolution for the sin, and it is the duty of the confessor to quicken at once the conscience and the memory of the penitent by cross-examination.

Is auricular confession in connection with sacerdotal absolution taught by the Church of Ireland? Is it recognised in this order? No formula for any sacerdotal absolution is to be found in the formularies of the Church of Ireland. The Church recognises the advantage to men whose consciences are troubled with any weighty matter to open their grief to some *discreet and learned minister* of God's Word, that by the *ministering* of God's *holy Word* he may receive the benefit of absolution. What a contrast this view of the relation between the troubled man and the discreet minister presents to that of the priest habitually confessing his parishioners, and by sacerdotal power pretending to confer or convey the benefit of Christ's Passion to the soul of man!

But the absence of recognition in our Prayer-Book proves conclusively that auricular confession is opposed to the doctrine of the Church, when this book is compared with those which preceded it. In the first book of King Edward we read: "Let him come to us, or to some other discreet and learned *priest* taught in the law of God, and *confess* and open his sin and grief *secretly*, that of *us*, as of the ministers of God and of His Church, he may receive comfort and absolution."

This historical comparison is important, and might, did space permit, be presented in startling and interesting aspects. Permit me to refer to a valuable paper on the subject in the *Nineteenth Century*, January, 1894, p. 69, by the Rev. Canon T. Shore. The formulas of absolution given by our Church are declarations of the direct forgiveness of God of the penitent and believing. What need of a priest for that? Can a priest forgive the impenitent? Can a priest retain the sin of the believer? The visitation formulary relates to Church discipline.

Fasting Communion, Non-communicating Attendance.—In the Roman Church the rule is absolute: no communion after food. And so the Anglo-Romanist (see Usher's "Church-teaching," pp. 14-16) says: "What else is required of those who come to the Blessed Sacrament? To be fasting from

midnight before!" It is quite *evident* that anybody who wishes to obey his Church and be reverent to our Lord could never receive the Blessed Sacrament non-fasting." The pretended reason of this rule is that it is irreverent to receive the Body and Blood of Christ after ordinary food—a reason disgusting in the reference to digestion; foolish, as if it did not come to the same thing to partake of ordinary food after Communion.

Now, it is certain that our Church does not forbid evening Communion or direct fasting Communion; the fourth paragraph of the note which precedes the order of morning and evening prayer of the Church of Ireland expressly declares that evening prayer and the administration of the Lord's Supper may be used in combination at the discretion of the minister, subject to the control of the ordinary; and this practice has the highest sanction, the example of our Lord, who instituted the Sacrament in the evening after supper, while they were eating, whence the name "the Lord's Supper." This usage continued through the times of the Apostles, as, *e.g.*, at Troas; and though the practice was afterwards changed, we have no reason to think the change was due to any intrinsic objection. It rather must be ascribed to abuses which resulted from the combination of the Lord's Supper with the Love-feast. I do not dispute the authority of a particular Church to make a rule for itself on this subject, nor the right of a minister of the Church of Ireland to exercise his discretion therein, subject to the control of the Bishop.

But I think evening Communion at stated times, more or less frequent, is expedient for most congregations, especially in cities. In many houses there are servants who cannot leave their domestic duties before breakfast, and who are obliged to return to their duties and their own meals after the morning service without waiting for the Administration, and who are thus practically excommunicated.

For the practice of non-communicating attendance no excuse can be found in the Book of Common Prayer. Everything points to actual reception, and in the Irish book there is an express rubric which provides an opportunity to withdraw for those who do not intend to communicate—*i.e.*, to receive and partake of the Lord's Supper. I conclude this paper with a quotation from Archdeacon Quarry's "Analysis Eucharistica," p. 25. Speaking of the Roman practice of attending Mass without Communion, he says: "This seems as much at variance with our Lord's words, 'Drink ye all of this,' as withholding the cup from the laity; for if the rite was to be for all Christians, these words imply that all present were to receive the Sacramental elements. And so in the primitive Church non-com-

municating were punished by temporary excommunication." It is to be regretted that some amongst ourselves are disposed to encourage this practice.

ROBERT R. WARREN.

ART. III.—COUNT TOLSTOI ON CHRIST'S CHRISTIANITY.

I SHALL make no attempt to criticise the literary work of Tolstoi as a whole. I am too slightly acquainted with his performances in fiction to warrant any such attempt. I have read him only in translations; but even through this disguise it is possible to discern the brilliancy, animation, and variety of his writing, and the audacious extensiveness of his speculative ideas. I propose to myself a more restricted task. Even here I shall not offer an exhaustive account of the single book before me.

It is scarcely possible to judge of the real merits of a book when read in a translation. Contrary to the absurdly shallow doctrine that you can read any author as well in your own tongue as in his, I freely avow myself disqualified through not knowing Russian from criticising a Russian work.

But the ideas which this book embodies for the English public ought not to circulate without a challenge. Tolstoi's is a name to conjure with. Hundreds, perhaps thousands, imbibe his spirit and his ideas, and feel that in doing so they are putting themselves in touch with what is quite the thing. Some, moreover, proclaim him with ostentatious clamour as one of the prophets. The old question has returned to my mind in reading this book, and in reflecting upon the many who run after Tolstoi, "What went ye out into the wilderness for to see?" Merely to raise such a question will in some quarters be regarded as a token of obstinate inability to discern the signs of the times. The reader must judge as to the propriety of the question, and as to the answer which is conveyed in this article.

Russia shows signs of awakening. The Stundists are a living force; they thrive under the blessing of persecution. Though their form of piety lacks strength and definition, they plainly possess both life and godliness. The agitation is hopeful; it may portend the awakening from slumber of an empire and a Church. What Evangelical Christian can forbear to pray that these Russian Lollards may initiate a rich but regulated Reformation?

The vast and sluggish Oriental Church must surely have a

destiny of blessing; but without a regeneration like that which renewed the West in the sixteenth century this future is impossible. Yet the hope of it is not an illusion. Last year Russia received or bought from the Bible Society Scriptures in whole or in part numbering half a million. This startling fact is an augury of blessing. What the Bible has done in Germany and England it can do in Russia. It can emancipate the soul, and pave the way for freedom and self-government; it can draw together classes long and widely estranged; it can teach rulers to be good, and subjects to render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, while rendering to God the things that are God's.

Whether Count Tolstoi is a leader in religion is uncertain. If he wishes for the title, let him have it. He is earnest, he is original, he is consistent with his doctrines in his own practice. Those doctrines have a strong tincture of some sort of Christianity. At any rate, no one who watches the movements of religion with a wide and sympathetic eye ought to disdain the noble enthusiast of the North. He at least repeats the proof that Russia is awaking. If she wakes only to a pietist Socialism, it may be better than what now is. But the hostility of the Czar and the rigours of the Synod may, alas! be too strong both for the Count and for the Stundists, and Russia may yet have to wait for a Luther or a Huss who shall break her bonds asunder.

The system of Count Tolstoi resembles that of the Socialists in some things; in others he is a Quaker; in others, again, a higher critic. Yet he ought to be heard with candour, because of his sincerity; and with respect, because he knows that of which he speaks.

The book before us is entitled "Christ's Christianity," and is in quite the modern vogue. It is an autobiography in two parts: the first part entitled "How I came to Believe"; the second, "What I Believe." Books of this kind have undoubtedly a place of their own. In some famous instances they are classics beyond price. Augustine's "Confessions" or Scott's 'Force of Truth," the "Confessions" of Rousseau or Newman's "Apologia," are books the loss of which would impoverish the world. But writers who write about themselves must always feel tempted to morbid disclosure or morbid reticence. Perhaps the Count has felt the force of each temptation in writing the story of his inner life. I would therefore inspect the record of his soul's wanderings with the delicate reverence of charity.

Tolstoi is of noble birth. He had great possessions. He was reared amid the luxury of Russia, sumptuous and semi-barbaric. He was bred a soldier, but, forsaking the sword for

the pen, he turned man of letters, journalist, or novelist in his early prime. At St. Petersburg he lived the life that owns no law; he describes it in words (p. 9) too terrible for isolated quotation. At length, weary of loose living and loose thinking, he withdrew to his estates, married, and applied himself to the duties of a rural magnate.

But he could find no satisfaction for his soul. The question haunted him, What was the meaning of life? Tormented by this inquiry, he travelled in search of the answer to various lands. He read French books, he studied modern science; all was alike in vain. Amid prosperity, domestic ease, and literary renown, he was miserable still. Even suicide seemed at one time a refuge to be desired.

At length in the teaching of Christ, as he conceived it, he found repose.

Such, in brief, is the story of Count Tolstoi as told by himself. It is a melancholy and not wholesome record. Many devour it with a morbid alacrity; the picture of unrest and endless disappointment entertains them. It is Solomon over again; it is Ecclesiastes in a Russian dress.

Others, we believe, really think that such a narrative as that of Tolstoi's is healthful reading. They study the strange psychology with a curious eye. Science is served by such disclosures, and humanity is enriched by fresh knowledge of itself.

But to me these pages present a spectacle of frailty, vacillation, and unrest, which edifies and pleases in the least possible degree. They forcibly recall the pertinent aphorism of Voltaire, that a man should not wash his dirty linen in public.

Without the first part of the book it was impossible to render the second part intelligible. The Count was impelled to publish a religious manifesto; the story of his life seemed both to justify and elucidate this manifesto, and accordingly the world has had his biography. The two are closely connected: like creature, like creed. From the man who had tried and had exhausted the resources of Russian culture, such a version of Christianity might naturally be expected. On the other hand, the creed furnishes a lucid and telling comment on the religion prevalent in Russia. The Count was baptized and confirmed into the Greek Church. His education was orthodox. He belonged to that social class which everywhere, from one motive or another, upholds the established Church. But the Christianity which Tolstoi saw dominant in Russia was a Christianity of pomp and legal proscription, tinged with idolatry, grossly superstitious, persecuting,[1] ex-

[1] P. 102.

clusive, and behind the times. From such a Church he has, not unnaturally, recoiled into the pale and meagre system explained and defended in the second part of his book.

Tolstoi's creed may be summed up in three articles: I believe that it is wrong to revenge myself; I believe that it is wrong to take an oath; I believe that it is wrong to lay up money.

No force, no adjuration, no capital. These positions he maintains and emphasizes with great earnestness, for he shows that violence, perjury, and avarice are the vices peculiarly favoured by the autocracy of Russia in Church and State.

No one can be surprised if this be so. Let us grant that the Count writes with the fervid exuberance distinctive of those who propound new notions in religion; still, we can readily believe that violence is a vice in a country where the profession of arms is enormously prominent; that perjury is common where transactions the most trivial are watched with suspicion by priests and magistrates; and that the inordinate love of money goes hand-in-hand with a state of things in which the mass of the people live habitually within sight of starvation.

A social and religious system like that of Russia bristles with points repugnant to the New Testament. Count Tolstoi has assaulted what on his testimony we may well believe are the worst of these blemishes. Against them he sets the Sermon on the Mount in its austere and splendid purity. Look on this picture and on that, says he in effect. Try by Christ's standard our practices sanctioned by Czars and blessed by patriarchs, and then say whether of the two is more like Christ's Christianity—the established order of all the Russias, or the little and poor community which follows the leading of Tolstoi.

Thus far it is easy to agree with him. However eccentric may be his views, however capricious and defective his interpretations of the New Testament, we may at least rejoice that he has the courage and ability to deliver a protest so needful and so direct.

None can impeach Tolstoi of insincerity or half-heartedness. He has forfeited much in obedience to his convictions; he may not improbably have to forfeit more. Many who know him personally testify to the simplicity and blamelessness of his life. He is poor, when he might have been rich; and without power, when he might have been distinguished and influential.

Yet those who render him the most willing homage must regret that the cause which he has espoused with such ardour

and self-denial is not more worthy to be called the cause of Christ. It lacks the vital reality of religion; its doctrine is indefinite;[1] its spirit is mainly ethical, its relations mainly social. It is dubious when it touches what is supernatural; it hesitates feebly about the history, the person, and the work of the Lord Jesus. It treats the New Testament with libertine criticism, and brings inspired Apostles to the bar of a modern mystic.

We regret all this for its own sake, and also because we feel sure that such a movement can never endure. It is only fleeting remonstrance, not an abiding protest. It gives nothing to the heart and soul. If it could succeed in displacing the ancient and massive system of Russian superstitions, it would not, as Evangelical Christianity did when it expelled from half Western Christendom the falsehood of a thousand years, fill up the void with new and living principles of faith and practice.

I am tempted to treat a little more in detail some few of Tolstoi's peculiar tenets.

There are many persons at the present day who profess themselves believers in the Sermon on the Mount. Those Socialists who retain from custom or connection some belief in religion generally applaud these three chapters of St. Matthew. Even the anti-Christian Socialists are fond of citing them: not to prove that Socialists ought to be Christians, but that Christians ought to be Socialists. Tolstoi is undoubtedly pious in his own way, and he insists that the teaching of Christ is to be found in the Sermon on the Mount.[2] With this we have no quarrel. We heartily believe that the Sermon on the Mount is truly and thoroughly the teaching of Christ—an integral and vital part of Christianity.

The late Archbishop Magee, I think, said on one occasion that to attempt to regulate society by the principles of the Sermon on the Mount was absurd. May I, with deference, dispute his Grace's dictum? What is absurd is this: to attempt to regulate society by parts of the Sermon on the Mount. That Sermon is something more than a mere code of ideal ethics. It is a revelation of grace and truth. In order to carry out its precepts, it supplies new motives and a Divine power. It not only teaches that men ought to be meek and forbearing, unworldly and perfect, but it also discloses the power which can make them so. To attempt to regulate society by its precepts without first bringing the individual members of society under the influence of this life and these motives is not only absurd; it is also profane. But to offer to

[1] Pp. 103, 105. [2] P. 104.

men the precepts coupled with the doctrine of the Sermon on the Mount, and to persuade them to recast the whole of life in agreement with the Divine model, so far from being absurd, is the purpose and the plan of the wisdom which cometh down from above.

Here, then, I submit my first objection against Tolstoi's version of Christianity. I adopt the Count's own standpoint; I take the Sermon on the Mount as he takes it, and I maintain that he deals unfairly with it.

Should these lines ever come under his eye, I respectfully invite him to consider how much there is in these three chapters beyond what he almost exclusively insists upon. Are not the Beatitudes deeper and wider in their scope than any social precept? Does not the "light of the world"[1] imply darkness, and the salt of the earth corruption? Is not prayer in its simplicity, secrecy, and patient assiduity, revealed here as the power with God?[2] Is not the Great Teacher something more than a teacher? Does He not call Himself the end and the subject of the law and the prophets?[3] Does He not solemnly anticipate the day when He will judge and reject men for unfaithfulness to Himself? Does He not claim lordship in the kingdom of heaven? And are not His words[4] the foundation on which the wise man, having built an eternal habitation, shall calmly defy the dissolution of all things?

Such is the self-portrait which the Sermon on the Mount contains of its wonderful Author. We cannot refuse Him and retain His teaching, yet this is what Tolstoi is in danger of doing. Fascinated by the moral beauty, simplicity, and salubrity of certain precepts, he relegates the weightier matters of the new law to the regions of theological obscurity. This is what I mean in saying that his treatment of the Sermon on the Mount is unfair.

My second objection must take the form of a protest against the ruthless fashion in which Tolstoi handles the Greek original. He has no scruple about altering a word or two according to taste. In a like vein he forces a meaning out of "the law and the prophets"[5] which it is certain the words cannot bear, and never have borne. A yet sadder feature in Tolstoi's religion is the almost fierce contemptuousness with which he handles the Old Testament.[6] In a word, the Count displays the form and features of the Rationalist. While he glows with ethical fervour, he has but slender belief in spiritual realities. While he admires Christ as a Teacher, he hesitates

---

[1] Matt. v. 14.
[2] Matt. vi. 6 *et seq.*
[3] Matt. v. 17; vii. 21-23.
[4] Matt. vii. 24, 25.
[5] P. 148.
[6] Pp. 146, 147.

to own Him as the Divine Saviour and Supreme Judge. If the text of Scripture obstructs his theory, he removes it; if the Old Testament displeases his taste, he rejects it with scorn.

My third and final criticism conducts me to a kindly parting from Count Tolstoi. Why is the Sermon on the Mount to be regarded as supremely, as almost exclusively, the teaching of Christ? It has no more authority than any other part of St. Matthew's Gospel. The great parables of chapter xiii., the great prophecy of chapters xxiv. and xxv., are just as much the teaching of Christ as is the Sermon on the Mount. They were penned by the same sacred author; they were spoken by the same august lips. Further, the Sermon on the Mount is not more the teaching of Christ than are the discourses in chapters xiv., xv., xvi. of St. John, or than the parable of the Prodigal Son, or than those innumerable and scattered words of Christ which shine in every page of the Evangelists.

To leave these out of account, and to fasten the eyes of the mind exclusively upon the wonderful exordium to Christ's teaching, is to do violence to the truth, injustice to history, and irreparable damage to the Christian religion. I know that it is the fashion in certain quarters to hail the Count as the prophet of the new era. I have attempted to show that, if he does inaugurate a new era at all, there are reasons to fear that it will not be marked by a development strongly and vitally Christian.

While wishing to recognise every element of good contained within his movement, I cannot fail to note with regret germs of a tendency which, if not corrected, must lead men's souls away from the grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ—a tendency which, from its intrinsic weakness and shallowness, can never satisfy the soul or yield the peaceable and imperishable fruits of righteousness. That this defect may be remedied should be our earnest desire, so that Count Tolstoi may not lose the fruits of his toil, his sorrow, and his noble sacrifices for Russia.

But it is time to draw to a close these reflections upon the Russian mystic, and to turn our thoughts from the vast and snowy tracts where the Czars hold sway to the land of the olive and the vine. In Italy another Count is endeavouring to bring about a spiritual revolution. His aims and his methods differ widely from those of his Russian contemporary. It will be the object of the second part of this paper to describe the life and work of Count Campello, and thus to complete a contrast picturesque in itself, and not without important and instructive lessons.

H. J. R. Marston.

ART. IV.—THE HISTORY OF OUR PRAYER-BOOK AS BEARING ON PRESENT CONTROVERSIES.

PART I.

THE history of the Book of Common Prayer is a subject which, in the present day, is urgently calling for a less superficial study than is commonly accorded to it.

It would be out of place here to attempt anything like a minute examination of the various corrections and emendations through which the book has passed in its various revisions.

But I believe the readers of the CHURCHMAN will welcome an attempt to set before them a fair and impartial view of the doctrinal character which has been impressed upon it, as seen in the light of its own history, and of the controversies through which it has had to make its way.

I must not be understood as pretending to have anything very new to say on the subject. Indeed, attention has already been directed to some of the matters which I desire now to bring into prominence. But there has been, as I am persuaded, so much of misunderstanding on the subject, that, as it seems to me, an effort may well be made to emphasize certain important lessons which certainly ought to be learnt by all who desire to know the mind of the Church of England on some of the burning questions of our own day.

It is of the first importance to take a true view of the two editions of the Prayer-Book, which are commonly known as the first and second Liturgies of King Edward VI. And present circumstances demand that our attention should be fastened on the service for the Holy Communion.

The comparative study of this service as contained in the two books of 1549 and 1552 is full of instruction. And in order to apprehend this instruction aright, there are four questions to be asked. And to these questions it will be my endeavour, very briefly, to give a clear and sufficient answer.

These questions are as follow :

1. In what relation did the first book of Edward stand to earlier service-books ?

2. What was the doctrinal position of Edward's first book, in relation to then existing controversies ?

3. In what relation did the second book of Edward stand to the first book ?

4. What was the doctrinal position of Edward's second book ?

In the present article it will be necessary to confine ourselves to the first two of these questions. To answer these aright is

the necessary preliminary to the profitable study of the two last questions.

For the present, then, we have to do only with the first Liturgy of King Edward VI., which, having been drawn up by a Commission which met at Windsor in May, 1548, and then, having been approved by Convocation, was ratified by Act of Parliament in the January following, and enjoined to be used from the feast of Whitsunday, 1549.

I. As regards the first question, it is important for us to observe that the Sarum Missal (like the present Roman Mass-Book) contained much which may be said to bear witness against the doctrine of transubstantiation, while it also enjoined practices involving the idolatry of the Mass-worship, and prayers which might be understood as suggesting the blasphemy of the Mass-sacrifice.

Its witness against error had been received by tradition from earlier and purer days. Its idolatries had been added in comparatively recent times. They resulted naturally from modern additions to the faith, which they naturally also tended to support and establish.

In the first year of Edward's reign an Act of Parliament had passed (with the unanimous approval of Convocation) requiring that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper should be delivered to the people, and under both kinds.

Following this, on March 8, 1548, was put forth, by proclamation, an "Order of the Communion," which not only restored the cup to the laity, but also made certain interpolations in the service which were to be spoken in the vulgar tongue. These were afterwards incorporated in the service-book of 1549. They included "the comfortable words," the idea of which had doubtless been suggested by the Liturgy of Archbishop Hermann of Cologne, with whom Cranmer had had correspondence, and of whose "Simple and Religious Consultation" an English translation had been published in 1547, and a second edition in 1548.

But these additions were to be made "without the varying of any other rite or ceremony in the Mass (until other order shall be provided)."[1]

This first step towards reformation was by no means an

[1] Yet the last rubric for *second* consecration directs "without any levation or lifting up."

It should be observed that the proclamation accompanying gives to this service the character of a first instalment only of further reformation to be expected. See Cardwell's "Liturgies," p. 426, and Gasquet, pp. 95, 96. A somewhat similar note of promise appears to have been inserted (perhaps as an afterthought) in the book of 1549. See P.S. edit., p. 97, and Preface, iv., v.; see also Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 234.

unimportant one. Yet it was but one step, and a step which was professedly to be followed by other steps. And the next step made a very much farther and bolder move in advance.

The changes effected in the first book of Edward VI. were very considerable indeed. It is right for us to view them not only from the point of view of our own further progress, but especially from the standpoint of those who were familiar only with the mediæval service of superstition.

It will then be seen clearly that the authorization of this book marks a most important epoch in the history of our Reformation.

The name of "the Mass," indeed, survived (though only as the term by which the Communion[1] was "commonly called"), but the idolatry of the Mass and the blasphemy of the Mass-sacrifice were not to be found. And how was their absence to be accounted for? Their absence was the absence of what had been conspicuously present. It was unmistakably the absence which came of determined and deliberate rejection. The design and purpose of the rejection was too obvious to be questioned. The object clearly and evidently was to lop off

[1] It would be a mistake to suppose that the first Prayer-Book necessarily meant to express an approval of the term *Mass*, or desired to perpetuate its use, any more than Article XXV. meant to set a seal of approval to the use of the language whereby those five rites are "*commonly called* sacraments," which "are not to be counted for sacraments of the Gospel." Compare Article XXXI., "vulgo dicebatur," "it was commonly said." It has been said: "The word 'communion' would hardly have been understood in mediæval England, and it does not occur before the sixteenth century. The phrase 'Lord's Supper' was equally strange. Latimer tells us that, when talking to a Bishop he 'chanced to name the Lord's Supper.' 'Tush!' said the Bishop; 'what do ye call the Lord's Supper? What *new term* is that?' ('Sermons,' p. 121). . . . The Lord's Supper had to be explained to the Romanized English folk of that day as being that which [had been travestied in, and] was 'commonly called' the Mass" (*English Churchman*, review of "Some Replies to Mr. Tomlinson's Pamphlet"; see also Gasquet, p. 199).

In Cranmer's "Book on the Lord's Supper," published in 1550, he declares the purpose to take away the Mass clearly out of Christian Churches as being manifest wickedness and idolatry (see ch. ix., P.S., p. 349; also ch. xii., pp. 350, 351). Yet of the fifth and last book it has been said that it "is really a defence of the Prayer-Book just set forth, with the praise of which he concludes" (Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 199).

It should be noted also that the word "Mass" is used only in the heading of the service: "The Supper of the Lord and the Holy Communion, *commonly called the Mass*." Elsewhere the word is avoided, as in the heading of the Collects, etc.: "The Introits, Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, to be used at the Celebration of the Lord's Supper and Holy Communion through the Year."

This seems to be good evidence that the first book had no intention of setting the seal of approval to the term by which the service had previously been "commonly called."

without sparing the "dangerous deceits" which had grown out of the doctrine of transubstantiation.

In the view of this obvious and conspicuous rejection of what had hitherto been so prominent a feature in the Mass, we are bound to pronounce the service in the first book of Edward to have been a very innovating service indeed. And its innovating character is only rendered more marked by the conservative principle which (as compared with the work of Continental Churches of the Reformation) marked the peculiar character of the English Reformation.

The effect of these striking innovations in the book of 1549 has hardly, perhaps, been estimated to the full. The Sarum service had become an eminently sacrificial rite, and elevation was ordered for the purpose of adoration. But in the new book the sacrificial character is made to give place to the prominent feature of communion, and all elevation and ostentation is distinctly forbidden. Even among Continental Protestants there were not wanting some who would have hesitated to counsel so sudden and sweeping a measure of reform.[1]

Yet—all this notwithstanding—it must be added that the first book took no distinct and decided stand as against more than the Romish doctrine of the mode of the Presence *sub speciebus*.

Therefore there remained yet somewhat that had a doubtful sound in the ears of those who were as the vanguard in the Reformation movement. Of this I shall have occasion to speak presently. For the present it must suffice to emphasize the point which I desire specially to have insisted on in answer to the first question, viz., that in the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI., as compared with earlier service books, this is the prominent feature to be noticed—that there is a root-and-branch rejection of the idolatry of transubstantiation, and of all the most salient points of the sacrifice of the Mass.

II. We proceed, then, to our second question, and we ask: What, then, was the doctrinal position of this book in relation to the then existing controversies? It is needless to insist on the fact that it was decidedly anti-Papal. Not, of course, that it was intended to be intolerant of the adherents of the old learning. It was a Liturgy designed for the use of a great national Church—the Church of a nation which, having been

[1] See "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 501, 502; see also Bucer's "Scripta Anglicana," p. 375, and Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 224. Luther did not regard elevation as a dangerous practice. It was prescribed in the Wittemberg order of 1533. And though Luther had given it up in 1539, it is said to have remained in use in Northern Germany (see Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 222).

recently held in the bonds of superstition, had to be educated in the new learning of a purer faith. But while it was thus intended to be, as far as possible, comprehensive and tolerant, it was unavoidable that its omissions should tell the tale of a decidedly Protestant influence, and so give it a character (as far as omissions and prohibitions could do) which was decidedly anti-Romish.

But it is not sufficient for our purpose to say that its character was anti-Papal. It is essential that our inquiry should go further than this. Protestants at this date were separating into two distinct camps, both decidedly anti-Papal. These were the Lutheran and the Reformed parties. And this separation, which had its accentuation on the Continent, made the echoes of its voices to be pretty clearly heard here in England. It is scarcely necessary to say that the main point of difference was on the question of the Real Presence in the Eucharist. The Lutherans stubbornly insisted on maintaining the doctrine which is commonly called consubstantiation, and which (so far as regards the Presence in the reception of the Sacrament) can scarcely be said to differ from the Romish doctrine; while the Reformed acknowledged only a Real Presence to the faith of the recipient—a Presence which (though in their view, and in the view even of eminent Romish divines, all that is needful or profitable for the purpose of communion) was consistently and persistently denounced by their opponents as only a Real Absence.

Now, we have to ask: In which of these camps did the new Prayer-Book take its place? To which of these separate parties did it belong?

It has, perhaps, been too commonly assumed to have been Lutheran. It would, as I am persuaded, be far more correct to say that it adhered to neither of these parties. But it would be a still better answer to say that it was the property of both, and did not speak distinctly the language of either.[1]

And here we have a position to maintain, which, because it will probably be assailed, we must be content to bestow some labour upon. It will doubtless by many be thought weak, and therefore we must endeavour to defend and fortify it.

It will be my aim, accordingly, to show that those portions of the book which might be most naturally regarded as evidencing a distinctively Lutheran (or decidedly anti-Reformed) character are capable all of being understood in a sense which might be accepted by the Reformed, and, indeed,

[1] See Hilles's letter to Bullinger (June, 1549) in "Original Letters," P.S. edit., p. 266, and Bucer's "Scripta Anglicana," p. 456; Basil, 1557.

were held to be defensible by those who rejected most strongly the (so-called) doctrine of consubstantiation.

(1) What some will probably regard as the most difficult statement to reconcile with Reformed doctrine, will be found in a rubric at the end of the Communion Service. This rubric declares: "Men must not think less to be received in part, than in the whole, but in each of them the whole body of our Saviour Jesus Christ."

This teaching, however, should be classed with other similar declarations in the same book which use the preposition "in" to denote the relation of the *res sacramenti* to the *sacramentum* in the reception of the Lord's Supper. Thus, in the exhortation to the communicants we have the words, "He hath left *in* those holy mysteries, as a pledge of His love, and a continual remembrance of the same, His own blessed body and precious blood, for us to feed upon spiritually, to our endless comfort and consolation."

Again, in the prayer after the administration we have the words: "We most heartily thank Thee, for that Thou hast vouchsafed to feed us *in* these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, and hast assured us (duly receiving the same) of Thy favour and goodness towards us."

But for those who know the place which was taken by Archbishop Cranmer in these liturgical revisions, the following extract will suffice to show that this language was not intended to convey of necessity anything like the distinctive doctrine of the Lutheran Churches: "I say (according to God's Word and the doctrine of the old writers), that Christ is present *in* His sacraments, as they teach also that He is present in His Word, when He worketh mightily by the same in the hearts of the hearers; by which manner of speech it is not meant that Christ is corporally present in the voice or sound of the speaker (which sound perisheth as soon as the words be spoken), but this speech meaneth that He worketh with His Word, using the voice of the speaker as His instrument to work by, as He useth also His sacraments, whereby He worketh, and therefore is said to be present in them"[1] ("On Lord's Supper," p. 11, P.S. edit.).

---

[1] See also Cranmer's explanation of the rubric in reply to Gardiner ("On Lord's Supper," p. 64, P.S. edit.), and his apology for the Catechism (of Lutheran origin), authorized by him (in English translation, with important changes; see Burton's Preface, pp. xiii, xv, xviii) in 1548 ("On Lord's Supper," pp. 227, 374, P.S. edit.).

It will be seen that Gardiner, who had, with the other Bishops generally, subscribed the book of 1549, or some book of "agreement on points" (see *Church Intelligencer*, October, 1891, p. 160), though strongly con-

Indeed, language of a far more decidedly Lutheran sound was on occasion defended and maintained by our Reformers as capable of being fairly understood in the sense of the Reformed. And divines of distinctly anti-Lutheran views did not hesitate to speak of the Body and Blood of Christ, as not only *received in*, but *being*, in a certain sense, *in* the outward and visible signs of them; not, of course, as being contained in them, nor, of course, as being in them viewed simply in themselves, but in them regarded as the ordinance of Christ for the purposes of the Sacrament.

(2) In the prayer of consecration is found language which to some may seem, perhaps, still less in accordance with the doctrine of the Reformed. Here we have the following petition: "Hear us (O merciful Father), we beseech Thee; and with Thy Holy Spirit and Word vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son, Jesus Christ," etc.

But the language which speaks of sanctifying the sacramental elements for their sacramental purposes was by no means regarded as inconsistent with the views of those who were called sacramentaries.[1] And there is good reason, as well as high authority, for regarding the addition of the words "to us" as making a very important modification in the meaning of expressions which speak of the elements as being the Body and Blood of Christ.[2] Thus modified, the words do

---

demning the prohibition of elevation and adoration, claimed four points in the book as having a Catholic sound, and inconsistent with the views of the Reformed.

These points were: (1) The consecration prayer, "wherein we require of God the creatures of bread and wine to be sanctified and to be to us the body and blood of Christ" (Cranmer, "On Lord's Supper," P.S. edit., p. 79). To which Cranmer answers, "We do not pray absolutely that the bread and wine may be made the body and blood of Christ, but that unto us in that holy mystery they may be so" (*ibid.*; see also pp. 83. 88). And (2) "that the Church of England teacheth at this day, in the distribution of the Holy Communion, in that it is there said the body and blood of Christ to be under the form of bread and wine" (*ibid.*, p. 51, referring, apparently, to the words of administration). To which Cranmer replies: "When you shall show the place where the form of words is expressed, then shall you purge yourself of that which in the meantime I take to be a plain untruth" (p. 53).

The other two points, (1) "To remember with prayer all estates of the Church, and to recommend them to God" (*ibid.*, p. 84); and (2) the "prayer of humble access" (after consecration), Cranmer passes by as needing no answer (*ibid.*, p. 229).

[1] See, *e.g.*, Westminster Confession, ch. xxix. 3.

[2] So Cranmer explains the meaning of these words as in the first Prayer-Book of Edward, in language which becomes almost the very language substituted for them in the second Prayer-Book ("On Lord's

not at all necessarily imply any change in the elements in themselves. They may quite fairly be understood as signifying no more than their being exhibitive or effectual signs for the conveyance of the *res sacramenti* to the souls of the faithful —in other words, their being to the faithful the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ.

(3) But another difficulty may be found in the words, "We Thy humble servants do celebrate, and make here before Thy Divine majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make." This is language, indeed, not unnaturally suggestive of a doctrine for which there is, we believe, no foundation in the inspired Word of God. Nevertheless, the words "these Thy holy gifts" do not, any more than "these Thy creatures of bread and wine," imply of necessity any presence on the Holy Table of the Body and Blood of Christ. It is not questioned that the sacrament was ordained for the continual remembrance of the Sacrifice of the death of Christ. And the memorial of that sacrifice may as well be made by the *ordained signs* of Christ's crucified Body and outpoured Blood, as by the very Body and Blood of the glorified Redeemer.[1] Such a memorial of a sacrifice in the

---

Supper," p. 79, P.S. edit.). Similarly, Herbert Thorndike ("Rel. Assembl.," p. 369; quoted by Waterland, "Works," vol. iv., p. 689, note), and Archbishop Laud (see Bulley's "Variations," p. 184), and Waterland ("Works," vol. iv., p. 695), and Bishop Field ("Parasceve Paschæ," p. 114, 1624), and Hooker ("Works," vol. ii., p. 362, edit. Keble), and Archbishop Wake (Gibson's "Preservative," vol. x., p. 56), and Bishop Patrick ("Christian Sacrifice," pp. 56-59, 1690).

The Bishop of Chichester (Day), who refused to sign the book, or to agree to the "book of their agreement," gave three reasons for his refusal: (1) The omission of chrism in confirmation; (2) instead of "that it may be unto us," etc., he would have "be made unto us," etc.; and (3) after the consecration he would have added, "that these sacrifices and oblations," etc. (see Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 164).

[1] In the visitation of the Universities following on the Commission of May, 1549, Ridley arranged for a great public disputation, in which the second conclusion to be maintained was this, "that in the Lord's Supper there is no other oblation than a giving of thanks and a commemoration of our Lord's death" (Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 247). And this in support of the Book of 1549. As early, probably, as January, 1548 (see Gasquet, "Edward VI.," p. 85), Cranmer had come to the conclusion that the "oblation and sacrifice" of Christ in the Mass are terms improperly used, and that it is only a "memory and representation" of the sacrifice of the Cross (see Gasquet, p. 86).

Moreover, it appears from the "Administration Book" in the probate registry of Norwich (1549-55) that during the vacancy of the See of Norwich most part of all altars in the diocese had been taken down by the commandment of Cranmer, and this must have been some time in the first twelve months during which the first Prayer-Book was in use (see *Church Intelligencer*, September, 1891, p. 137, and Cranmer's "Works," P.S. "Remains," p. 154, note).

Lord's Supper may readily be conceded by those who are most faithfully opposed to the blasphemous doctrine of a real sacrificial offering in the Eucharist, and of the Real Objective Presence which underlies it. And the language of this prayer —objectionable as it may be thought to be—ought in fairness to be interpreted by the fact that the language which spoke of the *hostia* in this sacrament had—evidently of set purpose—been eliminated from this service-book.[1] Thus interpreted, it may certainly be said that this prayer does not convey—does not even naturally suggest—the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist. It would be easy to fortify our position, if need be, with additional evidence. But, perhaps, what has been alleged may suffice to make good our contention. We are fully satisfied that our second question can only fairly be answered by saying that as regards the doctrinal position of Edward's first book, while it admitted somewhat of a Lutheran sound, a sound which would be agreeable to Lutheran ears, it did not teach distinctly any[2] strictly Lutheran doctrine. Its tendency was very distinctly anti-Papal. It was not at all distinctly anti-Lutheran, but it was also not distinctly anti-Reformed.[3] It was comprehensive (as far as possible) of the

[1] And by the words, "Christ our Paschal Lamb is offered up for us once for all when He bare our sins in His Body upon the Cross."

M. Gasquet supposes that the word "oblation" was in the first draft of the book, but had disappeared before it came up to the Lords ("Edward VI.," p. 196). Accordingly he considers the book had been *tampered with* after the Bishops had signed it (p. 179). And this view is endorsed by the review in the *Guardian* of December 17, 1890. This charge rests entirely on the report of the speech of Thirlby, Bishop of Westminster, whose words are set down: "Also there was in the book 'oblation,' which is left out now" (p. 405). Gasquet understands this to signify "that when the book was agreed to by the Bishops the word 'oblation' was in it, which is now left out." But that the word was ever in the revised book is extremely unlikely. Not only would it have been altogether out of accord with "Cranmer's known opinions" as represented by M. Gasquet himself (p. 196), but if such a *tampering* had taken place we should almost certainly have heard more about it; whereas the words of Thirlby are only paralleled with other expressions, which point to a change, not from an earlier draft of the revised book, but from the book of the old use. This mistake has been clearly and ably pointed out by the reviewer in the *Church Intelligencer* of January, 1891, p. 12. See also especially p. 159, October, 1891.

[2] Thirlby consistently said in the debate of 1548: "It is a duty to set forth God's truth in plain terms. The want of this plainness in the present case caused him in his conscience not to agree to the doctrine" of the book (see Gasquet, pp. 165, 406). On the other hand, Gardiner, who, desiring to show Cranmer inconsistent, made the most of its ambiguities, could speak of the book as "not distant from the Catholic faith in my judgment" (Cranmer, "On Lord's Supper," pp. 62 and 92, P.S.; see Gasquet, p. 284).

[3] Cranmer himself had at this date embraced the doctrine of the Reformed (see "Original Letters," P.S., p. 323).

views of both Lutherans and sacramentaries. There were passages not a few which might doubtless be pleasing to Lutheran hearers, and displeasing, in the sense which they *might* naturally convey, to the ears of those who were strongly opposed to anything like the doctrine of a Corporal Presence.[1]

And Bishop Tunstall, in the House of Lords (December 14, 1548), pointed out that "the adoration was left out of the book" because those who had compiled it believed that "there is nothing in the Sacrament but bread and wine" (see Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 161).

There can be little doubt that the book of 1549 was really an *interim* provision with a view to a further reformation (see "Original Letters," P.S., vol. ii., pp. 535, 536, and "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," No. 7, pp. 514, 515, and Gasquet's "Edward VI.," pp. 95, 234, 235, 259). So the Irish Prayer-Book of 1551 was a reprint of the English book of 1549, which Mr. Walton regards as a "remarkable illustration" of the "doctrinal insincerity" of those in authority ("Rubrical Determination," p. 52). This, however, is assuming a doctrinal position for the book of 1549 which we are persuaded is a mistaken one.

There was much need for caution, and great dread (with great cause) of the consequences of "sudden mutation." See Latimer's "Sermon of the Plough" ("Sermons," P.S., p. 76) and Gasquet's "Edward VI.," pp. 251 *et seq.* Bucer, in 1551, wrote to the King: "Your sacred Majesty has already found by experience how grave are the evils which ensued on taking away by force false worship from your people without sufficient preliminary instruction" ("De Regno Christi," lib. ii., cap. v.). See Gasquet, p. 300.

[1] It is true that the Lutheran doctrine of the Presence can consistently claim, if true, to be regarded as an article of the faith. And therefore the first Prayer-Book, in admitting Lutheranism, was admitting that which might make a claim, if admitted at all, to be admitted alone. But it does not follow that the first book, in admitting a sound of Lutheran doctrine, was admitting this claim, however consistent. It might say—and we believe that in effect it did say—to the doctrine of a Corporal Presence, "Room is not altogether denied to you here; only you must be content to take the place of a tolerated opinion beside another tolerated (and more favoured) opinion which is your contradictory." No doubt this was like offering to it a place as to live in, in which its life must be enfeebled as unto death. But the Reformers would doubtless have preferred that, without doing violence to it too violently, it might die a natural death. There was policy, therefore, in the *mixed* character of the first book, regarded as an *interim* measure. But it must be obvious that such a book had not the elements of endurance, regarded as a permanent provision for the worship of the English Church. It must have been evident that it could never give satisfaction to any party. And, as a matter of fact, we know what dissatisfaction it gave both to the Reformed and to the anti-Reformed.

Thus Hooper speaks of the book as "very defective and of *doubtful* construction, and in some respects, indeed, manifestly impious ("Original Letters," P.S., p. 79). And Dryander writes of it: "You will find something to blame in the matter of the Lord's Supper, for the book speaks very obscurely, and however you may try to explain it with candour, you cannot avoid great absurdity. The reason is, the Bishops could not for a long time agree among themselves respecting this article" (*ibid.* pp. 350, 351. See Gasquet, "Edward VI.," pp. 232, 333).

Early in 1548 John at Ulmis wrote to Bullinger: "Peter Martyr has

But there was in it absolutely nothing that need either have shocked the views of the Lutheran or (as regards any doctrine distinctly taught) have been a necessary cause of offence to the Reformed.

And the importance of this will be seen, I believe, when we proceed to examine the second book of Edward VI.

N. DIMOCK.

---

maintained the cause of the Eucharist and Holy Supper of the Lord; namely, that it is a remembrance of Christ and a solemn setting forth of His death, and not a sacrifice. Meanwhile, however, he speaks with caution and prudence—if, indeed, it can be called such—with respect to the real presence, so as not to seem to incline either to your opinion or to that of Luther" ("Original Letters," P.S., pp. 377, 378. See Gasquet, p. 103). These words may be said, we believe, exactly to express the doctrinal position which the first book was intended to occupy.

That the first Prayer-Book was not intended to teach any distinctly Lutheran doctrine is certain from Cranmer's vindication of the language which made the nearest approach to Lutheran sound in his work on the Lord's Supper, which was written from a distinctly Reformed standpoint. And that Cranmer was already standing on the same doctrinal standpoint before the authorization of the first Prayer-Book is now abundantly evident from the "Notes touching the Disputation of the Bishops," which has been published by M. Gasquet. See especially Gasquet's "Edward VI.," pp. 434, 440, 441.

And though he had been "in the error of the Real Presence" not long before (see "On Lord's Supper," P.S., p. 374), it may be inferred that his views had changed before the publication of his translated German Catechism, from the evident design of his changes to de-Lutheranize its teaching (see Gasquet, "Edward VI.," pp. 130, 131).

Richard Hills, a man very well informed in such matters, wrote from London on June 1, 1549: "We have an uniform celebration of the Eucharist throughout the whole kingdom, but after the manner of the Nuremberg Churches and some of those in Saxony" ("Original Letters," P.S., p. 266). Evidence of the influence of the Lutheran pattern on the book of 1549 will be found in Gasquet's "Edward VI.," ch. xiii.; see especially pp. 228, 229. But abundant evidence that the book was not intended to teach distinctly Lutheran doctrine will be found also in pp. 229-235. It is clear that at this date Cranmer had adopted the views of the Reformed. And Gasquet quite rightly speaks (p. 233) of "the care taken to employ turns of expression which should not clash with his new views."

Latimer found "no great diversity" in the Communion offices of the first and second Books of Common Prayer ("Remains," P.S., p. 262), which is explained by the fact that he regarded their transubstantiation, and oblation, and adoration as "the very sinews and marrow-bones of the Mass" (Ridley's Works, P.S., p. 112), and these were not found in the first book (see Gasquet, "Edward VI.," p. 276). But it should be noted that Latimer added "I do not well remember wherein they [the two books] differ" ("Remains," p. 262).

ART. V.—THE POSITION OF THE UNBENEFICED CLERGY.

THE recent danger of Disestablishment, which has happily passed away for the present, has not been without beneficial effect upon the Church which it threatened. It has acted as a tonic upon public opinion, and as a stimulus also to the more lethargic official mind. It is now fully recognised that some measures must be taken to amend certain abuses, and so to strengthen the position of the Church. Abuses have grown up imperceptibly; and, inasmuch as vested interests have grown up side by side with the abuses, it is exceedingly difficult to set the machinery of reform in motion.

Not the least important of the present defects in our ecclesiastical system is the very unsatisfactory position of the unbeneficed clergy. This is a question which sooner or later the Church will certainly have to face; and the sooner the question is thoroughly taken in hand, the easier it will be to make a satisfactory settlement.

The system of employing assistant curates has developed in a haphazard kind of way. It was adopted without deliberation, almost unconsciously, and no provision was ever made for the vast development which it has reached at the present day. The number of unbeneficed clergy is now larger than the number of those who hold livings, and the difference tends to increase. In the London diocese, an examination of the Bishops' visitation registers shows that about two hundred and fifty years ago—in 1666—only 12 per cent. of the clergy were unbeneficed. A century later—in 1745—the proportion had grown to a little under 45 per cent. In another century—in 1846—it was just over 60 per cent. During the last fifty years the number has swelled to 200 per cent. The London diocese is an extreme example, but the tendency is the same throughout the Church.

Briefly stated, the position of the unbeneficed clergyman is this:—Like his beneficed brother, he is frequently underpaid, and the poorer the parish the more laborious is the work, and the more difficult it is for the incumbent to raise a sufficient salary for the curate. Again, he is not the master, and his energy is crippled through lack of opportunity for initiative. This, in the case of older men, though unavoidable, amounts to a hardship. Further he is liable to dismissal, through misunderstanding, or even through the caprice of the incumbent, and sometimes through lack of means to maintain him in the parish. Thus he comes to be regarded by the parishioners as a bird of passage, here to-day and gone to-morrow, and suffers accordingly in prestige; neither is it possible for him to take

the same interest in the flock as a permanent pastor. Worst of all, as he grows older his lot becomes harder, because he finds it increasingly difficult, whenever a separation is deemed advisable, to obtain another curacy, younger men naturally being preferred to fill subordinate positions.

Various suggestions have been put forward to remedy this state of affairs. But most of them, especially those advocated by the recently-formed Curates' Union, savour too much of trades-unionism methods, and have been repudiated by the large majority of curates themselves. The curates, in fact, are very rightly suspicious of propositions which seem to degrade the office of the ministry to a mere means of livelihood.

It has been proposed, for example, that when there is stagnation in promotion, the Bishops should refuse to ordain more than a limited number of men, and thus, in the language of trade, "restrict output." To pursue such a course would obviously be detrimental to the true interests of the Church, and would tend to make the Christian ministry a close corporation.

It has also been suggested that the same end might be attained by making the examinations harder, and so raise the standard of qualification for ordination.

Although this latter proposal may be open to somewhat the same objection as the other, there is much more to be said in its favour, more especially if the Bishops could see their way to put life into the diaconate, and to make it a reality by the creation of a permanent lay diaconate, raising the standard of qualification for the priesthood only. The other proposal for the compulsory retirement of incumbents at a certain specified age, merely to stimulate the flow of promotion, is also open to certain obviously serious objections. It would rob the Church of her ripest fruit.

What is really required is some remedy which shall not be at the expense of the efficiency of the Church as a whole, and which shall not be in the interests of those inside the clerical profession at the expense of those who are seeking admission. Is it possible to find such a remedy? There are at least three ways which suggest themselves as satisfying these conditions:

1. The redistribution of present endowments.
2. Instead of specifying an age at which a man should retire from a living, to specify an age before which he may not enter upon one.
3. To raise a large new endowment fund.

1. The first of these, namely, the redistribution of the endowments already in possession of the various parochial and capitular bodies of which the Church is composed, is the one

which comes most readily to hand. And it is one which has very frequently been put forward as a means of augmenting the incomes of the smaller livings. For this reason it has been mentioned here. It may, however, be dismissed at once from further consideration, as scarcely coming within the range of practical politics. It is also, from other considerations, which it would be superfluous to enter into here, of doubtful desirability.

The other two are much more feasible.

2. In order that all may have a better chance of holding a living, it might be made not permissible for anyone to enter upon a benefice under the age of, say, thirty-five, and also after having been at least ten years in the service of the Church. This would reduce to some extent the competition for benefices, and improve the prospects of the older unbeneficed clergy, whilst it would be no real hardship to the younger ones. It could also be productive of nothing but good to the Church at large. A young man of promise who might be quite capable of undertaking the cure of souls at the age of twenty-nine would be all the better fitted with six years' more experience at his back, at the age of thirty-five. It would also by its operation abolish one of the greatest scandals complained of at the present time, namely, the appointment to parishes of young and inexperienced men. This arrangement would involve no additional expenditure, and would go a long way towards mitigating the evil. It would not, however, of itself be sufficient to effect a radical cure.

3. The third suggestion would require large financial aid from the members of the Church, but there is no reason why such aid should not be forthcoming. Were the matter fairly brought before the laity, with proper safeguards that the money should not be wasted, there is every probability that a free response would be made to this appeal.

There is at the present time a movement on foot for raising an enormous capital sum as a common endowment for increasing the incomes of small livings to a minimum of £250 to £300 per annum, or of attaining the same end by a scheme of annual subscription similar to the Sustentation Fund of the Free Church of Scotland. In a letter to the *Times* a correspondent pointed out that the great difficulty in the way of this is the fear in the public mind that the money would only go to increase the market value of advowsons. But the same correspondent considers, as is most probably the case, that many patrons of small livings would be willing to forego their patronal rights on condition that the stipend of the living were augmented.

But in any case no scheme of endowment which does not

also include the unbeneficed clergy would be adequate for the present needs of the Church. It is unreasonable that a clergyman who has been fortunate enough to obtain a benefice should have his stipend raised to a sum sufficient to enable him to live in decency and comfort, while an equally competent *un*beneficed clergyman should be left to starve on a pittance. There are, in fact, fewer impediments in the way of raising the stipends of curates all round than of beneficed clergy. The difficulty with reference to patronage, for instance, would not come in.

On the other hand, it cannot be contended that the lowest figure proper for a curate's stipend is sufficient for a beneficed clergyman. An incumbent must always have claims on his purse and pecuniary responsibilities from which the assistant clergy are exempt. If £250 to £300 per annum be the ideal minimum for a benefice, £200 to £250 would be the ideal minimum stipend for a competent assistant curate *of a certain standing*, say of twenty to twenty-five years' standing in the Church.

The following scale of remuneration is set down tentatively by way of illustration, but no special merit is claimed for the particular ages selected :

From	23	years of age	to	28, salary as now, by arrangement.
,,	28	,,	,,	35, not less than £150 per annum.
,,	35	,,	,,	45, not less than £200 per annum.
,,	45	,,	,,	and upwards, not less than £250.

The question of pensions is a separate one. Undoubtedly the scale of pensions should be fixed upon the basis of self-help, prudence, and forethought on the part of the recipient in his younger days.

Such a schedule as the above would have to be made more flexible to adapt it to all circumstances. For instance, a salary of £120 in a Lincolnshire rural parish would be quite equivalent to one of £150 in the West End of London.

The establishment of any great central fund for increasing the stipends of curates would involve a great deal of adjustment with societies such as the Church Pastoral Aid and the Additional Curates Society. It certainly ought not to supersede them. To propose a scheme of adjustment would be beyond the scope of this paper, and it would be premature as well. There should, however, be no insurmountable difficulty. It might be best to have separate diocesan funds instead of one large central fund. Again, it seems most likely that money for the maintenance of the assistant clergy would be more freely given if the laity of each congregation, through their representatives, had some say in the selection of curates. But this also is a question by itself.

With regard to the curate's greatest anxiety, the insecurity of his position in the parish, the difficulty is much greater, and the utmost caution is needful. It may be conceded at once that a curate's position cannot possibly be made so secure as that of the incumbent. "Can two walk together, except they be agreed?" and in case of a serious difference arising it is the unbeneficed one who *must* leave.

Yet it is surely possible to go much further in the direction of security of tenure for a curate than is the custom now. The Bishop's license should be made a reality, and it should be made a very serious and difficult matter for a curate to leave his parish for any reason but that of preferment. It ought to be made quite impossible even to suspect that a curate was obliged to leave because his Vicar was jealous of his powers; and a curate ought not to be allowed to change his sphere of work for trumpery or insufficient reasons.

Were such a rule in vogue, the work thrown on the Bishop's shoulders would no doubt be increased. But if so, the work of investigation might very well be delegated by him to the Rural Deans, or to others nominated by him, who should act in his name, and with his authority.

Lastly comes the question, How is all this to be brought about? Raising the necessary money is, perhaps, the least difficult part. Without resort to Parliament every proposed measure of Church Reform is strangled in infancy by the unsatisfactory state of ecclesiastical law. The Church herself is tied hand and foot by statute and by ancient custom. The force of public opinion must be brought to bear upon the subject. Were that once aroused, *and wisely guided during the process*, technical difficulties would soon be brushed aside.

The present period of freedom from external attack is the time for Church Reform of every kind. A certain measure of well-considered reform would give increased confidence to the laity, and would inevitably secure a generous response to any appeal, even on a large scale, for the more adequate (may we not say the more decent?) remuneration of deserving clergymen.

W. M. FARQUHAR.

BASIS OF AN EIRENICON.

1. IT is admitted by old-fashioned Protestant High Churchmen that the English Church, in its Homily for Whit-Sunday, warrants the use of the term "regeneration"—"spritual

regeneration"—in a sense in which it is not invariably conferred by baptism upon all baptized infants.[1]

It is admitted by Evangelicals that, "in some sense or other,"[2] it may be predicated of all the baptized "that regeneration does actually take place in baptism."

It is admitted by High Churchmen that those baptized persons who lead ungodly lives have "fallen from grace,"[3] and cease to be the children of God,[4] and need to be urged to conversion.[5]

It is admitted by Evangelicals that in the sacrament of Christian baptism, persons are *nominally* and *conditionally*—outwardly and sacramentally—"made" members of Christ, the children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven, and heirs of everlasting salvation; and that by a repentant and believing ratification of the baptismal covenant they become so truly and actually;[6] and may thank God for calling

---

[1] See the late Rev. Professor J. B. Mozley's "Review of the Baptismal Controversy" (published by Rivingtons). Also Archdeacon Paley's sermon "On the Doctrine of Conversion," No. 7 in his Works.

[2] Viz., sacramentally or ecclesiastically. See the late Rev. E. Bickersteth's "Companion to the Baptismal Font," and "Defence of the Baptismal Service," in 1850, which is practically identical with the view set forth in the "Discourse concerning Baptismal and Spiritual Regeneration," by Bishop S. Bradford, of Carlisle, and of Rochester, in 1718, 1723, 1731, No. 93 on the list of the S.P.C.K., of which he was one of the fonnders. "A question may properly be raised as to the sense in which the term 'regeneration' was used in the early Church, and by our own Reformers; but that regeneration does actually take place in baptism is most undoubtedly the doctrine of the English Church; and .... in some sense or other, baptism is indeed 'the laver of regeneration'" (Bishop Blomfield's London Charge of 1842).

[3] See Gal. v. 4, and the sixteenth of the Thirty-nine Articles.

[4] "Whilst we continue in the commission of any known sin, we have renounced the grace and privileges of our baptism; in other words, that we are no longer 'children of God,' that we are out of a state of filial favour and acceptance," etc. (Bishop Jebb's "Pastoral Instructions," vi., pp. 112, 119).

[5] "If, as is the case with such a lamentably large proportion of those baptized in infancy, he grow up unholy and impenitent, he will have to be converted," etc. (Rev. M. F. Sadler's "Sacrament of Responsibility," pp. 9, 10).

[6] See the "Exposition of the Church Catechism," by Dr. John Mayer, published by royal command in 1623, 1630, and 1635; and the "Exposition of the Church Catechism," by Bishop Nicholson, of Gloucester (in 1660-1672), one of the Convocational Committee for revising the Prayer-Book, in 1661, as quoted in Dean Goode's "Effects of Infant Baptism," chap. x., pp. 431-435, and chap. xii. pp. 445-446. See also John xv. 2, 6, with Heb. iii. 14. And Deut. xiv. 1, 2, and Rom. ix. 4, with Acts xvii. 28, 29. And Matt. xiii. 33-51, with viii. 12, and xxi. 42. And Mark xvi. 16, with 1 Pet. iii. 21. Also Rom. vi. 3, 4; Gal. iii. 26, 27; Rom. viii. 7; and James ii. 5. "A *true Christian* man . . . who is the *very* member of Christ, the temple of the Holy Ghost, the son of God, and the *very* inheritor of the everlasting kingdom of heaven," etc. ("Church

them "to" that "state of salvation" or safety, and pray to Him to give them His grace, that they may continue in the same unto their lives' end.

It is admitted by High Churchmen that the wicked baptized are not "lively members" of Christ, nor obedient children of God, nor actually on the way to everlasting salvation.

2. It is admitted by High Churchmen[1] that the English Church disclaims the doctrine of the real presence of "Christ's body and blood" within "the consecrated bread and wine," and that (in the words of the judicious Hooker) "the real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not therefore to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament."[2]

It is admitted by Evangelicals that the English Church allows a considerable latitude of opinion as to the precise nature of Christ's presence at and in a devout reception of the Lord's Supper, and as to the actual benefits to be derived from a devout reception of it by the "faithful,"—that is, by those whose souls after death are described in the burial-service as being in joy and felicity."[3]

3. It is admitted by High Churchmen that the English Church repudiates the doctrine of any judicial power to forgive sins as against God being vested in its priests.[4]

It is admitted by Evangelicals that there is vested in the Church's priests or presbyters a power to declare to repentant believers forgiveness of sins as offences against God, and to

---

Homily against the Fear of Death," Part i., p. 83). "For death cannot deprive them of Jesu Christ, nor any sin condemn them that are *grafted surely in Him*," etc. (*Ibid.*, Part ii., p. 85). "Thou canst be no member of Christ, if thou follow not the steps of Christ," etc. ("Church Homily against Contention," Part ii., p. 130). "They declare by their outward deeds and life . . . that they are the *undoubted* children of God appointed to everlasting life . . . that they are the sons of God, and elect of Him unto salvation" ("Church Homily of Alms Deeds," Part ii., pp. 347, 348). "Faith, that it maketh us to please God, to live with God, and to be the children of God," etc. "If we return again unto Him by true repentance, that He . . . *will* make us inheritors with Him of His everlasting kingdom," etc. ("Church Homily of Faith," Part i., pp. 30, 31). "Are *very* members incorporate in the mystical body of Thy Son, which is the blessed company of all *faithful* people; and are also heirs through hope of Thy everlasting kingdom," etc. (Communion Service). "And be made *lively* members of the same." "Being made the children of God and of the light, *by faith in Jesus Christ*," etc. (Adult Baptismal Service).

[1] See Dr. Waterland's "Treatise on the Lord's Supper," and Bishop Mant.

[2] Hooker's "Ecclesiastical Polity," Book v., chap. lxvii., sec. 6.

[3] Church Catechism and Burial Service.

[4] See Wheatly on the Common Prayer; and Bishop Mant's Prayer-Book, pp. 11, 358, 477; and his "Romanism and Holy Scripture Compared," pp. 76-78; and "Churches of Rome and England Compared," pp. 31-39 (on the S.P.C.K. list).

exercise outward discipline in respect of open and notorious sins as offences in the eye of the Church.

4. It is admitted by High Churchmen that a servile obedience to the arbitrary exercise of episcopal authority and power is not required by the English Church.

It is admitted by Evangelicals that a respectful submission to episcopal authority is the duty of clergymen of the English Church. C. H. D.

Short Notices.

The God-Man (being the "Davies Lecture" for 1895). By Principal T. C. Edwards, D.D. London : Hodder and Stoughton.

WE have read this little book with mingled interest and irritation—interest, because of the deep and wide-reaching significance of the subject under consideration; irritation, because the author rarely, if ever, gets a firm hold of the matter he is endeavouring to handle, and because he has too often failed to make his meaning clear and lucid. The result of this serious defect in the book is that a study of its pages often causes an intellectual weariness, without the compensating gain which the struggle to master a difficult writer (*e.g.*, Hegel) involves. Not but what there are single passages of great interest, and full of helpful suggestions, but the book as a whole does not hang together; and the result is a general want of coherence throughout its pages. Much of it, especially the first chapter, reads rather like lecture-notes massed together, than a carefully-welded argument. It is only fair to add that these faults become less frequent as the work advances.

Dr. Edwards appears to us to have a certain hankering for vainly speculative opinions—a tendency which crops up several times in the course of his book. We quite fail to appreciate what good can accrue to anyone from discussions as to the "Ethical Condition of the Logos in the Trinity," "The Metaphysical Omnipotence of the Son of God," "The Son's Subordination to the Father within the Sphere of the Trinity," and such-like matters. The further we try to penetrate the impenetrable darkness which surrounds such stupendous themes, the blacker grows the obscurity, till at length

"We find no end, in wandering mazes lost."

It is too late in the day to reperpetrate the ancient errors of the Schoolmen. A confession of ignorance on such subjects is the truest wisdom.

Dr. Edwards' work consists of three lectures: (i.) The Incarnation and the Trinity; (ii.) The Incarnation and Human Nature; (iii.) The Incarnation and the Unity of Christ's Person. These are followed by a full and admirably-arranged index. Footnotes accompany each lecture—indeed, the book fairly bristles with them; they display an astonishing familiarity with patristic literature and a ripe acquaintance with the works of modern expositors. A leading idea of the book seems to be that Christ ("the ideal Man, eternally in God, as Archetype of humanity") must have become man, even if sin had never entered the world. This is the reverse of Aquinas' view, which was, "Si homo non peccavisset, Deus incarnatus non fuisset." In another place Dr. Edwards

asserts that "Christ must necessarily be God-man to all eternity, not to redeem His people, but to reveal God." Again, on p. 104, he says: "Jesus Christ is the Logos of God; and, at the same time, because He has emptied Himself of the form of God, and assumed instead of it the form of a servant, the Divine perfection and greatness, which have now become His own ideal, are to be won by Him as the reward of human efforts and suffering." This is not too clearly expressed; but (if we understand it aright) it is assuredly not true to add that this doctrine is the addition made by the Epistle to the Hebrews to the theology of the Incarnation. Dr. Edwards' own position is fairly summed up on p. 140, where he states that "the essential greatness of Christ is moral, and the incarnation is first of all a manifestation of infinite love, within the limits of human action. Hence, the evidences of Christianity will no longer consist in the 'miracles which He did,' but in Himself as He is manifested in His humanity. As His Divine life on earth did not transcend the human or become monstrous, His influence on others must be ethical. He will be God-man, if He is infinite love." All this is doubtful, to say the least; and we certainly demur to the use of the word 'monstrous'; we have read the New Testament to little purpose if we do not discover throughout its teachings insistence on the fact that Christ's life upon earth *did* transcend the human. "Never man spake as this man."

Dr. Edwards maintains that we are bound to accept the *kenôsis*, which does not imply—so he thinks—that the Incarnation was itself a humiliation. The Son of God, according to this view, while divesting Himself of His "metaphysical omnipotence," still retained a "moral omnipotence." Dr. Edwards does not, however, consider the profound consequences arising from a partial or complete acceptance of this form of the "kenotic theory," as he calls it. As a set-off against the *kenôsis*, he postulates an *anapleosis* of Christ, relying for proof on the passage in Ephesians (v. 9-13). This may, or may not, be true; but it requires a far fuller exposition than is given it in the pages of the present work.

What we have said will show that, while decidedly worth perusal, Dr. Edwards' work is, in our opinion, too slight of texture and too inconsequent in argument to bear the weight of his contentions. Moreover, many of his suppositions cannot either be proved or disproved; they lie wholly beyond the range of human thought. There are mysteries which the very angels may not look into or fathom—how much less man!

E. H. BLAKENEY.

Notes on the Scripture Lessons for 1896. Sunday-School Union.

This volume, while bearing evidence of careful thought and arrangement, suffers, we think, from a certain want of clearness of outline in the lessons themselves. It will be, however, a useful reference-book for teachers. The illustrations and local notes are admirable.

The Commandment with Promise. By the Hon. GERTRUDE BOSCAWEN. London: Elliot Stock.

We should recommend this book as suitable for village libraries, or as a Sunday-School prize. Its moral is, perhaps, a trifle too much enforced, but the story is healthy and pleasant.

Home-making; or, the Ideal Family Life. By J. R. MILLER, D.D. London: Sunday-School Union.

A writer so widely known and appreciated as Dr. Miller scarcely needs our commendation of the volume now before us. Many authors have dealt with the subject of home-life, but few, we venture to think, in a manner at once so practical and so spiritual as Dr. Miller. The first

three chapters especially are full of valuable teaching for husbands and wives; and we should like to see this book wherever "a new household finds its birth."

Spiral Stairs. By the Rev. J. H. TOWNSEND, D.D. With an Introduction by the Rev. H. C. G. MOULE, D.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

A book which has the good fortune to be introduced to our notice by Principal Moule is almost sure of a welcome. It will assuredly prove true in the case of the present volume, which—despite its somewhat ugly title—is well worthy our attention; for it illustrates, in a happy and helpful way, "the solid value of the seasons of the sacred year to the thoughtful Churchman's mind." We are led, in its pages, "to the contemplation of Christ as seen in the Church's year, and, as a consequence, the attributes of Christ exhibited in His people." The attractive exterior of the book is more than justified by the attractiveness of its contents. May it have a wide circulation!

Whether of the Twain? By the Rev. W. J. W. WORDEN. Liverpool: Thompson and Co.

This little book is meant to be read as a solemn protest against inconsistency among professing Christians; and surely such a protest can never be ill-timed. Unpretending in design and modest in scope this work may be, but it is assuredly worth considering, and we think it will prove of lasting use to those into whose hands it happens to fall.

Poems. By L. H. VICTORY. London: Elliot Stock.

There are one or two pretty enough things in this collection.

Romance of Rahere, and other Poems. By EDWARD HARDINGHAM. Elliot Stock.

We have looked at the "other poems," but have not had the time nor the inclination to read through the "Romance of Rahere," which is, indeed, a considerable work. The "Romance" would not have suffered if the author had given it to his readers in prose.

Gentle Jesus. A Life of Christ for Little Folks. By HELEN E. JACKSON. Pp. 223. Sunday-School Union.

This is a most valuable and delightful book for children, giving in perfectly simple but impressive language the story of the life of Jesus from the cradle to the cross. It is strictly faithful to the New Testament narrative, which we fear cannot truly be said of all such publications. The type is beautifully clear, the illustrations are many and appropriate, and, in short, we cannot speak too highly of the book, upon which everybody concerned is to be warmly congratulated. No better present for a child could be desired.

Salvation and Service. By GEORGE EVERARD. Pp. 262. James Nisbet and Co. 1896.

The writings of George Everard, late Vicar of St. Andrew's, Southport, are too well known amongst Evangelical Churchmen to require commendation here. It will be sufficient to say that the last book by this veteran Evangelical writer is quite up to his usual standard, and, like its predecessors, is very suitable as a gift-book to those who never could be persuaded to read a "tract."

Little Rests by the Way. By E. H. G. Pp. 155. Elliot Stock. 1895.

The title of this little book almost explains the book itself. It consists of thirty-one short meditations, clear, simple, and common-sense, written expressly for children. They are designed to stimulate and refresh the spiritual life of the children, and there is a special thought for each day in the month.

The Millennium. By SENEX. Pp. 110. Elliot Stock. 1896.

We are glad to call attention to this little work on a very important subject. The writer holds post-millennial views, that is, that the Second Advent will be after the Millennium; that the Millennium is a spiritual epoch; and that the descriptions of it in the Revelation refer chiefly to the saints in heaven. He shows that the Church of England expresses this view in her formularies, although Bishop Newton inclined rather to the pre-millennial interpretation; and in a careful discussion of the cognate passages in the Book of Daniel and the Revelation he shows that this is also the teaching of Scripture. The work is learned, temperate, judicious and suggestive, and is evidently the result of much prayerful and original meditation.

The Laying on of Hands. By the Rev. ALEXANDER BODDY. Pp. 116. S.P.C.K. 1895.

A handbook for preparation for Confirmation. Lucid and simple. Should be of great service in rural parishes.

Sermons and Addresses on Church Temperance Subjects. By the Rev. H. J. ELLISON.

Canon Ellison was for many years chairman of the Church of England Temperance Society, and he knows his subject better, perhaps, than anyone else. Canon Ellison is an enthusiast indeed, but wise and discreet. We heartily commend this volume to the careful study of all secretaries of parochial temperance associations, and others who take an interest in the work.

Notes for Mothers' Meetings, on the Sacraments, etc. By Mrs. HASHHURST. Pp. 108. S.P.C.K.

Lessons on the Acts of the Apostles, for the Use of Sunday-School Teachers and others. By JOHN PALMER, author of "Bethlehem to Olivet." Pp. 386. Church of England Sunday-School Institute.

These are sketches of lessons on the Acts, with notes and special hints to the teacher in connection with each lesson, to enable him to adapt the sketch to junior, intermediate, or senior classes. This little book will be found really serviceable to Sunday-school teachers and to those who have to prepare addresses to children in church or mission-room.

Scintillae Carmenis (sic). By P. H. W. ALMY. Elliot Stock.

There is a misprint in the title. The genitive singular of *carmen* is generally given as *carminis* in Latin grammars.

MAGAZINES.

We have received the following (March) 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.

APPOINTMENTS.

Archbishop of Armagh.

AT the meeting of the Bishops of the Church of Ireland, at the offices of the Church Representative Body, St. Stephen's Green, to elect a successor to the late Lord Primate, Dr. Gregg, the Archbishop of Dublin presided, and the following prelates were present: The Bishops of Meath, Derry, Ossory, Limerick, Kilmore, Cork, Down, Tuam, Killaloe, Clogher, and the Bishop-elect of Armagh. The only member absent was the Bishop of Cashel, who is ill. The Bishop of Derry was elected by an almost unanimous vote. William Alexander, Archbishop-elect of Armagh, is the eldest son of the late Prebendary Alexander, Rector of Aghadee, and was born in Derry on April 13, 1824. He was educated at Tunbridge School, and at New Inn Hall and Brasenose, Oxford, graduating in 1847 with a Fourth in Greats. In 1850 he won the Denyer prize for an essay on the Divinity of our Lord, and in 1860 the prize for a poem on a sacred subject—"The Waters of Babylon." In 1876 he delivered the Bampton Lectures, and received the same year the hon. D.C.L. Ordained in 1847, he has worked continuously in Ireland. In 1864 he became Dean of Emly; was appointed Bishop of Derry and Raphoe in 1867, and sat in the House of Lords during the session of 1869, when he delivered an eloquent speech against Mr. Gladstone's Disestablishment Bill. It is recorded of him that, during his stay in America in 1891, he spoke in one church in Philadelphia alone to two hundred persons whom he had confirmed in his own diocese. His Grace is the author of numerous works, among them being "Leading Ideas of the Gospels," which reached a second edition in 1891. His Bampton Lectures, "The Witness of the Psalms to Christ and Christianity," have been through several editions. A volume of sermons on "The Great Question" appeared in 1886, and in the same year "St. Augustine's Holiday, and other Poems." A third edition of the discourses on the "Epistles of St. John" came out in 1892. Dr. Alexander married in 1850 Cecil Frances, daughter of Major Humphreys, authoress of some of the best-known hymns in the language, whose death we had lately to record. The enthronement of the new Primate will take place in about a month, and the Bishop-elect of Armagh, Dean Chadwick, will be consecrated next day, and will proceed to Derry as Bishop of that diocese in the room of Dr. Alexander.—*Guardian.*

Bishop-Suffragan of Southampton.

The Rev. George Carnac Fisher, who has been appointed Bishop Suffragan of Southampton, was educated at Brasenose College, Oxford, and took his degree in 1868. He was successively curate of St. James', Doncaster, and Dartford, Kent, and in 1873 became Vicar of Forest Row, Sussex. From 1879 to 1881 he was Vicar of St. George's, Barrow-in-Furness, and from 1881 to 1889 Vicar of Beverley, Yorkshire. In the latter year he succeeded to the vicarage of Croydon, a position which he resigned two years ago. He is Liberal-Evangelical in views, and enjoyed great popularity and influence at Croydon.

Queen's Chaplains.

The *Gazette* contains the formal announcement that the Queen has been pleased to appoint the Rev. Clement Smith, Rector of Whip-

pingham, Isle of Wight, and Honorary Chaplain to her Majesty, to be one of her Majesty's Chaplains in Ordinary, in room of the Rev. Prebendary William Rogers, deceased; and the Rev. Canon Alfred Ainger, Honorary Chaplain to her Majesty, to be one of her Majesty's Chaplains in Ordinary, in the room of the Hon. and Rev. Canon A. Phipps, deceased; and the Rev. Herbert Edward Ryle, Hulsean Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, and the Venerable Archdeacon William Donne, Vicar of Wakefield, to be Honorary Chaplains to her Majesty.

CHURCH SOCIETIES.

The Church of England Incumbents' Sustentation Fund, 39, Victoria Street, Westminster, appeal for funds to enable them to provide, by means of annual grants, an increase to the incomes of the poorer benefices, so that every working incumbent may have the stipend of £200 a year. It is stated that at present many of the clergy find the greatest difficulty in securing even the bare necessaries of life. These words are used advisedly, with full and intimate knowledge of privations which affect not merely a clergyman's ability adequately to discharge the duties of his office, but to procure even the merest sufficiency of food, warmth, and clothing. In the present state of public opinion the council refrain from making any special appeal for an addition to endowments. They will, however, willingly accept any gift entrusted to them with a view of permanently increasing the income of any benefice which an intending donor may desire especially to assist. The fund is national in character, and aims at dealing with poor incumbencies in every part of the country. It owes its early development to the efforts and influence of the Marquis of Lorne, M.P., and its subscription list is headed by the Queen, who gives an annual contribution of £50.

AVERAGES OF COMMUNICANTS.

"E. M. R." writes: "Some further calculations based upon the tables of Church-work published in the *Guardian* of February 19 may not be without interest to your readers. In the year 1894-95 the total proportion of communicants to the population of England and Wales, as given in the census of 1891, was 1 in $16\frac{6}{11}$, or to the estimated population of the year 1 in $17\frac{1}{3}$. The fractions are approximations only, as are those in the following table, giving the averages, size of the parishes, and proportions of communicants in seventeen selected dioceses. I have taken the four dioceses in which the proportion is highest, the four in which it is lowest, the others at random:

Diocese.	Parishes.	Av. pop.	Communicants.
Hereford	352	616	1 in $8\frac{9}{10}$
Oxford	644	937	1 in $9\frac{1}{18}$
Chichester	376	1,461	1 in $9\frac{1}{10}$
Salisbury	477	776	1 in $10\frac{1}{4}$
Bath and Wells	485	819	1 in $11\frac{1}{2}$
Bangor	141	1,532	1 in $11\frac{1}{2}$
Winchester	548	1,745	1 in $11\frac{1}{2}$
Gloucester and Bristol ...	487	1,529	1 in $12\frac{1}{2}$
Lichfield	458	2,655	1 in $16\frac{1}{4}$
Southwell	467	2,090	1 in $17\frac{1}{2}$
Ripon	346	2,943	1 in $18\frac{9}{10}$
Rochester	340	5,702	1 in $20\frac{1}{4}$
Manchester	513	5,153	1 in $20\frac{3}{4}$
London	551	5,890	1 in $21\frac{3}{4}$
Wakefield	167	4,310	1 in $23\frac{1}{2}$
Liverpool	202	5,978	1 in $25\frac{1}{2}$
Truro	234	1,389	1 in $28\frac{1}{2}$

WYCLIFFE HALL.

The Regius Professor of Divinity, Dr. Ince, has laid the first stone of a new chapel at Wycliffe Hall, Oxford, in the presence of a large assemblage. At the conclusion of a service in the library in the Hall, Dr. Ince delivered an address, in which he said he thought they ought to reflect that there was a great advantage in many ways in the existence of a theological college in Oxford itself rather than away from the University. Happily, they had come to recognize the wisdom of the existence of such a college, and that the University simply as a University was insufficient to train men for the sacred office of the ministry. A mere sort of invertebrate, colourless theology would do no good in the world. It was not founded upon truth, and it could not produce any practical spiritual effect. There must be definite truth taught and preached, and therefore it was quite right and quite justifiable that Wycliffe Hall should continue to maintain its principles in the true sense of the word, being Protestant and Evangelical. He felt sure there would be that spirit of tolerance and charity and entering into the views and sympathies of others which would prevent the growth of bigotry, narrow-mindedness, and one-sidedness.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The income of the S.P.G. for 1895, as declared at the annual meeting, amounted to £118,258 10s. 9d., and was made up as follows:

1. Collections, subscriptions, and donations—General fund, £81,333 15s. 10d.; special funds, £13,500 17s. 4d.
2. Legacies—General fund, £11,609 12s. 1d.; special funds, £2,148.
3. Dividend and rents—General fund, £4,564 15s. 5d.; special funds, £5,101 10s. 1d.

In voluntary contributions under the first head there is an increase as compared with 1894 of £2,500, while in legacies there is a decrease of about £6,000. The gross total is consequently about £4,000 less than in the previous year, when it stood at £122,327.—*Guardian.*

Letters have been received by the Church Missionary Society from Bishop Tucker, in Uganda, in which he says that, with regard to the capital of the country, it is apparent that in material things there is a much greater measure of prosperity now than when he was there before. "But the contrast," he adds, "between now and my first visit in 1890 is even more marked. Then, comparatively, Uganda was a desolation. Now, however, we see a vastly different state of things. In the first place, order reigns. It is no longer the drum-beat from morning till night, and the gathering together of excited crowds. If the drum beats, it is either to call the people together for service in the great church or for classes in the various teaching-houses. It is true that from time to time, as a chief comes and goes, his movements are marked by the beat of the drum. But then the beat is known, and only stirs those who are immediately interested. But, besides the comparative quiet of the place, another sign of progress is the great increase in cultivation. In 1890 many of the gardens in the capital had fallen into ruin, and were little better than waste lands. Now, however, not only have these gardens been reclaimed, but fresh land has been taken into cultivation. The result is that Mengo is now one great garden. A further evidence of increased prosperity is the amount of building that has been done during the past three years, and more especially since the proclamation of the Protectorate. Every chief of consequence has now a double-storied house, and the improvement in the houses of the lower classes is very marked. The roads, too, have been greatly improved; the swamps have been mostly bridged, and some

have even been drained." But the evidence as to the progress made in spiritual things is, the Bishop says, even more pronounced. "For instance, not only is the hill of Namirembe crowned with a beautiful new church, accommodating some four thousand worshippers, but in the districts around the capital some three-and-twenty churches bear witness to the spread of the Gospel. These churches are regularly served from the capital, and as regularly gather their hundreds together for worship on the Lord's Day. . . . There are now, I believe, more than two hundred of these churches scattered throughout the country. The decent and orderly way in which the services (so far as I have seen them) are conducted is another token of the advance in spiritual things." The Bishop goes on to tell of a missionary meeting held in the capital, when nine new missionaries (natives) were sent forth to their work. The Bishop has held a series of confirmation services, at the first of which sixty-eight men and thirty women received the laying-on of hands. "One very interesting incident of the service was the coming forward for confirmation of two blind men, one of whom had lost both his ears. They had been cut off by order of the King some years ago by way of punishment for some offence or other. Both men in their sightlessness were victims of the King's cruelty." On the road to Gayaza, the Bishop's guide, when about one hour and a half from Mengo, pointed out to him a spot, the sight of which, in connection with its history, filled the Bishop with horror. "A huge trench lay before me, surrounding a considerable piece of land at the bottom of the valley. It seems that the former Namasole, or Queen-mother, gave orders that all who claimed relationship to the royal family were to be isolated on this piece of land. Houses were built for them, in cruel mockery, for no food was given to them. There they were starved to death, several hundreds of them. Such were the doings of those in authority in Mtesa's time, not very long ago; and there was I, a Christian minister, on my way to hold a confirmation, permitted to gaze upon the scene of horror. How changed the times! 'Thank God, that day is over!' was the exclamation which came from my heart as I resumed my journey."—*Times.*

GIFTS.

Prebendary Clayton, Rector of Ludlow, has informed the churchwardens that Colonel Windsor Clive, late M.P. for the borough of Ludlow, has placed to their credit at the bank £1,000 for the restoration of the south transept of the parish church.

The Rev. R. B. Blakeney, Rector of Wombwell, has received £1,000 from Mr. William Birks, of Retford, towards the new parish church fund. Mr. Birks had previously contributed £100 to the fund, which has now reached the sum of £3,500. The estimated cost, exclusive of seating, is £6,000.

Obituary.

The death is announced of the Ven. Thomas Bucknall Lloyd, Archdeacon of Salop, and Rector of Edgmond, Newport. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, of which Society he was a scholar, and graduated in 1846. The whole of his clerical career was passed in the diocese of Lichfield, and for thirty-four years he was Vicar of St. Mary's, Shrewsbury. He was appointed a Prebendary of Lichfield in 1870, and Archdeadon of Salop in 1886.