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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

MAY, 1896.

ART. I.—THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH.

No. VI.—The World before the Flood.

I MAY, perhaps, be allowed to preface this paper by a few general remarks as to the present condition of the question of the genuineness and authorship of the Pentateuch, as between the old and the new critics. It appears to me—and the remarks in my last paper may serve to emphasize the fact—that a gradual *rapprochement* is taking place. There is a decided tendency to abandon extreme views on either side. Many disciples of the traditional school are disposed to admit the possibility of sundry errors in minor detail, in numbers, and the like, in the Old Testament. They no longer insist that Moses wrote the whole Pentateuch with his own hand, or that it is absolutely impossible that the so-called Books of Moses may have been edited at a considerably later date, and that sundry alterations and additions to its contents may have been made. They are also ready to admit that Mosaism stands on a lower plane than Christianity, and that since the coming in of the "better covenant" Christians have been compelled to relinquish some of the teaching of the older one as inadequate, and therefore no longer binding upon the Christian conscience. On some points, however, they confront their adversaries with countenances unabashed and hearts thoroughly impenitent. They still refuse to believe that assumptions are as solid a basis of argument as facts, or that the agreement on the part of a few critics of a certain school at the present time is on an equality with the unwavering traditions of a whole nation. They, therefore, are inclined to reject the whole *apparatus* of Jehovists, Elohists, Deuteronomists, and Priestly Code writers, as elaborated on insufficient or mistaken *data*, and they invite those who wish to arrive at sound conclusions on the matter to lay aside these foregone conclusions and to

approach the whole question afresh with unbiased minds. They rejoice to have secured the adhesion of Professor Sayce to these views. Formerly, like many other men who have no time to carry on an independent investigation for themselves, he was disposed to accept the theories of the German school provisionally, as being the only conclusions of criticism known to him. Now, having secured for himself, as he supposes, a sufficient basis of fact, he has announced that he has thrown away the corks and bladders provided for him by the critics, that he has found them more of a hindrance than a help, and that he proposes to give himself a free hand in all future investigations. As thought is free, and critics not infallible, there seems no reason why Professor Sayce should not examine the facts afresh for himself. It is only the somewhat dictatorial attitude of the critics towards those who venture to declare themselves unconvinced which causes any amount of friction in the matter. There *are* some grounds for doubting whether their canons of historical investigation are quite so certain as they think them. Not only has the Bishop of Oxford, the most distinguished historical investigator we have, declared plainly that those canons would be "laughed out of court" in any other branch of historical study but the history of Israel; not only has Dean Milman, a Hebraist, a historian, and a man of letters, declared the task the critics have set themselves to be one impossible to be achieved, but Professor Bury, one of the most brilliant of our rising historical scholars, has recently laid down a principle of investigation in regard to the alleged heresy of Justinian which is certainly not that of Kuenen or Wellhausen, or even of their English disciples. "The principle is," says Professor Bury, "that neither (1) arguments resting on considerations of improbability—impossibility is a different matter—nor (2), as a general rule, arguments *ex silentio*—which are, indeed, merely a particular case of 1—can be used to invalidate positive evidence which is not on independent grounds suspicious, *unless there exist some positive evidence on the other side.*"[1] If this principle be admitted as a sound one—and it seems reasonable enough—a large number of the conclusions of the new criticism must at once be abandoned. The new critics appear to be becoming aware of this fact. With great silence and secrecy, with their camp-fires left burning so as not to attract the notice of the enemy, they have of late been executing a strategic movement to the rear. I will give two instances of this. A short time ago Ezekiel was the "father of Judaism," and the post-exilic institutions of the Priestly Code were mainly due to his initiative. This we

[1] *Guardian* for 1896, p. 362. The italics are Professor Bury's own.

learned from Wellhausen and Kuenen. Now, the Priestly Code is a codification of pre-existing regulations, and we are not definitely told of what date any of those regulations are. Therefore some, or even many of them, may, for aught the critics can tell us, be traced as far back as the age of Moses itself. A short time ago Deuteronomy was composed in the time of Hezekiah or Manasseh, or even that of Josiah, by the advocates of a monotheistic worship at one sanctuary. Now this extreme theory is abandoned, and Deuteronomy has become a *compilation* of that period, embodying a considerable amount of pre-existing materials. Once more we can gain no information regarding the date of those materials. It is by no means impossible that, according to the most recent theories on the subject, there is, after all, in Deuteronomy a tolerably substantial amount of Mosaic teaching and legislation. For we are not told precisely, as criticism, if it has arrived at a sound basis for constructive operations, ought to tell us, *what* portions of Deuteronomy are, and what are not, of the date of Hezekiah or Manasseh. And the reason of this indefiniteness is obvious. It renders it less easy to join issue with the theorist. If you have no theory to deal with but a negative one, there is nothing to lay hold of. We can hardly enter into a general engagement with an enemy who presents no front to us, or who is constantly changing his ground. All we can do in such a case is to act as the opponents of the Tübingen theory, in regard to the authenticity and genuineness of the New Testament, acted. We can challenge our opponents to take up a position which it is possible to attack; and failing this, we can hover around them, cut off stragglers, and generally harass their retreat, until they make a stand and enable us to come to close quarters. The position of Wellhausen and Kuenen was definite enough. It has been attacked; and the present attitude of the English disciples of that school is sufficient evidence that it has not been maintained. No doubt one strong reason for the ready reception the new theories have met with from men of every theological school among us is the escape they provide us from the necessity of accepting the miraculous. If the Pentateuch were written by Moses, or under his supervision, there is no escape whatever from the marvels of the ten plagues of Egypt, the manna, the quails, the fiery flying serpents, the destruction of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and all the other miraculous events with which the story of the Pentateuch is studded. It is best to face this fact frankly. The larger demands on our faith or credulity the Bible makes, the harder it is in these days to get men to accept it. The theories of the critics afford an easy method of minimizing this difficulty, and hence their wide

acceptance, even in the most unexpected quarters. Yet, however this unquestionable difficulty is to be met, it is perfectly clear to my mind that to admit the Old Testament Scriptures to be a tissue of fabrications from end to end, to grant that they have failed to attain the object for which they were written, namely, to give a faithful account of God's training of His people, is to pay too heavy a price for our converts from Agnosticism or unbelief. The canons of criticism we have adopted in the Old Testament will unquestionably be applied to the New, and we shall once more find ourselves called upon to surrender to the Tübingen school the positions we have won from them at the cost of so much labour.

In the present state of the controversy it is not unreasonable to hope that the final conclusion criticism will reach will be this—that the Israelite history as it has come down to us is at least as credible as any other history; and that, with whatever shortcomings in point of detail, we have in it an authentic account of God's moral education of the people which He destined to play so conspicuous a part in the religious history of the world. As far as I myself am concerned, I honestly confess that I do not accept the theory of Elohists, Jehovists, and the like, and I claim the right of examining into the signs of antiquity and common authorship of the Pentateuch without any reference to the assumptions those theories involve. "I refuse to believe," to use a favourite expression of Wellhausen's, that all inquiry in the matter is at an end because certain persons monopolizing the title of scholars have declared the question to be settled. Still, the theories may be true, or approximately true. The only point on which I should be disposed to insist is this, that when the writers of the Old Testament made definite assertions on points of moment, they spoke, and knew that they were speaking, the honest truth.

I will now return to Gen. v. 1, which I have previously discussed, but on which I have a few more words to say. In two points it seems to indicate a common authorship with the passage ii. 4b—iv. 26, which, as we know, has been assigned to JE. For P, in Gen. i. 26, 27, does not use the word *Adam* (man) of the *individual*, but of the *race*. It is JE who speaks of "Adam" as a *person*. It is true that at first he uses the article with Adam, to denote the person as distinct from the race; but by degrees the article is dropped. In chap. iv. 25 we have "Adam" for the first time,[1] not "the man." The same use of the word occurs *five verses afterwards*, yet here it is assigned to P. The exigencies of a theory may

[1] There is לְאָדָם in Gen. iii. 21.

justify this treatment; but certainly any critic who had no theory to maintain would come to the conclusion that chap. iv. 25 and chap. v. 3 were by the same hand. It is also to be observed that in chap. v. 1—3, we have both P's and JE's use of the word "Adam." This is as near an impossibility as anything can be, if Gen. v. be by a different hand to Gen. ii. to iv. It is as natural as possible if they are both by the same author.

The next point is that P and JE both refer to the birth of Seth, though P makes no reference to the previous birth of Cain and Abel. The irresistible conclusion from this, it seems to me, is that the so-called P here, instead of displaying traces of a different hand, is carrying on naturally and smoothly the narrative of JE. Yet P, be it observed, is *ex hypothesi* an independent narrator. Had his story really been independent, it would certainly have made some reference in chap. v. to the existence of the *eldest* son of Adam, this being his method throughout. Nor is the editing of the redactor usually supposed by the critics to be so careful as to cause him to take great pains in removing every inelegant repetition. On the contrary, it is owing to his carelessness on this point—to the continual repetitions he introduces into the narrative —that the critics are enabled to infer the existence of the two combined accounts. From this there can be no other conclusion than that the editor was extremely careful to avoid repetition when it suits the theory that he should be so; extremely careless when it is desirable to be able to point out the separate sources of the narrative. Here again, then, we have signs of the common authorship of JE and P.

But we have not yet done with the redactor's extracts from P. Let us put them together, so that we may be able to read the passage consecutively. It runs thus: "Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God ended the work which He had made; and He rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it He had rested from all His work which God created and made. These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created. This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God created He him; male and female created He them, and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created."[1] It appears from this that P, in conception and arrangement, must have been an extremely remarkable book. We are forbidden to see here the hand of the redactor, because we are specially

[1] Cf. Gen. i. 26, 27, and ii. 4b.

told that the word "Tol'doth" (*generations* or *origin*) is characteristic of P. That the historian of the creation, having turned aside to narrate the fall and its consequences, should recapitulate what he had said before about the origin of the human race before proceeding to trace its early genealogy, is reasonable enough. But what could have possessed the writer of P to indulge in so tedious and aimless a repetition as that given above is extremely difficult to understand. Surely, if he had used his favourite phrase, "these are the generations," at the end of the first division of his narrative, he would hardly have put it in such extraordinary juxtaposition at the beginning of the next. There is, of course, another alternative, but it is one to which the critics are somewhat chary of resorting. Portions of P may have been omitted here. But then the question arises: What were they, and why were they omitted? If we have not the contents of P almost *in extenso*—and it is the critical theory at present that nearly the whole of P is embodied by the redactor in his work—how do we know that P is so "juristisch, pünktlich, and formelhaft" as we are told it is? Anyhow, as we have seen, P knows the story of Seth. Is it possible that he, too, gave us his version of the fall of man, of the crime of Cain, and the like? And if so, why was his narrative less to the taste of the historian than the blended account of JE?

The story in chap. vi. next invites our attention. It has been contended in a previous paper that the elect line of patriarchs, as described in chap. v., maintained a more primitive kind of life than the restless and selfish descendants of Cain, who were urged by what has lately been glorified as a "Divine discontent" to invent for themselves new conditions of society. Invention, in fact, was in the first instance stimulated by impatience and greed of gain. Some sort of pastoral life, it is true, must have been known from the first, for Abel was a keeper of sheep and Cain was a tiller of the ground.[1] Jabal[2] can only, therefore, have been the inventor of a more elaborate system of pastoral occupation. But many of the descendants of the elect line were seduced by the prospect of gain to join the descendants of Cain; and this, it may be presumed, is what is meant by the sons of God coming in unto the daughters of men. The descendants of Seth, stronger, healthier, and longer lived than the degraded posterity of Cain, not only followed the example of, but entered into the closest possible relations with, the lost and proscribed race. Thus crime multiplied; and we find from JE that the wickedness of the earth was so great that God resolved to destroy it. After chap. vi. 8 the

[1] Gen. iv. 2. [2] Gen. iv. 20.

redactor takes his matter from P. But Noah is equally well known to JE. We first meet him in a passage belonging to JE torn from its context (chap. v. 29), beginning: "And he" (Lamech, presumably) "called his name Noah, saying, This same shall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands, because of the ground which Jehovah hath cursed." JE, then, had something to tell us, not only about Noah, but about Lamech, his father. It is natural to wonder why the redactor has passed by his more picturesque details, and has given us only P's more formal genealogy. Noah's three sons, moreover, are known to JE, though he introduces them very incidentally (Gen. ix. 19) in a passage—I refer only to verses 18 and 19—dry and formal enough to have obtained for it a place in the selections from P. One cannot but express a hope that the criticism which has done so much for us already may be enabled to do more—that it may recover for us the lost portions of the narrative of JE, which the redactor has so ruthlessly, and apparently, too, so inconsistently flung away.

Another remarkable feature of the compilation is the way in which JE's *lacunæ* are filled up from P. JE tells us that the world is to be destroyed; P here comes to the rescue, and tells us how it was to be destroyed, and that God commands Noah to build the ark. But it next dawns upon us (chap. vii. 1) that all this is known to JE also. He, too, mentions the ark;[1] and he describes Jehovah as inviting Noah to "come into the ark," into which He had before prophesied (chap. vi. 18) that Noah should "come."[2] It is true that in chap. vi. 1-8, and in chap. vii. 1-5, Jehovah is used, and Elohim in chap. vi. 9-22. But we really need some more grounds than the change of the Name of God to make it credible that the redactor, instead of keeping to one plain, straightforward story, has combined the two narratives, which must have been singularly like each other, in this extremely remarkable manner, when we see the earlier writer so distinctly referring here to a phrase in the later narrative. Perhaps it ought to be enough for us to know, on unimpeachable authority, that it is so. But man is an inquisitive being, and we may be sure that he will, sooner or later, require an answer to the question *why* it is so. For myself, the more I contemplate the phenomenon of the redactor, the more mythical, I confess, he appears to me to be. I cannot account for him, except on the principle that "it is the impossible that always happens," or on that of Tertullian's triumphant ejaculation, "Credo quia impossibile." And what is more to the purpose still, no one else has as yet been able to account for him. Something more than the mere change

[1] As *already constructed.*

[2] Observe that P here anticipates the language of JE.

from the word Elohim to the word Jehovah seems to be required to bring him "within the range of practical politics" in this particular passage.

Yet further eccentricities on his part have to be detailed. It is curious that he cannot wait till (in chap. vi. 1) he begins his extracts about Noah from JE, but must thrust a scrap about Noah from JE into the middle of the genealogy with which P has supplied him. Of course, if the whole of these chapters are by one author, all is intelligible enough. He is writing his history, and when he comes upon Noah, he naturally introduces his name with a word of preface. But if we were making extracts from two or more writers, we should not, I think, be inclined to interrupt the course of one extract—especially when copying out a genealogy — in order to interpolate anything from another author unless necessity required it. An ordinary redactor would certainly have waited till chap. vi. before he introduced the little detail about Noah which we find in chap. v. 29. The answer will most probably be that the redactor here is not an ordinary person. This is a proposition which we do not feel at all inclined to dispute.

My next point is that verse 2 is obviously derived from very ancient sources indeed. It is not at all the way in which a man living under the Kings of Israel or Judah would have expressed himself. Unless all the accounts of Solomon are myths, a high civilization must have been introduced into Israel in his reign, and the simplicity of the earlier epochs would have been impossible. Whether we interpret the term "sons of God" of supernatural beings, as some are inclined to do, or of the descendants of Seth, which is the view taken above, it seems impossible that this sentence can have been written in the time of the kings. For the first view suggests a very early period indeed of human thought and history, while the second surely requires not only a familiarity with the details in chap. iv., but with the genealogy, assumed to be post-exilic, in chap. v., the contents of which seem presupposed in chap. vi. 2.

Then the mention of Noah in verse 8 suggests another difficulty. Why did the redactor leave out the interesting details about Noah, which JE must have inserted between chap. v. 29, and the narrative which begins in chap. vi. 1 ?[1]

[1] The only possible way in which the reader can follow me here is to put either the supposed JE's or P's narrative in brackets. Chap. v., with the exception of verse 29, is assigned to P. Chap. vi. 1-8 is assigned to JE. Put chap. v. 29 into immediate juxtaposition with chap. vi. 1-8, and we find a *lacuna* in JE's narrative, which is filled up from P. What could JE have contained at this point, and why did the redactor leave it out? That is the question I desire my readers to consider.

Once more—if the narrative extracted from P in chap. vi. 9-22 be considered by itself, it seems to presuppose what has been extracted from JE in chap. vi. 1-8. The reason why God established His covenant with Noah only would seem to be given in verse 8 as well as in chap. vii. 1 (also assigned to JE), and to have some connection with what precedes, namely, what I have suggested to have been the marriages of the chosen seed with the apostate Cainite race. The history as it stands is homogeneous and intelligible. Its separation into extracts from various independent authors not only solves no historical difficulties for us, but it introduces an infinity of new ones. From the point of view of the ordinary historical investigator, then, though not, of course, of the Biblical critic, it must be rejected.

We turn once more to the literary side of the question. Is it for a moment likely that P could have written the following consecutive sentences: "And Noah was five hundred years old, and Noah begat Shem, Ham, and Japheth. These are the generations of Noah: Noah was a just man, and perfect in his generations; and Noah walked with God. And Noah begat three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. The earth also was corrupt before God," etc. That a single author might thus repeat himself after having diverged from his subject awhile (see chap. vi. 1-8) is probable enough; but it is barely possible that he could have written the above sentences consecutively. Another point, too, must be borne in mind. If chap. v. 29 be an extract from JE, then some portion of P must have been omitted to make room for it. For with verse 29 omitted, the extract runs thus: "And Lamech lived one hundred eighty and two years, and begat a son. And Lamech lived after *he begat Noah* five hundred ninety and nine years." Did the redactor himself think that the word "Noah" in verse 28 would be an inelegant repetition, and substitute "a son" for it, in sharp contrast with every former sentence in the genealogy? If so, his regard for elegance here is very decidedly contrary to what we are told is his usual practice.

From general literary criticism we turn to some linguistic considerations. First of all, the Niphal of the verb שׁחת only occurs in the sense *to be corrupt* three times in the Bible. Of these, two are here (verses 11 and 12), and the other in Exod. viii. 20 (A.V. 24), which is assigned to JE.[1] The word קץ (verse 13), in the sense of *end*, is not very common in Scripture, and a large proportion of the times in which it

[1] The Niphal occurs in Jer. xiii. 7 of the "marring" of a girdle, in xviii. 4 of the spoiling or "marring" of a vessel in the hands of the potter, and we find the participle used adjectively in Ezek. xx. 44.

occurs are in the Pentateuch. But we will postpone the consideration of this word till we meet it again in chap. viii. 6. In verse 14 we meet with the phrase, מבית ומחוץ (within and without). The first of these words occurs only in P; but the second not only meets us frequently in P, but is found also in Gen. xix. 16, xxiv. 11, Exod. xxxiii. 7, Numb. xv. 35, 36, which are assigned to JE. We meet with it seldom in Deuteronomy, and only ten times in the rest of the Old Testament. We may remark, in passing, on the unusual construction זה אשר תעשה (this is the way in which thou shalt make).[1] And in verse 17 we ought not to fail to notice the characteristic and striking phrase, מבול מים ("deluge," or "flood of waters"), which recurs in an inverted form in chap. vii. 10, which the critics have assigned to JE. In this last form the words occur in chap. vii. 7, which they have assigned to P. In other cases the words "flood" and "waters" occur separately. If the use of any particular form of expression is really characteristic of any particular writer, as the critics tell us, then one would have thought the word "flood" or "deluge" (מבול) would be characteristic of one writer, "waters" (מים) of another, and "waters of the flood" and "flood of waters" of two more. Thus we once more come to the conclusion at which we have already arrived,[2] that *variations of expression by no means necessarily indicate diversity of authorship.*

Our last point is not linguistic, but historical. It is slight, but significant. JE, in chap. viii. 6, makes an allusion to the orders given in chap. vi. 6, which, according to the critics, were not published till centuries after JE was written—a window was to be made in the ark. That window is mentioned in JE's narrative.[3] The word used is different, and on critical principles would seem to postulate diversity of authorship. We have just seen on how very slender a foundation this theory rests. And here *unity* of authorship seems to be postulated by the natural and undesigned allusion to the fulfilment of the injunctions which we find in chap. vi. 16. Another point has just occurred to me. JE (in chap. vii. 1) speaks of the ark as made (*cf.* chap. viii. 6; also JE); yet JE gives us no allusion to the making, or of any instructions to that effect. Thus once more JE presupposes P, or the earlier the later account.

---

[1] There is no "it" in the Hebrew. [2] CHURCHMAN, April, 1896, p. 345.

[3] If, with some, we take the former word (צהר) to mean *roof*, this argument falls to the ground. But I must once more remind the reader that if one argument of this character is disproved, it does not in the least affect the others. It only detracts to a slight extent from the cumulative effect of the whole.

Art. II.—FAILURES.

IT has been said that the better men triumph over the better cause. Humanly speaking, that school of thought in the Church which possesses the best men will make most progress. And although our cause is the better one, we shall not prosper unless in some particulars we can improve.

We are sure the School of the English Reformation is the true one. Yet, speaking generally, it is not the school which attracts the young. In this paper we wish to point out what seem to us some of the principal reasons why this is so.

It is not an easy task for one who believes firmly and strongly in a cause to find fault with, or to bring charges against, those who agree with him. The plea that has most weight with the writer in attempting to expose what appear to him to be defects is, that if Reformation Churchmen can only be brought to see their failings, they will quickly take steps to remedy them.

The first failing which has a good deal of weight with young clergymen is want of loyalty to the Prayer-Book. Many an one, we hope, comes from his ordination feeling strongly about the oath which he has taken to use the services of the Prayer-Book, and none other, in public worship. To such an one omission is almost as bad as addition. Yet in very many (may we not say the majority of?) non-sacerdotal parishes there is a great deal of omission. Take, for instance, the observing of saints' days. A special collect, epistle, and gospel, and special lessons are appointed by the Church for saints' days. There may be strong reasons why there should not be a celebration of the Holy Communion. But is there any reason, especially in town parishes, why services on saints' days should be omitted altogether? To anyone longing to be loyal to the Prayer-Book such an act of omission creates a feeling antagonistic to the school of thought whose principles he believes to be true, but whose practice in this respect is distinctly contrary to their principles. The adherents of the Reformation claim to be, and rightly, so far as principles go, the loyal sons of the Church of England. They must not expect, for they do not deserve, the esteem of the younger clergy if they have glaring defects in their allegiance to the rubrics of our Liturgy.

Again, there is a failure in practice in not keeping fast days. This is an age of luxury, as well as of squalid poverty. The middle classes need some check on their appetites. What better than that of fasting as appointed by our Church? If the adherents of the Reformation would teach their flocks to

use this rule of the Church, or, rather, the rule of fasting laid down by our Lord,[1] much good would result.

But there are graver failures of loyalty even than these. In our ruri-decanal chapters adherents of the Reformation frequently accuse their brethren of adding to the services of the Church. But what must be said of their own illegal omissions in the occasional services? There are a few churches where the marriage service and the baptismal services are seriously mutilated. Why should the marriage service be considered complete if the pause at the end of the first blessing be final? Yet we know several churches where this is habitually done. The case of the baptismal service is even worse. The rule laid down for the attendance of sponsors is continually ignored. We know the difficulty of obtaining good sponsors. Yet most parents ought to be able to find one, and the congregation might supply the others. Where sponsors are not brought, that part of the service beginning with the address to the god-parents, "Dearly beloved, ye have brought this child here to be baptized," and ending with their last answer, "I will," is altogether omitted, as well as the exhortation at the end. This is not simply the practice at one church, but at several. No wonder the candidates for confirmation in such parishes are few in number. This want of loyalty to the Prayer-Book is, we are sure, one reason why many young clergymen who begin as adherents of the Reformation gradually find their way into the ranks of the moderate High Churchmen. If we wish to retain in the Reformation section the loyal sons of the Church of England, let us reform ourselves in these matters and be true to our Prayer-Book, neither omitting nor adding thereto.

A charge of want of reverence is frequently brought against adherents of Reformation principles. It has to be admitted that, speaking generally, there is more outward reverence shown by a mediævalist congregation than by one that is non-sacerdotal. We ought not to allow reverence to be the monopoly of any section of the Church. It is an essential virtue in true worship, and it is our duty to teach our people that in God's house and throughout divine service they should be at all times reverent and devout in demeanour. In prayer they should kneel; in praise they should be earnest. When responses are repeated they should not be silent. We teach that these things ought to be done; let us also teach the reverent way of doing them.

The great want of reverence among adherents of the

[1] St. Matt. vi. 17.

Reformation is, we think, most painfully shown at the administration of the Lord's Supper. And the clergy themselves are sometimes less careful than the congregation. Supposing we take the lowest view of all, viz., that the Lord's Supper is merely a commemorative act. It is at any rate a commemoration of the most solemn and tragic act in the world's history. The consecrated bread and wine are signs or symbols of the body and blood of Christ. They are the outward expression of very holy things; they ought to be used with the utmost reverence. This argument is strengthened considerably when we take the view of our Church, that what is signified by the outward and visible signs in this Sacrament "is verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful." These outward and visible signs ought therefore to be used with all reverence. But is this so in many churches of the Reformation school? When the administration is over, crumbs not a few may often be seen on the floor. Is this using holy things with due reverence? Are our confirmees taught before their first communion to handle these holy things with becoming reverence? Outward reverence is not, and cannot be, all, yet it is a great thing to teach the young due reverence, without which there is a danger of too great familiarity in the use of holy things. And the best way of teaching is by setting an example.

We would say to Reformation Churchmen: Make your practice so outwardly as well as inwardly reverent that no one shall be able to accuse you of irreverence. Teach by all means that lowliness of spirit is necessary, but do not fail to teach also that outward reverence which is sometimes so lacking amongst us.

The third and last failing we shall deal with is the want of courtesy and kindly feeling which characterizes some Reformation incumbents. There are, we are thankful to say, many notable exceptions; yet these only tend to accentuate the difference between those who possess this courtesy and kindly feeling and those who do not. Why should it ever have become a current saying that amongst men of our school the three orders of the ministry are bishops, rectors, and curates? The theory of High Churchmen (and we advisedly use the word theory, for their practice is not perfect) is that all presbyters are equal, except in the fact that to some the cure of souls is given. In many cases the rights of assistant curates are altogether disregarded. Take an instance. Often when a neighbouring vicar wants the assistance of a curate, the whole transaction is made between the two vicars, and the curate is simply told to go to such and such a church. The curate has the right to refuse to go. If he is wise he will not refuse; but

how much better it would be if the incumbent who requires the help would consult him in the matter! These are trifles, but a little forethought and kindly feeling would prevent a great deal of soreness. If the adherents of the Reformation wish to keep their young curates and add to their number, they must respect their rights and treat them with more courtesy. In one large town that we know it is the custom for the Church Missionary Society committee to meet and arrange their annual sermons. In so doing they have arranged for curates to go to different churches, they have made public announcements in print and otherwise, yet the curates have not been asked whether they would preach or not, and in many cases their first knowledge of the arrangement has been the posters they have seen in the streets. This is simply quoted to show how widespread the evil is. The remedy is easy.

Most churches now have a Church Council. More often than not the members are elected by the congregation. The vicar calls them together to ask their advice and counsel. Through them he finds out what the people are saying. They are, or ought to be, the pulse of the congregation. Yet there are many vicars of our school who have a Church Council and ignore it altogether. Far better than this, let the vicar rule with a mild yet despotic hand. With Church Councils elected on a democratic basis, the clergy must be prepared to give as well as take. Nothing acts so much like a wet blanket as a vicar who constantly calls his Church Council together and simply ignores the advice which is tendered to him. This happens time after time. No wonder that the enthusiasm of many men is damped.

This surely is a want of courtesy. If we cannot carry out the wishes of our Council, let us say so at the time, and if possible give our reasons. Our men may not agree with us, but, at least, they will not accuse us of want of courtesy. If there had been less pride and more courtesy in times gone by, there would be much more cohesion now among supporters of the Reformation.

Our cause—which is, we are sure, the cause of truth—will prevail. On our part, we can aid it by more loyalty, more reverence, more courtesy and kindly feeling. We are in peril of losing our influence in the Church by our failings. When we have learnt what these are and have corrected them, then we may expect the tide of prosperity to flow. All of us have our part to do in leavening the whole; let us make haste and do it.

A. M. D.

ART. III.—ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF PATRONAGE IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

PART I.

NO Churchman who has at heart the welfare of the Church of his fathers can be indifferent as to the distribution of its patronage. It has at all times exercised the minds of Church reformers, though occasional events may bring its consideration into more prominent notice. If there has been some flagrant case of nepotism, or rapid promotion showered on some recipient whose merits the most microscopic inspection cannot descry, or some disappointed ecclesiastic feels aggrieved, then an outcry will be raised about the abuses of patronage, and schemes of reform, or supposed reform, propounded.

Thus the exercise of Church patronage will be a mirror reflecting the moral sense of the times. When the religious life of the nation is low, the estimate of responsibility will be low, and the exercise of clerical patronage will be a grave index of that religious declension. No rules, however stringent and cunningly devised, will then prevent flagrant abuse. But when the religious tone of the nation is ardent, and there is a burning zeal for the Church of Christ to show itself worthy of its great Founder, this high tone will affect the exercise of patronage of every description. The writer of this article is bold enough to maintain that this desire was never more manifest in the Anglican Church than at present. True, that against the very best appointments exception will be taken by some hypercritics. But the desire on all hands to fill up vacancies with worthy nominees is unmistakably manifest. Should the progress of the Church of England still be onward, and the sense of responsibility be universal and intensified, the distribution of patronage will partake of that elevation, and to fair minds there will be little ground for cavil.

It would be a blind and foolish exaggeration to assert that the Church as it stands is faultless, and the fault at present spotted is the exercise of patronage. One Bill, if not more, is to be laid before the Legislature, proposing amendments in this exercise. One was introduced last year in the House of Lords by the highest ecclesiastical officer of the Church, and another in the House of Commons. Attempts were previously made in the same direction by Archbishops Thomson and Magee. Thus the question will for some time be before the eyes of Churchmen, and will doubtless receive the attention such an important subject merits. It is conceived by the writer of this paper that, without reference to any particular

measure, it may be of use to his fellow-Churchmen if a statement is set forth of the various forms of patronage existing in the English Church, the advantages and disadvantages supposed to attach to each, with such observations as may be suggested by a long and varied experience.

The existing forms of patronage in the Church of England, with the amount of patronage appertaining to each, may be stated approximately thus:

1. The Crown and the Prince of Wales, both as Prince of Wales and also as Duke of Lancaster.

At the disposal of the Crown are commonly considered to be the archbishoprics, the bishoprics, the deaneries, and about 520 benefices.

2. The Lord Chancellor, who is patron of about 520 benefices.

3. Episcopal patronage, which may be considered to apply to about 3,000 benefices.

4. Capitular patronage, *i.e.*, the patronage of the various deans and chapters, who can be credited with about 1,300.

5. Academic, *i.e.*, the various colleges, who can present to about 700.

6. Public bodies, such as corporations, who can present to about 200.

7. Trustees of various kinds to about 700.

8. The clergy themselves: many rectors and vicars, by virtue of their benefice, can present to about 500.

9. Private patronage, *i.e.*, patronage held by certain holders of property, noblemen, gentlemen, and others, as attached to the property. These will number roundly 6,000.

Anyone scanning the above summary will observe the immense *variety* in the patronage. Perhaps no Church in Christendom is marked by such varied patronage—a circumstance which will account for the great variety found among the Anglican clergy, and their inter-penetration and identification with the varied social life of the nation.

A second observation will be the immense amount of patronage in the hands of the *laity*. The Church of England has often been called the layman's Church. This designation will arise partly from the construction of the Church services and the Prayer-Book, in which the congregation take such a part themselves, and are made remarkably independent of the officiating minister. But the designation will fit the distribution of patronage; for as the Crown, the Chancellor, the Corporations, and the trustees will be mainly a lay element, the amount of patronage held by laymen alone will be upwards of 8,000 benefices. No wise Churchman would wish this lay element to be diminished. It prevents the clergy from being

all of one type and cast of thought, and from being dissociated from all sorts and conditions of men. On the other hand, it makes laymen feel that the Church is their Church, that they have a great stake in it; for the families who have relatives or connections in some way associated with the Church might be numbered by thousands. The inclination of Englishmen is to increase this association, that the clergy may feel still more that they are ministers (servants) of the Church, and thoroughly identified with their people.

It will be useful to consider the various forms of patronage separately, and the advantages and disadvantages supposed to be incidental to each. The cases stated will not be simply conjectures, but positively known to be facts.

1. The patronage of the *Crown*, including that of the Prince of Wales, though nominally that of the Crown, is practically in the hands of the responsible advisers of the Crown. There are cases when the Sovereign has been credited with the personal appointment of someone she delighted to honour. And surely it is but right that one in that station should be able to express personal approbation by promotion, the very circumstance indicating that the beneficiare will amply justify the appointment. But the Prime Minister is generally credited with the appointment of the bishops, deans, and the recipients of the more important benefices in the gift of the Crown. That a Prime Minister feels his responsibility is shown by a story told of Lord Melbourne, that nothing would put him out of temper sooner than the announcement of the death of a bishop. "Do what I will," he used to say, "make all the inquiries I can, someone is sure to cavil at my selection." If such a man as Melbourne felt the responsibility so grave, it is felt in a higher degree by such men as Gladstone or Lord Salisbury.

The Prime Minister is often a man of high University distinction, or is intimate with such. If not, he knows personally or by repute the men of mark, is often not indifferently read as a theologian himself, and is able by secretaries and surroundings to make the most minute inquiries. Such a man is no unmeet person to fill up vacancies that fall to his prerogative.

The only objection of any weight that has ever been made to Crown appointments, especially of the lower kind, is that they have been often given as rewards, not for clerical or theological distinction and tried fitness for the office, but as rewards for political aid in elections. The objection is not without foundation. But even then the power of public opinion is so strong and so unsparingly exercised, that a Minister would shrink from appointing on political grounds alone. The recipient will be found to be a man of distinction

of some kind, and may eventually justify his appointment, though brought to the front by processes open to criticism.

2. The patronage of the *Lord Chancellor* has been sometimes described as a means of rewarding cousins and other connections down to the remotest degree. Others have been described as the rewards of persistent wearying importunity. Such descriptions could not be maintained since the revival in the Church. Whoever scrutinizes the appointments by later Chancellors will find that, if the benefice is anything above a starving, the recipient has done some service in the Church. Possibly such recipient would have otherwise lived and died in obscurity, but by the aid of some lay friend he has been able to catch the Lord Chancellor's eye. That is indeed one great advantage of having such an "appeal to Cæsar." His patronage secretary and other officials diligently correspond with the referees of such applicants, and make minute inquiries. Private letters have been known as sent to this effect: "You are named as Mr. Blank's referee and parishioner. He is described as open to a certain objection. Should that in your opinion debar him from the preferment he seeks, or is it over-balanced by his other merits?"

Another objection alleged against the Lord Chancellor's patronage is that, considering his short tenure of office—not for life, but whilst his party is in power—his patronage is too large. Many of his benefices are of small value, dispersed all over England, and inquiries respecting them and the fitness of the candidates very difficult. This was felt so strongly by one Chancellor (Westbury) that he obtained an Act empowering the sale of a large number, which he scheduled. His hope was that they would be purchased by those having property in that neighbourhood, and thus interested in its welfare, especially as the purchase-money was to augment the value of the living. This was a move in the right direction; if successful, it would point to an extension of that process. The Chancellor's patronage would then, though more circumscribed in operation, be of increased value, and would enable him to reward many a meritorious pastor not self-asserting, nor rushing about the country, but doing his duty faithfully, though noiselessly, and submitted by some sympathetic observer to the Chancellor's consideration.

3. Proceeding to *episcopal* patronage, Churchmen will be astonished to find it so small. Some bishops have but fifty or sixty benefices at their disposal, many of them of slight value, and the whole being only approximately 2,700. The theory of episcopacy is that the bishop is the chief pastor of his diocese, and the clergy are his vicarii, and it would *primâ facie* appear a manifest advantage to the Church that the

clergy should be nominated by him who incurs the chief responsibility. If his life be prolonged, and he be earnest in his office, he becomes personally acquainted with every clergyman in his diocese. Even where the diocese is unwieldy, he may, through his suffragans (now so common) or his archdeacons, learn not a little of each clergyman's operations, not simply the fussy, the loquacious, but those who live always in their parishes and faithfully pursue their path of duty. But English statesmen have ever viewed with disfavour the increase of episcopal power. They have shown great fear of ecclesiasticism, of the Church becoming too powerful, an *imperium in imperio*, and thus, if united in opposition to the Government of the day, a troublesome factor. It is quoted of Monsignor Dupanloup, the recent Bishop of Orleans, "When I say to my clergy, 'March,' I expect them to march as one man." Englishmen have dreaded this in the English Church, and have legislated accordingly.

Bishops are but men, after all, and have "their treasure in earthen vessels," and episcopal patronage is liable to objections. Little need now be said of nepotism—a vice which so often disfigured episcopal patronage in times past. There will never be another Harcourt aggrandizing every one of his blood by pickings from Church property, nor will any prelate nowadays say, as was said to a clergyman *now living*, when, after fifteen years' charge of a parish as curate, he asked his bishop to present him to the vacant living, and hinted at his struggling poverty, "Sir, poor men should not enter the Church." Those days are passed away. But a modern bishop has other dangers. Besides being surrounded by hangers-on saying his shibboleth, he is liable to display crotchets. Bishop Lightfoot, late Bishop of Durham, was one of the greatest divines this century has produced. He had previously been a distinguished Cambridge Professor, and was fond of tuition. When made bishop, forgetting the University of Durham before his eye, and its provisions for ministerial training, he took young men into his house, trained and ordained and soon promoted them. Thus his nominees had been barely eight years in service, and veterans who had borne the burden and heat of the day were left out in the cold by the obtrusion of the "Bishop's lambs," as they were called. Archbishop Thomson's episcopate was open to the same criticism. In his later years he systematically promoted young men, who could well have waited twenty years, to benefices that would have gladdened hard-worked veterans by a little better pay and lighter work in their old age.

These were blemishes in distinguished men. Who is free? Still, the increase of episcopal *patronage* (not *power*) would in

many dioceses be beneficial to the Church. Many a prelate has been known to lament his inability to reward his meritorious clergy, owing to the scantiness of the patronage at his disposal.

4. The patronage at the disposal of the *Universities of Oxford and Cambridge* is very small (about 700). At one time one of the projected reforms of the Church was to multiply this patronage. All the Fellows of the colleges were then in holy orders, and the bulk of the students had the ministerial office in view. But a clerical Fellow of a college is now the exception. The students aiming at clerical life are in a great minority, and considering the character of the electors, now mostly laymen, partly Nonconformist or Socinian, and partly of no religious belief whatever, few Churchmen would desire an increase of collegiate patronage.

5. The patronage held by *public bodies* and *trustees* is of a varied character, and will embrace about one thousand appointments. With the exception of the Simeon Trustees and the Church Patronage Society, of whose management little is known externally, the bulk of the nominators as trustees will be laymen. Sometimes the trust of a Church is thoroughly representative of its congregation: these are summoned to fill up any vacancy in the trust; the members of the trust nominate the minister, and submit his name to the diocesan.

In other cases, the trustees fill up vacancies in their body by co-optation. Of all of them it may be said that they are a reflex of the revival of Churchmanship in England, showing an earnest desire to secure the best man possible for the vacancy at their disposal. A good specimen will be the parish church of Leeds. The trustees are twenty-five in number, chosen for their well-known character and position from the lay-Churchmen. The care they have taken in the selection of their nominees is proved by the mark their vicars have made on the Church of the nation. The success seems to suggest an extension of that mode of patronage.

6. *Private patronage* next comes under consideration; and as it embraces as much as all the *rest put together*, its distribution is a most important factor for the well-being of the Anglican Church. The number of benefices in the hands of private patrons is, as has been said, over six thousand. The theory of the system is this: Most of the old Churches of England have been built by the owners of the adjacent property, and it would seem natural that such owners should nominate the minister. He would be more than anyone else interested in the welfare of the neighbourhood; and the fact of his building the church proved his estimate of his responsibility. His nominee was often a son. An eminent writer

expresses his astonishment how often, in investigating past history, he finds the parochial clergy to have been high-born.[1] According to his means and his estimate of responsibility, the builder of the church has set aside land and tithes for the vicar's maintenance. That circumstance explains the diversity in income in various country parishes.

An immense amount of these benefices and their possessions became absorbed by the religious houses, who sent out "fratres" to officiate in the parishes. On the dissolution of these houses and the sale of their lands, the purchaser of the estate became the patron of the benefice on the estate as of old, and so it has continued since.

Such an arrangement is natural; the very stake that the proprietor holds must create some interest in its welfare, and in the moral condition of his tenants, their contentment with their surroundings, of which a respected parish priest would be no inconsiderable factor. The patron's conduct beyond this will depend, as with all patronage, on the religious convictions of the patron. If he entertains a high sense of his responsibility, he will exercise his patronage with great care, make much inquiry as to his applicants possessing the high qualities demanded by the clerical office; if he doubts his own ability, he will consult his bishop. A few specimens of such exercise shall be given—all actual facts:

(*a*) A patron of rank, now living, has been known, when a clergyman has been strongly recommended to him, to attend his church more than once, under an assumed name, and make inquiries on the spot.

(*b*) A living of very small value was vacant; the patron offered it to a clergyman whom he respected, adding, "If you will accept it, I will augment the income to you personally, will incur all your parochial and school expenses, and my gardener shall save you that expense."

(*c*) The patron of a vacant living said to his steward: "Look out for a man who will care for his people, not a hanger-on upon the richer residents about; take the farmers into your confidence." The steward did so, and they unanimously asked for a clergyman who had been serving as a curate near for fourteen years, of blameless life, always on the spot, and universally respected. The patron appointed him.

(*d*) A patron went to his bishop, saying: "I have a living in my gift. There is a neighbouring curate for whom I have conceived considerable respect; does your lordship know much of him?" The bishop went to his papers, and, producing a letter, said: "That letter was written to me by a clergyman

[1] Rev. Dr. Jessop of Norwich.

who has known him for years; it gives his history before ordination. Since his ordination he has justified it." The patron read the letter, and after further conversation nominated the subject of his inquiry.

(*e*) A veteran clergyman wished to retire; he wrote to his patron, asking permission to nominate a relative as his successor, not solely from respect to the veteran's services, but on the merits of the nominee. The patron instructed his steward to go round the whole neighbourhood, make inquiries as to the relative's character, manner of life, and preaching power. After some interval the relative, who knew nothing of the inquiries, was informed of his nomination.

These specimens might be multiplied a hundredfold, and they indicate a wholesome sense of a grave responsibility.

Where this high tone is absent, the patron views the matter perhaps *socially*. As the clergyman will be his immediate neighbour, the patron not unnaturally seeks one who will be desirable socially. Sometimes he adds conditions which may be called, to speak euphemistically, questionable—*e.g.*, "Is he a good shot? as I like the vicar to join me in a day's shooting." Or he will go lower in his estimate of clerical fitness, and inquire as to the pecuniary resources of his nominee, and will seek one who will spend money on the house and church—*i.e.*, benefit the patron's property, or, at all events, not trouble the patron by reminding him of his responsibilities, and bid him discharge them by opening his pocket.

The worst form is when the patron offers it for sale, either public or private. By that act the patron shows that he ignores all responsibility; the sole desideratum in such a patron's mind is—the *amount of money* the applicant is prepared to give. It is sometimes said in justification of this practice that it resembles the sale of a medical practice. It does not; the cases are not parallel. A practitioner purchasing a practice gets thereby introduced to a connection, but after that introduction he stands or falls by his merits. The patients may give him a trial out of respect to his predecessor, but if after trial he disappoints expectation, the connection leave him. Cases are known where a practitioner has bought one practice after another and has lost all. But the parishioners resident on a bought living have no such escape. The purchaser is a fixture, the infliction has to be endured, and the church suffers.

It may be cheerfully admitted that numbers of occupiers of purchased benefices justify their presentation. They have been well educated, and have kept their future vocation steadily in view. All honour to such men; but much greater honour is due to those men who, when gifted with means, have

taken a clerical charge on which a poor man could not exist. Such men have supplemented the starving by their own means, and have adorned their ministerial office by an almost gratuitous service.

The system of purchase once obtained in the army. The "great Duke" said he should have lost every one of his battles in the Peninsula but for the *non*-commissioned officers. The commissioned officers showed pluck and bravery (Englishmen in that respect are never wanting), but were utterly ignorant of their profession. Napoleon I. said that the English cavalry officers had not the slightest idea how to handle their men. Most of the commissioned officers had purchased their positions, and the system has been abolished. A similar reform would seem advisable in the Church.

The purchase system is open to two grave objections:

First, the system shocks the religious sense of mankind. The general mind confounds it with the sin of Simon Magus. That is not the case; but the very confusion shows its repulsiveness to all except vested interests.

Secondly, it negatives all promotion by merit. Bishops and deans and canons are nominated after grave deliberation. Their personal life, their intellectual gifts, their theological attainments, the probability of their adorning their dignified position—these are the considerations that have weight and suggest their promotion. In a presentation that is offered for sale there is no consideration of any of these merits. The sole inquiry of the presenter is, Can you give so much money?

On reviewing the whole subject, all these varied forms of patronage, and the criticism to which they are open, it must be admitted by any fair mind that the methods in the aggregate, take them all round, have *worked well*, and work now better than ever. Like the British constitution, the system has grown with the growth of the nation, sometimes apathetic, though "having a name to live," and then roused up by causes manifold to zeal in fulfilling its high mission. The writer of these lines is therefore no advocate of any revolutionary changes. He would leave the various forms of patronage still to enjoy their privileges, and let the Church present those manifold varieties of thought and action that have ever characterized the English Church. Still, the Church is not faultless. He would respectfully commend to the consideration of Churchmen the following reforms. They have been so generally proposed that they almost answer to the requirements of the canon law, "Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus."

1. The abolition of the sale of next presentations, a practice never contemplated by the Church.

2. The sale of advowsons to be allowable only to the holders of considerable property in the locality. This was the plan advocated by Archbishop Magee, and it received general commendation. It is in harmony with the true principle of private patronage, viz., that the possession of property creates responsibility.

3. That private patrons should more frequently take their bishop into council, and if they have no nominee in view especially desired, then hand over the patronage to the bishop. Many men would object to an increase of episcopal power, but few to the extension of their patronage.

4. That no clergyman should be instituted to a benefice over £100 a year in value, unless he has served an apprenticeship as curate of at least ten years. There may be cases when to fill up an appointment is very difficult, and a younger man would accept the charge as a stepping-stone. But it would be a wholesome rule to restrain the putting a novice to the sole cure of souls. Who would place a beardless subaltern in the charge of a regiment?

Various other schemes are suggested by some agitators of a very drastic character. A few words may be said of two.

There is a craze at present for young men, and some would-be reformers advocate the expulsion of veterans, however worthy and wise, from their ministerial charge. It may not be amiss to remind these innovators of a certain chapter in history, when a Hebrew king refused to be guided by the tried counsellors of his father, and handed himself over to the suggestions of his youthful friends. Subsequent events showed that it would have been a blessed thing for that king and his people if the veterans had remained at the helm.

Another scheme suggested by a few is of a still more revolutionary character: they would make all ministerial appointments of a temporary character. Such advocates of "thorough" are under the impression that there is a plethora of clergy.[1] They are under a delusion. Already there are abundant causes deterring our educated youth from entering the ministry of the Church of God. The proposed scheme would be one more deterrent. If these continue for twenty years there will be, as in France and Switzerland, churches without pastors.

It would be a more excellent way for such men of exacting demands to contribute their own sons to the sacred office, especially if of affluence. Such men could magnify their office in many ways—in one especially. Being exempted from the

[1] See an article in the February number of this magazine on "The Supply of Candidates for the Ministry."

res angusta domi, they could hold a cure impossible to a penniless man, but offering noble opportunities to a devoted soldier of Christ.

The whole Church may well breathe "the prayer divinely taught," "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest that He will send forth labourers into His harvest."

NOTE.—Lord Cranborne's Bill, now before Parliament, will, as to its first part, at least, be welcomed by earnest-minded Churchmen. But their legitimate aspirations will not be satisfied till it can be said of every clergyman that he owes his position as a "steward of the mysteries of God," not to some money transaction, but just as his bishop does, to his intrinsic merits, personal, intellectual, religious.

RICHARD W. HILEY.

ART. IV.—THE ELLAND CLERICAL SOCIETY.[1]

THE Society which bears this name was founded in 1767, mainly through the exertions of the well-known devoted and energetic Vicar of Huddersfield, the Rev. Henry Venn, in order to afford to the Evangelical clergy of the last century, comparatively few in number, and widely scattered, as they were, opportunities to meet together from time to time for spiritual counsel and fellowship, and mutual edification. It was under considerable difficulties, owing to the lack of facilities for travelling which existed a century ago, that these gatherings were held. How much they were needed and valued by those who attended them may be inferred from the following words which occur in the prayers which are still used at the opening and closing of the meetings of the Society, as they have been from its commencement:

"We bless Thee that Thou hast put it into our hearts to meet together for the purpose of furthering one another in the work of the ministry. We thank Thee for the liberty we enjoy, and that things are so peaceably ordered by Thy Providence that we can thus assemble together, none making us afraid. O our God, what would our forefathers have given for so great a privilege!"

"O merciful Father, how much are we indebted to Thee for these pleasing and profitable interviews! We adore Thee for making them so often the happy means of renewing our friendship, gladdening our hearts, and strengthening our hands in

[1] The writer of this article, who has been a member of the Society for twenty-nine years, desires to express his acknowledgment of the aid he has derived from "A Review of the Origin and History of the Elland Clerical Society," compiled by the late Canon Hulbert, and published in 1868.

Thy blessed service. O our God, what a mercy is it that, whereas in the world we meet with many difficulties and discouragements, Thou favourest us with such precious means of instruction, edification, and consolation!"

Until 1771, when Mr. Venn resigned the living and removed to Yelling in Huntingdonshire, the meetings were held at his house four times a year. After that date, as he was succeeded by a Vicar of uncongenial views, they were transferred to the village of Elland, an ancient chapelry in the parish of Halifax, where the Rev. George Burnett, the perpetual curate, and one of the earliest members, received the Society at his house. The meetings continued to be held at the same place during his incumbency and that of his successors, Thomas Watson and Christopher Atkinson—a period of upwards of seventy years —until the death of the latter in 1843. From this long sojourn at Elland the Society derived the name which it still retains, although since the year 1843, when it met once at St. James's Parsonage, Halifax, it has returned to its original and more convenient place of meeting at Huddersfield, where it has been hospitably welcomed at the Vicarage under the following successive Vicars—Josiah Bateman, Samuel Holmes, William Bainbridge Calvert, and James Waring Bardsley.

With the removal from Elland the recorded transactions of the Society commence.

In order to secure the unity of sentiment and the personal character which are essential to the success of such a body, the number of members has been limited, formerly to twenty-five, now to thirty; and the mode of election guarded, so as to preserve the distinctive character of the Society. The result has been conducive, in a remarkable degree, to the internal harmony and prosperity of the brotherhood, and to the confidence which it has secured among the friends of Evangelical truth.

Among the well-known and honoured names of former members are found those of Venn, Stillingfleet, Burnett, Powley, Crosse, Richardson, Atkinson, Riland, Wade, Olerenshaw, Wilson, Whitaker, Roberson, Knight, Smith, Coulthurst, Dykes, Franks, Graham, and Kilvington, from amongst the generation which originated our great religious societies at the end of the last, and the beginning of the present, century.

In more recent times the following names occur: Maddock, Carus, Wilson, Knight, Redhead, Tattersall, Hill (Archdeacon), Jarratt, Bateman, Birch, Sinclair, Blunt, Meredith, Richardson (Archdeacon), Bull, Blomefield, Sale, Musgrave (Archdeacon), Long (Archdeacon), Camidge, Brown, Falloon, Carr-Glyn, Goe (Bishop), James Bardsley, Hulbert, Roberts, Gibbon, Brooke, and Jackson, and the three latest Bishops of Sodor and Man.

The number of clergy who have been enrolled as members is 172.

At the meetings a portion of the Greek Testament is read and commented upon by those present, and one of the following Articles freely and unreservedly discussed, each member in turn giving the result of his experience:

Article I. On Public Preaching;
" II. On Gospel Truths;
" III. On False Doctrines;
" IV. On Meetings for Mutual Edification;
" V. On Personal Inspection and Pastoral Visiting of the Flock;
" VI. On Visiting the Sick;
" VII. On Catechizing of Children and Instruction of Youth;
" VIII. On Confirmation;
" IX. On Extending the Influence of the Gospel at Home;
" X. On Foreign Missions;
" XI. On Ruling their own Houses well;
" XII. On Particular Experience and Personal Conduct—

a list which embraces the whole field of clerical duty.

The business at the meetings is conducted by a Director, this office being undertaken by each member in turn, according to seniority of admission, for two consecutive meetings.

After its establishment at Elland the objects of the society were, in 1777, enlarged by the adoption of a design to raise a fund with a view to the education of poor young men of piety for the ministry. One of the results of mutual conference among the members had been the discovery that there existed a great want of devoted men sincerely and intelligently attached to the Church of England; and also that many who were desirous of entering holy orders were unable, through narrow circumstances, to complete the necessary preparation either at the Universities or under private tuition, and that on this account not a few who were zealous to do good sought an opening for usefulness by joining the ranks of Dissent.

Among those who were hindered by pecuniary considerations from entering the ministry were many sons of clergymen, and to the assistance of these the attention of the Society was specially, although by no means exclusively, directed.

Upon this design being made known, liberal pecuniary help towards its accomplishment was furnished by those who were in sympathy with the principles of the Society in donations and annual subscriptions, which, while fluctuating in amount, have never from that time to the present failed to place at its disposal very considerable means for this purpose, to which

they have always been immediately applied, never being allowed to accumulate.[1]

It may be mentioned that all the members subscribe annually to this fund, in addition to defraying all the expenses connected with its administration, and the conduct of the meetings, with the exception of a small sum (under £5 per annum) for postages and printing.

Through the aid of the grants which the Society has from these funds been enabled to make, no fewer than 325 young men have received the advantages of a University education with the express design of entering the ministry of the Church of England. It may be here mentioned that all pensioners, when they are elected, sign an undertaking that, should they devote themselves to any other work than that of the ministry, they will return the money they may have received from the Society.

At the present time every candidate for aid is required to fill up a printed form of application, giving particulars as to himself, and also to furnish the names of three clergymen able to bear personal testimony as to his character and fitness, to each of whom a paper of questions is addressed. If the result be considered satisfactory, he is invited to present himself at one of the meetings, when he is examined partly in writing and partly *vivâ-voce* in classics and mathematics, in order to ascertain the probability of his being able successfully to pass through and profit by a course of training at the University; in Holy Scripture, the Greek Testament, and the Prayer-Book and Articles.

Among the pensioners in former days have been the honoured names of Thomas Thomason, formerly chaplain of the Honourable East India Company at Calcutta, and translator of the Scriptures into the Hindustanee language, and Samuel Marsden, the first chaplain at Botany Bay, and the apostle of New Zealand, both of whom in after-years expressed and gave

[1] Among the names of munificent donors appear the following, with the total amount of the contributions of each: William, second Earl of Dartmouth, £241; William Wilberforce, Esq., M.P., £2,565; Henry Thornton, Esq., £3,380; John Thornton, Esq., £300; Mrs. Bouverie, £1,350; Rev. Charles Simeon, £275; Sir Richard Hill, M.P., £175; — Daw, Esq., £185; Rev. Dr. Kilvington, £200; Robert Thornton, Esq., £200; Lady Catherine Murray, £220; Sir Charles Middleton, £130; Richard Hoare, Esq., £260; Rev. G. Burnett, £100; W. Hey, Esq., £104; Lord Carrington, £50; Rev. William Romaine, £78; Rev. W., M.A., former pensioner, £200; Rev. J. W. (India), former pensioner, £150; the Misses Harrison (Sheffield), £1,185; Rev. T. T., being all the money expended on his education, £400; Henry Wilson, Esq. (Sheffield), £1,155; Canon Jackson (Leeds), £195, etc. Many and considerable legacies have been also from time to time left to the Society, including one of £1,500 in 1813; and another amounting to £6,434 by Mrs. Disney Robinson.

substantial proof of their gratitude to the Society. It is interesting to know that the poet Henry Kirke White was accepted as one of the Society's pensioners. On his arrival, however, at the University he was taken up by Rev. Charles Simeon and other friends, the devoted Henry Martyn showing a lively interest in the young man, whose career, so full of bright promise, was cut short by an early death. The names of other pensioners who afterwards distinguished themselves might be mentioned.

Of the value of the aid afforded by the Society in its early days we may form some idea from the following extracts. The first is from Sargent's "Memoir of Thomason" (p. 16):

"At Elland, in Yorkshire, a Society existed—it still lives, and is vigorous in well-doing—the sole (?) object of which was the highly important one of spreading a fostering wing over those aspirants to the ministry of the Church of England whose means were not sufficient to enable them to take the necessary degree at the University. By the advice of Mrs. Thornton application was now made to this institution, the transcendent utility of which will be at once seen when it is known that neither the subject of this memoir nor many others who have been, and now are, ornaments of our Church would ever, in all probability, have become her ministers but for support derived from that source." An interesting account of the examination of the candidate by Revs. Henry Foster and Richard Cecil follows, and his final acceptance by the Society in 1791 was signified. "I am accepted," he writes to his mother, March 18 of that year. "No doubt your heart overflows with gratitude. I am sure mine does. Mr. Atkinson is quite a father to me. The kindness I have experienced at Leeds far eclipses all other favours. 'Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all that is within me, bless His holy Name.'"

From the memoir we learn that the young man was placed under the care of a well-qualified clergyman, who undertook to instruct him without any remuneration, the Society merely paying for his board. In 1792 he became a student at Magdalen College, Cambridge, whence, on the occasion of his obtaining the gold medal and books for the Norrisian prize essay, he wrote to his mother: "Against all expectations, I have succeeded. . . . It will be a testimony to Mrs. Thornton, and to the Society who have sent me here, that I have not misspent my time." In the journals of the Society we read, under date of August 19, 1796: "Resolved, that Thomason be curate to Mr. Simeon at Cambridge." In after-years, before he left England, from a slender income he saved above £400, and repaid to the Society the whole amount which had been expended upon his education.

From the above extracts it will be seen that in its early days the Society frequently assisted young men in their preparation for the University. In this they were aided by Revs. George West, of Stoke next Guildford, and J. Clarke, of Chesham Bois, Bucks, who gave gratuitous instruction and domestic accommodation to the students. This practice has been for some time discontinued, the necessity for it no longer existing.

These extracts also furnish illustration of the cordial relations existing between the members of the Society and their pensioners at the time referred to, as, indeed, at the present day. The treasurer, on behalf of the members, has always been in the habit of giving fatherly counsel to the young men during their University course, and manifesting his interest in their progress. Every term he usually receives a letter from each pensioner, giving some account of himself, which is laid before the next meeting.

The following extract from Rev. J. B. Marsden's "Memoir of Rev. Samuel Marsden" refers to his connection with the Society: "That Mr. Marsden was a young man of more than ordinary promise is evident from the fact that he was adopted by the Elland Society, and placed at St. John's College, Cambridge, to study for the ministry of the Church of England. The Elland Society . . . is an institution to which the cause of Evangelical truth in the Church of England has been much indebted for the last sixty or seventy years. It is simply an association of pious members of the Church of England, who assist young men of enlightened zeal and suitable talents with the means of obtaining an education with a view to the Christian ministry. . . . To this Society Samuel Marsden was introduced by his friend, the Rev. Mr. Whittaker, a neighbouring clergyman; not, it is said, without some apprehension on the part of the latter lest his simple and unassuming manner should create a prejudice against him. Such anxieties were superfluous. . . . The piety, the manly sense, and the modest bearing of the candidate at once won the confidence of the examiners, and he was sent to college at their expense."

In after-life, besides refunding the amount spent upon his education, Mr. Marsden wrote frequent long and interesting letters to the Society detailing his labours, difficulties, and successes. In his latest recorded letter (he died in 1837 in his seventy-second year, after forty years of usefulness in Australia and New Zealand) he writes: "I must live and die a debtor to the Elland Society. It is to their patronage and support that I owe my present situation. It has been my constant study since I was made partaker of their bounty to render myself worthy of their esteem, and never to disgrace the honour conferred upon me by that respectable Society." The biographer

remarks that had the Society done no other good than to send the Gospel to New Zealand, it would not have been formed in vain.

Further testimony to the same effect is derived from the life of the Rev. Charles Jerram, Vicar of Cobham, Surrey, who writes (p. 59): "I must not omit this opportunity of expressing my opinion of the excellence of this Society, the benefits it conferred upon the Established Church, and my own personal gratitude for the kindness I received from it. They commenced operations, and flourished beyond expectations; and at the time I had the happiness to share its benefits I was credibly informed that at least fifty young men, all of them men of piety, some of them of eminent literary attainments, and a few occupying posts of much importance, had been sent by them into the ministry. At the time I entered college there were not fewer than eight or ten on the Society's books at Cambridge."

These extracts, and similar testimony which could be advanced, will not only show the service rendered by the Society to the Church, but also indicate the grateful sense of the value of its aid entertained by the recipients of its bounty.

Although, according to our rule, more recent instances cannot be made public, some idea of the extent of the Society's work may be gathered from the following statistics, relating to the twenty-eight years during which the late Canon Crosthwaite was the beloved and indefatigable treasurer and secretary. The sum of £11,166 was contributed to its funds, and expended in grants, 118 applicants receiving assistance. Of these, in 1888 33 were already beneficed clergy; 5 were working in the foreign mission field; 27 were assistant curates; 10 were otherwise usefully employed, and 26 either at college or preparing for holy orders.

The Society's report for 1894 enumerates 11 pensioners at Cambridge, 4 at Oxford, and 1 at Wycliffe Hall, in the latter University.

In 1892 the Society resolved to make grants to assist promising graduates, with preference to those who had previously been their pensioners, to pursue their studies at Wycliffe or Ridley Theological Halls. It is difficult to overestimate the value of this new departure in its operations, the statement recently made by Archdeacon Sinclair being undoubtedly true, that the weakest point of the Church of England to-day is clerical education. "Very few men," he adds, "come to the parishes with training in, or appreciation of, the composition of sermons or public reading; and many know nothing of pastoral work, and are utterly without

experience of the working classes, or knowledge of working-class ideas or movements."

With a view to remedy this defect, a course of special preparation for the ministry, such as is afforded in the halls alluded to (or in theological colleges), is most desirable; and yet the expense attending it can in many cases be ill afforded by those who have with difficulty been enabled to procure the means to defray the heavy cost of a previous University career.

How strong, on the score of its educational work, is the claim of the Elland Society on the sympathy and support of Evangelical Churchmen may be inferred from the words of an appeal issued by the Conference on the Training of Candidates for Holy Orders, held at Oxford in January, 1890, with the approval of the Archbishops and Bishops of both provinces without exception, and attended by a large and influential body of professors of divinity at the Universities, examining chaplains, and officers of most of the theological and missionary colleges in England.

"There are doubtless many claims at the present time upon the liberality of Churchmen. But to those who are able to look beyond the immediate wants of their own neighbourhood, and to consider what will most tend to the welfare of the Church at large, nothing will seem more important than the supply, in increased numbers, of a fully trained and instructed ministry; and no duty will seem more binding than that of endeavouring to remove any merely pecuniary difficulties that stand in the way of this. For (*a*) to Churchmen the supply and the character of their teachers must necessarily be a matter of the highest moment; and (*b*) a result similar to that which has been seen to flow from the increase of the episcopate would follow any increase in the number of highly-qualified clergymen. Each effective and devoted clergyman becomes a centre of activity and influence, leading to the supply of the other needs of the Church."

The appeal had previously stated that it is proved "that the course of training in the English Church is less prolonged and thorough than that in some other important religious bodies, both in England and Scotland; yet at the same time the expenses it entails are heavier, from causes which are inevitable. The majority of those ordained would find it impossible to meet the expenses of a more costly education than at present. *And the number of men desirous of ordination who have the means for the education even now required is likely to diminish relatively—relatively, at least, to the growth of the population, owing to the diminution of the incomes of the clergy, from whose sons the ranks of the clergy are to a large extent recruited*" (the italics are ours).

These considerations may serve to emphasize the importance of the work of the Elland Society, a large proportion of whose pensioners are sons of clergy, to whose cases, as a rule, preference is given.

The connection of the Society with foreign missionary work must not be overlooked. It is interesting to know that the Elland Society took part, in connection with a similar society at Rauceby in Lincolnshire, and the Eclectic Society in London, in the origination of the Church Missionary Society. The journals contain copious records of the correspondence on missions which took place, and of the resolutions which resulted from it. A meeting of representatives from the societies at Elland and Rauceby was held at the latter place on May 6 and 7, 1795, when the Rev. T. Knight, one of the deputation from the Elland Society, was chairman. Mr. Simeon, of Cambridge, and Mr. Robinson, of Leicester, were also present—in all, fourteen clergymen. Again, the memoirs of Mr. Simeon record a meeting of the Eclectic Society, on February 6, 1796, when the majority were not prepared to recommend any immediate measures beyond the education of young men for the special purpose, either by the Elland or some other society. Mr. Basil Woodd, in his notes, says: 'This conversation proved the foundation of the Church Missionary Society. Several years previous to the formation of that great Society in 1799, the attention of the Elland Society had been drawn to the importance of the publication of the Gospel by Foreign Missions, and in 1797 a student named Nankiwell was sent to the West Indies, and supported by the Society.

The interest of the Society in the cause continued after the formation of the Church Missionary Society, and in 1801 they were urged by the committee of that Society to supply them with men, rather than with funds, which were far more readily obtained.

Many of the pensioners of the Elland Society have, in later years, devoted themselves to foreign missionary work. One recently died on his way to Uganda; another is already there; and a third preparing to go, should the way be opened.

It is a matter for sincere regret that the last Report of the Society (1894-95) discloses the fact that there are many promising candidates, carefully selected, whom the Society is altogether unable to assist, owing to lack of means. We cannot but think that if the work of this venerable handmaid of the Church at home and abroad were more widely known, and its importance more adequately recognised, this would not be the case. An earnest appeal is therefore made to the

friends of Evangelical truth, to strengthen the hands of those who are entrusted with its administration.[1]

Some insight into the inner life of Christian fellowship, of which the Society is the centre, may be derived from an interesting reference in the memoir of Bishop Wilson, of Calcutta, by his son-in-law, Rev. Josiah Bateman, who relates an interview between that venerable prelate and the members, in 1845, during his visit to the Vicarage at Huddersfield:

"On one of the days of their meeting they presented him with an affectionate address, which was read by the Director, Archdeacon Musgrave. He (the Bishop) was so much affected by it as to be incapable of reply, but the address itself was carefully preserved to the day of his death, and found marked among his papers."

"The Elland Society," he (the Bishop) notes in his diary, "met here for discussion. Archdeacon Musgrave, Revs. Bull, Knight, Gratrix, Redhead, Tripp, Sinclair, Crosthwaite, Meek, Haigh, Hope, Bateman, etc. I was much edified and comforted." Again, in a letter, after his return to India, he writes: "Present my tenderest love to the Elland Society, my introduction to which I consider among the many blessings of my visit home. I trust I shall continue to have their prayers. The prayers I collected in England are like a covering cloud, distilling showers of blessing on me in the heat of India. Yes! I remember the dear Archdeacon and the clergy present, to all whom, and more especially to Archdeacon Musgrave, my love."

T. Alfred Stowell.

Art. V.—THE HISTORY OF OUR PRAYER-BOOK AS BEARING ON PRESENT CONTROVERSIES.

Part II.

IN the former article I endeavoured to show that the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI., while distinctly rejecting what belonged to the doctrine of Rome, gave an uncertain sound as regards the doctrine of the Corporal Presence, using language which might seem to be conciliatory towards the Lutherans, but which did not necessarily involve the teaching of the doctrine of Luther.

In the present article we have to deal with the second Prayer-Book of Edward. We have again two questions to

[1] The present secretary and treasurer is the Rev. W. Meredith Lane, Beeford Rectory, Hull, by whom contributions will be thankfully received.

ask; and in answering these, it is important for us to bear clearly in mind what we have learnt in answer to our questions concerning the first book.

1. Our first question is: In what relation did Edward's second book stand to the first?

There appears to have been much misunderstanding on this point.

Yet about the answer to this question, when fairly examined, we can hardly suppose that there is, or will be—we are quite sure there ought not to be—any doubt or hesitation whatever.

But the answer is so important for the purpose we have now in view, that we must be allowed to emphasize the fact that it was just Edward's first book, divested of whatever had sounded a doubtful note—a note which might have grated on the ears of the Reformed, and seemed to any to harmonize with, or be suggestive of, the doctrine of Luther. If it is evident that there was in the first book a steadfast purpose to take quite out of the way whatever could tend in any degree to support the doctrines of Transubstantiation, it is not less evident that the revision which gave us the second book was carefully carried out with a fixed design to let nothing remain that could lend encouragement to the doctrine of a Corporal Presence. If the first book was distinctly anti-Papal, the second book was distinctly and unmistakably anti-Lutheran.[1]

[1] It may be said to have a mediæval (or, rather, *ancient*) basis, with the mediæval superstructure carefully removed, then built upon with a Lutheran framework, from which the interior of Lutheran doctrine has been forcibly and laboriously discarded.

Thus the very remains of what had been received by tradition from the Middle Ages testify to the deliberate rejection of Popery. And the very Lutheran form of the formulary bears clear witness to the evident *design* of altogether eliminating the Lutheran doctrine.

The claim made for the Mozarabic Liturgy as influencing our Reformed Formularies must await the result of further research. There are difficulties in the way of supposing that Cranmer had access to a copy of this rite. But so long as it is admitted that the form of blessing the font (in the Baptismal Service of 1549) "must have been obtained either directly or indirectly from the Spanish Liturgy" (Gasquet, "Edward VI.," p. 185; see also Mr. Burbidge's Letters in the *Guardian* of February 6, 1895), it cannot be regarded as impossible that the Communion Service also may have been similarly affected. And there are not lacking indications that it was so affected (see Burbidge's "Liturgies and Offices," pp. 175, 177, 230; and "Papers on the Eucharistic Presence," p. 511).

It should be noted, however, that with very slight and unimportant variations, the recital of the "words of institution" (which exhibits so striking a similarity to the Mozarabic Liturgy: see Mr. Warren's Letter in the *Guardian*, March 22, 1890) is found to correspond with the formula of the Nuremberg order of 1533, as well as with that given in the Latin version by Justus Jonas of the Catechism of Nuremberg (see Droop's "Edwardian Vestments," p. 44), and with Cranmer's translation of this (see Gasquet's "Edward VI.," pp. 446-448).

Where was the declaration about receiving in each part the whole Body of our Saviour Jesus Christ? It was gone. Where now was the petition for sanctifying the gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of the Saviour?[1] They were nowhere. Where was the statement, "He hath left in these holy mysteries . . . His own Blessed Body and precious Blood"? It had been struck out.[2] Where were the words of thanking

---

And it seems not altogether improbable that this formula may have had its origin in an attempt to make "a harmony of all the four narratives of the institution contained in the New Testament" (Gasquet, p. 446); and we know that Cranmer had long before been studying the Nuremberg form (see Brewer's "State Papers," vol. v., p. 410; see also Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 207). Still, there seems no great force in the argument that Luther cannot have derived it from the Mozarabic, because that rite, "in its continual expression of the idea of sacrifice" (Gasquet, p. 445), would have been distasteful to him.

As regards the Greek Liturgies, it is not doubtful that they were in part known to our English Reformers (see Dowden's "Annotated Scottish Com. Off.," pp. 11, 12), but by some they seem to have been doubtfully regarded (see Gasquet, "Edward VI.," pp. 168, 186, 187). They can hardly be said to have made any very decided or very marked impress on our English Communion Service. Their influence cannot be spoken of with any certainty. Yet certain features seem to indicate some probable derivation (see Burbidge, p. 194).

I much regret that in an article in the CHURCHMAN of February, 1892, I was misled by an error of Palmer in stating that the Liturgy of St. James had been printed at Rome in 1526. I am indebted to Mr. Tomlinson for kindly pointing out this mistake (see Swainson's "Greek Liturgies," Introduction, p. ix). It was published (with others) in Latin at Antwerp, 1560; and in 1562 it was quoted in the Council of Trent (see Theiner, ii., pp. 69, 91; see also Jewel's Works, "Sermon and Harding," p. 114, P.S.).

[1] See the reason for the change as given by Bishop Guest (Dugdale's "Life," pp. 147, 148), Cosin (Nicholl's "Additional Notes," pp. 45, 53; and "Works," A.C.L., vol. v., pp. 470, 471). The effect of the change was pointed out by Bishop Scott, of Chester, in his speech before Parliament, 1559 (see Cardwell's "Conferences," p. 113). The change had been urged by Bucer (see "Scripta Anglicana," p. 468).

[2] In 1549, in the exhortation, when "the people be negligent," we have these words: "Wherefore our duty is to come to these holy mysteries with most hearty thanks to be given to Almighty God for His infinite mercy and benefits given and bestowed upon us His unworthy servants, for whom He hath not only given His Body to death and shed His Blood, but also doth vouchsafe, in a Sacrament and mystery, to give us His said Body and Blood to feed upon spiritually" (Cardwell, p. 276).

In the exhortation to be said "some time" in the book of 1552, we have a corresponding statement, but with a sentence altered (and very awkwardly expressed in the alteration), obviously for the purpose of avoiding anything like a Lutheran sound, thus: ". . . most hearty thanks, for that He hath given His Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance, as it is declared unto us, as well by God's Word as by the Holy Sacraments of His blessed Body and Blood" (Cardwell, p. 286).

God "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"? They have been changed into the words, "for that Thou hast vouchsafed to feed us who have duly received these holy mysteries."[1]

Labour and learning and ingenuity indeed have been expended, and taxed to the utmost, in the endeavour to find yet some dens and caves in which the doctrine of a Corporal—*i.e.*, a local (called "supra-local")—Presence may still find a lurking-place. But surely the very shifts to which they have been driven in these attempts afford an evidence of the carefulness and thoroughness with which our Reformers eliminated everything that had a sound or a semblance of anything beyond the doctrine of the Reformed.[2]

The change made in this at the last review not only removed the awkwardness of the expression, it was also *doctrinally* preferable (see "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 433, 484-488). The carefulness to shun anything like the Corporal Presence had given to the awkward expression something too much like a (so-called) Zwinglian sound. It might have seemed to some to look like an ignoring of the true *Unio Sacramentalis*, as taught by "Reformed" divines (see "Eucharistic Worship," pp. 182-184).

[1] This post-Communion thanksgiving is a Lutheran form with the words of Lutheran sound thus extracted. It is taken from the Brandenburg-Nürnberg Order (see Jacob's "Lutheran Movement in England," p. 243). So also the words of distribution in the first book, "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee," "shed for thee" (which were unknown to the Mass), were adopted from the Nürnberg formula (*ibid.*, p. 242); and their omission in the second book was doubtless owing to some (needless) suspicion that they might be capable of suggesting the idea of the Lutheran doctrine of the Presence. The words substituted in 1552 were strongly anti-Lutheran in sound—sufficiently so to correct any misapprehension from the use of the earlier form, when the two forms were combined in the book of Elizabeth. It seems to have most resembled the form of John a Lasco (see Cardwell, "Two Liturgies," Preface, pp. xxx, xxxi).

Dean Aldrich declares, "'Tis manifest that neither form single, nor both of 'em together, either owns a *Corporal* or denies a *Real* Presence" ("Reply to Two Discourses," p. 7, Oxford, 1687).

[2] The idea that the revising hand was a foreign hand, and the revision an un-English work, must be altogether abandoned. It is nothing but a prevalent misconception that we have to think of the changes as owing to the guidance and direction of Continental Reformers. Peter Martyr's letter to Bucer (of January 10, 1550-1551; see Gorham's "Reformation Gleanings," p. 229) makes it evident, not only that he had not been consulted, but that he had not even been well informed as to the "many alterations" which had been concluded on (see Collier's "Ecclesiastical History," vol. v., p. 434). He did not even presume to ask Cranmer for information as to "what these corrections were" (see Burbidge's "Liturgies and Offices," p. 166). But it by no means follows that the English action in the matter had received no impulse from the influence of Reformers from abroad. In the same letter Peter Martyr "gives God thanks for making himself and Bucer instrumental in putting the Bishops

Some may perhaps think that this carefulness was excessive, and allowed to run to extremes. But its aim, its purpose, its design, is too manifest to admit of any fair question for those

in mind of the exceptionable places in the Common Prayer." It must not, however, be supposed that Bucer's "Censura" was taken as a guide to be followed in the revision (see Cardwell's "Two Liturgies," Preface, pp. xxvii, xxviii).

There is good reason to believe that our English Reformers, in preparing the second book, were entering heartily into a *perfecting* work, which was in view in their original design (see "Papers on the Eucharistic Presence," pp. 513-516, 497-501).

It has been said by a learned writer: "What we are concerned to show is that there was no sudden and abrupt change after the publication of the first Prayer-Book, as if different parties and different interests had been concerned in the drawing-up of the two Prayer-Books, but that there was a scheme deliberately planned from the first, the idea being to get rid at all hazards of the service and doctrine of the Mass, and the sacrifice, by representing the matter as one of reform, and not of abolition" (*Church Quarterly Review*, October, 1892, p. 58).

"It [the book of 1549] was designed as a half-way house towards a second Prayer-Book, which should be more unequivocally Protestant in tone. And that this was so is abundantly evidenced in the correspondence of the day" (*ibid.*, October, 1893, p. 137).

If the leading foreigners "affected for a time the whole character of Liturgical worship in England" (Luckock, "Studies," p. 65), it was only because our English Reformers were at one with them in their "Reformed" views, and were willing from any quarter to accept suggestions which might commend themselves to their judgments (see Cardwell's "Two Liturgies," Preface, pp. xxviii-xxx).

As regards the very improbable report "carried about in Frankford" that "Cranmer had drawn up a book of prayers a hundred times more perfect," Jenkyns observes that Strype "is fully justified in treating it as altogether unworthy of credit" ("Cranmer's Works," Preface, p. liv). Dr. Cardwell, indeed, considers the report "an exaggerated statement rather than as entirely groundless" ("Two Liturgies," Preface, p. xxxv); and he thinks "we may infer that he [Cranmer] was not satisfied with it [the book of 1552] in all respects from the order of Council, which was issued soon afterwards in explanation of the kneeling at the Communion" (p. xxxvi). But, then, Dr. Cardwell had not seen the letter of Cranmer which Mr. Perry has printed from the STATE PAPER OFFICE in his "Declaration on Kneeling" (pp. 77, 78), which shows clearly, not only how little disposed Cranmer was to sympathize with the objections to kneeling reception, but also how little inclination he had to yield to the pressure for further innovation from "these glorious and unquiet spirits, which can like nothing but that is after their own fancy; and cease not to make trouble and disquietness when things be most quiet and in good order." He adds: "If such men should be heard, although the book were made every year anew, yet should it not lack faults in their opinion."

The great value of this letter consists in this—that it shows that Cranmer (while he had willingly set to "his hand and his axe" with the rest at the perfecting of the Prayer-Book by giving it a distinctly "Reformed" character) was sensible of the danger to the Reformation from the violent tendencies of extremists, and was resolved, as far as in him lay, to protect the Church of England from the floods which might result from the rising tide of Puritan innovation.

who will honestly look at the facts. And this carefulness did not stop at the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation. It did not confine itself to the matter of the Eucharistic Presence. We are familiar in our day with the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice,[1] and with that doctrine as made dependent on the doctrine of the so-called Real Objective Presence. The claim is made on behalf of a Christian *sacerdotium*, that its function is in this Sacrament to offer sacrificially a sacrificial and propitiatory memorial before God (with the really present Body and Blood of Christ on the altar) of the one sacrifice on the Cross. And this claim is too often made to rest on forced interpretations of our Blessed Lord's words in the institution of the Lord's Supper. This claim, indeed, has been abundantly disproved. It is actually void of any scriptural warrant; and we may be well assured our English reformers, with Cranmer at their head, would never have allowed it. They were dead against any such teaching of the Eucharistic sacrifice. They saw in it the roots of all the vain superstitions and blasphemous delusions of the Papacy.[2]

But if the words of Edward's first book,[3] which spoke of "making here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the memorial which Thy Son hath willed us to make," had been allowed to remain, they might have afforded something like a colourable pretext as a shelter for a doctrine making something like an approach to such a perversion of the truth.[4]

---

[1] In this connection it should be observed that, whereas in the first book there had been a prayer "for the whole state of Christ's Church," which ended with a recommending the dead to the mercy of God. This *recommendation* was omitted in the second book, and the words "militant here on earth" were added in the prefix, "to show that the Church not only did not practise intercession for the dead, but even carefully excluded it" (Cardwell, "Two Liturgies," Preface, p. xxxiv).

[2] In this matter Luther and the Lutherans would also have agreed with them (see, *e.g.*, "Historia Comitiorum, MDXXX., Augustæ Celebratorum," Frankfort-on-Oder, 1597, folios 53, 54).

[3] It has been said "Cranmer substituted a new prayer of about the same length as the old Canon, leaving in it a few shreds of the ancient one, but divesting it of its character of sacrifice and oblation. Even the closest theological scrutiny of the new composition will not detect anything inconsistent with or excluding Luther's negation of the sacrificial idea of the Mass" (Gasquet's "Edward VI.," pp. 223, 224). This is true; and the words quoted in the text, as interpreted by the animus which governed the revision, would convey no idea of the *Mass-sacrifice*. But, as regarded by themselves, they must be allowed to be also not incapable of conveying a sense not inconsistent with a sacrificial idea. Indeed, they are appealed to by Canon Luckock ("Studies," p. 45) as evidence to show that the Revisionists of 1549 "were extremely careful to avoid bringing the sacrificial view into discredit."

[4] The words of Institution constitute the Lord's Supper an ἀνάμνησις—

It is true, indeed, that the sting of such teaching may be said to have been taken away in the taking away of the doctrine of the Corporal Presence. Nevertheless, the vigilance of the Revision could not suffer such language to remain. And in the second book not only is this language rejected, but with it is rejected whatever could be regarded as being accessory to such a system of teaching. Everything that could possibly be accounted as a clothing of this doctrine, or a suitable accompaniment to it, is carefully removed. The name of Mass is gone; the altar is turned into a table;[1] the sacerdotal

---

i.e., simply "a perpetual memory" to be *continued*—not a μνημόσυνον—*i.e.* (in the technical terminology of the LXX.), a sacrificial memorial to be *offered* by a ἱερεύς on the altar to the Lord (see "The Eucharist considered in its Sacrificial Aspect," Elliot Stock, pp. 23, 24).

The language of the second book admits only the idea of ἀνάμνησις. The rejected language of the first book was certainly capable (as we think) of suggesting the idea of μνημόσυνον.

If this is so, the doctrinal significance of the change is not to be depreciated, especially when viewed in connection with what is sometimes called the *dislocation* of the Prayer of Oblation, the design of which was evidently to separate its sacrificial language from any possible connection with the consecrated elements (see "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," No. VII., pp. 454, 555).

The μνημόσυνον may be said to ask for (if not to demand) some sort of Real Objective Presence. For the ἀνάμνησις any such Presence is superfluous. The μνημόσυνον is co-related to a θυσιαστήριον. The ἀνάμνησις needs only a τραπέζα Κυρίου (1 Cor. x. 21).

The word ἀνάμνησις, when standing alone, never (we believe) makes approaches to the signification of μνημόσυνον (see "Eucharist considered in its Sacrificial Aspect," Note I., p. 23; and "Some Recent Teachings concerning Eucharistic Sacrifice," pp. 10, 15, 16).

[1] An order of Council had been issued for changing altars into tables in 1550. This order was perhaps in conformity with law; but some earlier episcopal orders had gone before the law. While the name "altar" remained, it was explained as referring to the "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" (see Edward's letter to Ridley in Bulley's "Variations," p. 147). One of the "reasons" given by the order in Council for the change is this, that "the form of a table shall more move the simple from the superstitious opinions of the Popish Mass unto the right use of the Lord's Supper. For the use of an altar is to make sacrifice upon it; the use of a table is for men to eat upon" (Foxe, "Acts and Monuments," vol. vi., p. 6, edit. Townsend, 1838).

The second "reason" justifies the change on the ground that the Book of Common Prayer calleth the thing "indifferently a table, an altar, or the Lord's board, without prescription of any form thereof."

It has not, perhaps, been generally noted how the first Prayer-Book had prepared the way for the removal of altars. For while it retained in five places the word "altar," it introduced (besides the term "God's board") twice the name "Lord's table" ("for the first time," says Mr. Walton, p. 52, "in the rubrics of any Catholic Liturgy"), probably from Hermann's "Consultatio," in which it is also found side by side with the occasional term "altar." It had been used also in the "Order of Service of the Church of Denmark." "No one," says Mr. Walton, "acquainted with these two foreign manuals can have any doubt as to the thoroughly

vestments[1] are not to be seen; last, not least, the eastward position[2] is to be used no more.[3]

2. Now, whatever we may think of this very bold and decided, not to say *slashing*, work from the Liturgiologist's

---

Protestant and non-sacrificial intention of their language. It is important, then," he adds, "to trace this term 'Lord's table' to its true source, because generous attempts have been made to assign it a strictly Catholic sense; but its immediate derivation from foreign Protestants, together with Bucer's use of 'Mensa Domini,' when speaking of the 'altar' of the English Liturgy of 1549 ('Censura,' p. 459, etc.), seems quite conclusive against this higher view" ("Rubrical Determination," p. 52, enlarged edition).

Attempts are sometimes made to represent the omission of the word "altar" from the Prayer-Book of 1552 as having no doctrinal significance, or as indicative only of a desire to restore the "Communion" aspect to the service without excluding the Mass sacrifice. But the other corresponding changes, if we knew nothing of the history of the revision, would suffice to refute every such plea. The change did not, of course, imply that the word "altar" could not be used (as by the ancients) in a sense which might be innocent. But it did imply that there was danger of its being understood in a sense suggestive of false doctrine, and that the revision which was to make the book "fully perfect" should use all caution to shun the danger.

And when Laudian divines defended the use of the word, it was at a time when the danger might by some be regarded as past. So the canons of 1640 assume that, as applied to the holy table, it cannot be understood in a "proper" sense, and that the Corporal Presence (now regarded by some as essential to the Eucharistic sacrifice of the altar) can have no place in the Liturgy of the English Church.

Mr. Warren assures us (*Guardian* of March 4, 1891) that in Western Liturgies *altare* is the rule; *mensa* is the exception. In Eastern (Greek) Liturgies *τράπεζα* is the rule, *θυσιαστήριον* the exception.

[1] It should be observed that the first book of Edward left the use of the vestment (or chasuble, the essentially sacrificial vesture) optional. "It may be taken as certain," says Gasquet, "that those attached to the ancient custom would vest as before, whilst those who desired change would adopt the cope, which broke with past ecclesiastical tradition and the universal practice, and enabled them to display their rejection of the sacrificial character of the service" (p. 190). Cranmer himself officiated "in a cope, and no vestment, nor mitre, nor cross, but a cross staff was borne afore him" ("Grey Friars' Ch.," p. 60; quoted from Gasquet, p. 241).

It is evident that the service drawn up in 1533 for Brandenburg and Nuremberg had its influence on the book of 1549. And in that order it is directed that "the priest is not to wear a chasuble, but a cope only; or in village churches, where there are no copes, a mere surplice, lest simple folk should imagine it was intended to celebrate Mass after the former fashion without communicants" (see *Church Intelligencer*, January, 1891, p. 12).

But, then, it must be observed that the book of 1549 differed from the German in that it at least allowed the chasuble.

It may probably be that the sacerdotal character of the chasuble was not always ascribed to it (see *Church Quarterly Review*, January, 1891,

---

[2] See note [2] on p. 434.

[3] See note [3] on p. 434.

point of view, it ought certainly to be admitted that it makes the answer to our second question very easy.

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

Can any doubt that it was not only distinctly, but strongly, anti-Lutheran? Is it possible to question that it set forth the Eucharistic doctrine of the Church of England as strictly and straitly adhering to that of the so-called Sacramentaries?[1]

Some years since an English clergyman was met in the

---

pp. 460, 461). But it will hardly be questioned that (at the date of the Reformation) the distinction between the chasuble and the cope was pretty generally recognised (see Scudamore's "Notitia Euch.," pp. 66-75, second edition; see also Marriott's "Vestiarium Christianum," pp. 224, 225).

[2] The rubric at the commencement of the first book ordered the priest to stand "humbly afore in the midst of the altar," which in the second book is changed to "the north side of the table." This is what we mean by the rejection of the eastward position, not any rubrical direction concerned only with the prayer of consecration.

Archbishop Laud's Prayer-Book for Scotland (1637) allowed the presbyter *for that prayer* to stand so as he could most conveniently use both his hands. And Bishop Wren's own reason for standing on occasion *for that prayer only* with his back to the people was that, being little of stature, he could not otherwise well reach over the book for the manual acts.

None, it may be presumed, would ever think of objecting to the occasional convenience of such a posture *in this part* of the service if all doctrinal significance were removed by the ministers really turning to perform the manual acts visibly before the people.

It may, however, be observed that none of the eleven reasons given by Durandus for the eastward position cover the significance attached to that position by those who value it as teaching the Eucharistic sacrifice (see "Rationale," lib. v., cap. ii., § 57, p. 340; Neapoli, 1859).

[3] These changes should be viewed in connection with corresponding changes in the ordinal (see papers "On Eucharistic Presence," No. 7, p. 533, *sq.*).

What was strictly Roman in the ordinal had been eliminated before. Now there is no longer the delivery of the chalice or cup with the bread.

It should also be observed that in the second book there is no place for what in the first was "the very qualified permission of reservation for a few hours" for sick communion.

[1] M. Gasquet truly says: "It is . . . not a little significant that everything in the first Prayer-Book upon which Gardiner had fixed as evidence that the new Liturgy did not reject the old belief was in the revision carefully swept away and altered" ("Edward VI.," p. 289). And of other changes he truly says: "The only reason which it seems possible to give is that the innovators resolved that it should henceforth be impossible to trace in the new Communion office any resemblance, however innocuous, to the ancient Mass" (p. 291). In spite of Bucer's most earnest desire that the words, "Whosoever shall be partakers of the Holy Communion may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of Thy Son Jesus Christ," might be retained, even at the risk of their being interpreted of a Corporal Presence, they were left out, though "the parallel passage in the prayer of humble access, now removed to a part of the service before the canon, was allowed to remain" (p. 293).

streets of Berlin by a learned Lutheran Professor, who accosted him, saying, "Mr. Ayerst, I have been studying your English Communion Service. Why, *you are Reformed!*"

In England (unhappily, perhaps) the study of the difference between the confessions of the Reformed and the Lutherans is almost out of date. In Germany it is well understood still, and the Professor's language intimated very clearly that he found no trace of Lutheran doctrine in our English Liturgy.

It need not be supposed for a moment that we are claiming for the Church of England to be the champion of opinions now commonly stigmatized (though probably in error) by the name of Zwinglian.[1] There were doubtless some Reformed divines on the Continent who, by the dread of Lutheran doctrine, were driven sometimes towards an opposite extreme. But in England it would seem that (notwithstanding some exceptions) neither did the Lutheran doctrine, nor what may be called the doctrine of bare *significance*, ever obtain any very influential or conspicuous following.

There were never wanting among the Reforming divines abroad those who were vehemently opposed to any teaching which might seem to have a suspicious sound as tending to reduce the sacraments of the Gospel to anything like empty signs. And at home the voices of our English divines, strongly and distinctly anti-Lutheran, were lifted up almost as the voice of one man in strong and distinct renunciation and repudiation of any such tendency to degrade the holy ordinances of Christ.

But the point we wish to insist upon very strongly is this, that not only is the "reformed" character of Edward's second book prominent on the face of it; its true doctrinal position is singularly confirmed and established by the very history of its revision. If the record of the changes made in our Liturgy in the reign of Edward VI. had been the account of one revision only, we should have missed an argument the force of which is now not to be evaded. If all the changes effected in that reign had been made at once—made with one sweep—

---

[1] They should rather be called Schwenkfeldian. But it should be remembered that Zwingle's tendencies and some of his earlier utterances gave occasion for that which "some did exceedingly fear" (Hooker, "Ecc. Pol.," vol. lxviii., § 2). After the "consensus Tigurinus" (1549), the Swiss doctrine was less open to misrepresentation, and should have been better understood. There was then "a general agreement concerning that which alone is material" (Hooker, "Ecc. Pol.," V., ch. lxvii., § 2). It bridged the chasm which had separated the two sections of the Reformed, though some still stood aloof. Our English Reformers generally were very strong in repudiating any sympathy with the views which would have reduced the Sacraments to empty signs (see papers "On Eucharistic Presence," No. V., pp. 269-279).

we should not have been able to distinguish, as we can clearly do now, two distinct steps, with two separate designs (the result of caution[1]), in the matter of our revision. It might then have been just possible, perhaps, that all the changes might have been set down to an excessive caution in eliminating everything that could favour the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation.

As it is, we see *that end* evidently aimed at and accomplished in the first revision. We have another and a further end evidently aimed at and accomplished in the second revision. That further aim was, beyond question, the fully perfecting our Prayer-Book by casting out everything that by a doubtful sound could seem to find harbour for the Eucharistic doctrine of Luther.[2] The first revision was the result of a fixed purpose, whose word of command was, "Let nothing remain that savours of the transubstantiation of Rome." The second revision was as the perfect obedience to a steadfast determination, whose orders were, "Let everything be utterly cast away that can seem to favour the doctrine of a Real Objective Presence in or under the elements."

Now, if this be so, it is a fact which ought to be made prominent. We must be permitted to say that the mists which have been of late years allowed to becloud it ought to be cleared away. The Reformed Church of England has a right to expect of us that we should vindicate her "Reformed" doctrine, and make her true doctrinal position perfectly unambiguous—as unambiguous as it was when Archbishop Whitgift[3] declared before the world that this Church of England had, thank God! been reformed to the quick, and had "refused the doctrine of the Real Presence."[4]

Every Church's Eucharistic Service ought to teach the Eucharistic doctrine to the full, and the Church of England declares in her canons[5] that her Communion Service does

---

[1] The order for the use of the first Prayer-Book had been followed by risings in Devonshire, Essex, Kent, Norfolk, and Suffolk.

[2] See the opinion of Cornelius Schulting of Cologne, as quoted in Gasquet's "Edward VI.," p. 306.

[3] "Mr. Martyr nameth the Popish things which the Lutherans observe to be *the Real Presence*—images, all the Popish apparel which they used in their Mass (for so doth he mean), which *this Church has refused*. What his opinion is of this apparel that we retain I have declared, Tract VII., chap. v., Division 4, where he of purpose speaketh concerning the same. God be thanked! religion is wholly reformed, even to the quick, in this Church" (Whitgift's "Works," P.S. Edit., vol. iii., p. 550).

This was published when Whitgift was Master of Trinity College. Whitgift became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1583 (see papers "On Eucharistic Presence," pp. 34, 37-39).

[4] That is, of course, in the Romish sense. In another sense "the Real Presence" was maintained even by Puritan divines.

[5] See papers "On Eucharistic Presence," No. VII., pp. 462, 463.

teach it to the full. And yet that Service knows absolutely nothing, and the history of that Service makes it abundantly manifest that it has designedly determined to know nothing, has of set purpose refused to know or teach anything of any Real Presence locally under the form of the consecrated elements.

In view of the language of our Liturgy, and in view of what we know from history to have been rejected from our Communion Service, it is now impossible to doubt to which of the two great divisions, "Lutheran" and "Reformed," we belong. In externals, indeed, the Church of England has conformed to neither. And in her independent action she has declined the controlling guidance of both, and she has withstood the dictation of those who, in misdirected zeal for the truth, were sowing discord among brethren.

But not the less is her doctrinal standpoint unmistakable. And even for those resolved to mistake it the history of our Prayer-Book gives evidence which should be decisive. The German Professor said right, "*You are Reformed.*"

I am quite sensible, indeed, that in such matters it is possible, and unhappily rather common, to make a good deal too much of historical arguments. Our responsibility in respect of our symbolical and liturgical standards is to be measured by the plain, natural, and honest interpretation of language, not by recondite historical researches.

The arguments of much plausible special pleading as against the obvious sense of our formularies might be easily dispersed by the force of Lord Selborne's statement: "The propositions embodied in that law [*e.g.*, an Act of Parliament] may have recommended themselves for different reasons to different minds. What was proposed, but not adopted, may have been either disapproved on its merits or simply deemed superfluous. Even, therefore, if the proof of the intention of the mover of a particular proposition were direct and demonstrative, it is *immaterial*, unless it appears *on the face of the law*. Its irrelevancy is still more manifest when . . . the proof is conjectural and imperfect" ("Notes on Liturgical History," pp. 4, 5).

Nevertheless, patent facts of history may very well be summoned as witnesses in support of the natural meaning of our formularies. And the value of their testimony may sometimes be rated high for the defence of those formularies against misunderstanding and misrepresentation.

It is what may be called its indefinite character which has made it possible for the first book to be so differently regarded from different points of view. Thus (1) there are some who would speak of it as Popish, even as Bishop Gardiner (who

had a purpose to serve) claimed for it a "Catholic" character. These have failed to take account of the conspicuous absence of all that could give support to the Mass sacrifice. All "oblation" is absent, and absent because "left out." There are (2) others who regard it as Lutheran, even as strong anti-Lutherans condemned it in its own day. These have not sufficiently noticed the ambiguities of the language which seemed to have the strongest Lutheran sound. It was capable, as Cranmer showed, of a sound sense. (3) Others have pronounced it to be Reformed, even as Latimer regarded its doctrine as not differing from that of the second book. These have scarcely given sufficient attention to the shelter or tolerance (at least) which its ambiguities certainly afforded for Lutheran (occasionally perhaps for more than Lutheran) doctrine.

Those who understood its language in an anti-Reformed sense might fairly be pronounced to be "mistakers." But it cannot fairly be charged against them that the book afforded no loopholes for their mistakes.

But whatever loopholes for mistake there were in the first book, it is obvious that the revision which we have in the second was distinctly designed to stop them. It can no longer be said that there is fair room for mistake. When the second book is fairly compared with the first—and the first is to be viewed as made perfect in the second—it is impossible not to see that its perfecting consists in its dealing with ambiguous language, and that its ambiguities have been dealt with in the way of firmly and of set purpose closing the door against the approaches of Lutheran doctrine.

The well-informed among those who most strongly objected to what they regarded as the dangerous ceremonies retained in the English Church did not (I believe) venture afterwards to charge the Communion Service with being anything but a "Reformed" Liturgy.

It was intended, indeed, to minister to a great National Church, which was well known to contain a considerable variety of opinion. But we must insist upon it that it was intended to *teach* only the doctrine of the "Reformed." And, still more, we must insist upon it that a sidelight from history makes it perfectly clear that it was of set purpose and of fixed design intended to *unteach*, not only the "dangerous deceits" of the Mass, but also the Real Presence as held and taught in the Churches of the Lutherans.

Another question remains to be dealt with in our next article.

N. DIMOCK.

Notes and Queries.

Variations in the Meaning of the Word "Day," as used by St. Peter in his Second Epistle.

BESIDES the intrinsic interest in the study of every word of Scripture, and the incidental light thrown by the results of such study on the literary problems of Text and Authorship, two great subjects which especially attract the believing student at the present hour, may, I trust, receive some elucidation from this brief note.

The first of these subjects is scientific. I refer to the precise meaning of the word DAY in the Mosaic narrative of the creation. The second is Apocalyptic: the meaning of this word when applied to the period of the Second Advent of our Lord and Saviour.

My attempt is to show that no less than eight shades of meaning may be detected in the word DAY, as used in the second Epistle of St. Peter. If this inquiry is concluded in the way which I anticipate, the following inference may, I hope, be fairly drawn, namely, that we have Scriptural warrant for a wide interpretation of the word DAY, particularly when it refers to the remote past, and to the mysterious future of God's dealings.

The word DAY appears ten times in all in this Epistle; the following are the references:

Chap. i. 19.
Chap. ii. 8, 9, 13.
Chap. iii. 3, 7, 8, 10, 12, 18.

The tenth example is not apparent in the English text; but the Greek equivalent of the word DAY is the last word but one in the Epistle. Comparing these passages carefully together, the following shades of meaning can be discerned:

1. The first appearance of light (chap. i. 19).
2. The twelve hours of daylight as opposed to night (chap. ii. 13).
3. The whole twenty-four hours (chap. ii. 8).
4. The periods of the Christian dispensation (chap. iii. 3).
5. The exact scientific day as a basis of computation (chap. iii. 8).
6. The future period of the kingdom of God (chap. iii. 12).
7. A limited portion of that period (chap. iii. 7).
8. A beautiful paraphrase for eternity, namely, "the age-day," (chap. iii. 18).

H. J. R. Marston.

Icomb.

Surpassing the Natural.

Neither the universe nor man is the effect of any one sense or attribute, whether finite or infinite. Nature, whether physical or organic, has not sprung from mere power. Knowing this, we go beyond nature to the Master. The perfect man, who longs for that which is behind the veil, is the whole man in utmost and best development, physical, vital, mental, moral. Every perfect man surpasses nature by laying hold on eternal life. Nature at best is the whole of nature without decay, incorruptible, without pain, without sorrow, without death; at this best the natural surpasseth itself.

Science, subjecting nature, makes discoveries faster than we know the full meaning of them. Art in poetry and general literature; in painting, in sculpture, in architecture, that perfection of the two—"the poet's

dream of beauty frozen into stone"—in music, the romance of sound, always leads on, when guided aright, to something more and better than the natural man imagines.

Religion, not superstition; theology, not priestcraft; Scripture interpreted by wisdom, not as human patchwork, but as by inspiration of God, are making souls capable of, and lifting them into, bliss and splendour. Onward, then, to perfection! Onward to every great and glorious thing!

Beauty and use of the present, use and power of thought, our entering and knowing the unknown, the fact that we are not to regard anything as unknowable, show that nature unites many forces, and these centre in ourselves by lifting us up to God. Our whole man concentrates itself, enthrones itself, in reasonable, holy, happy intercourse with eternal majesty and infinite love.

Even if we are only as one in nature, God never loses us at any time. Those sperm-cells and ova, which give rise to succeeding generations, do not die. The continuity of the germ-plasm in an unbroken line, from generation to generation, to children's children, is a fact; and so we live on after death in those who follow us. We move, the worlds move, to a grand consummation. Not a dash, crash, destruction! No grandeur in that. We are not a flock of sheep for some great butcher. Patience, moral discipline, self-denial, the Divine and human key to the universe, open to us the possession and perfection of the world. We are sons and daughters of the Lord God Almighty, through Jesus Christ, with whom we shall live for ever.

JOSEPH WILLIAM REYNOLDS.

Review.

St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen. By. W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D. London: 1895. Hodder and Stoughton. Price, 10s. 6d.

THIS work is one of the most brilliant and satisfying pieces of expository criticism we ever remember to have seen. Alike in the fulness of the writer's knowledge, the vigour and perspicacity of his style, the masculine grasp of the subject which is everywhere displayed, the book is admirable. That Professor Ramsay has materially and permanently enlarged the horizon of modern New Testament criticism would be evident from the present work alone; but this book is only the latest fruit from a tree which has already produced a splendid harvest. "The Church in the Roman Empire," "The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia," and, above all, "The Historical Geography of Asia Minor," cannot be dispensed with by the historian; they are already become the chief mine from which will yet be dug material to furnish forth commentaries upon, and elucidations of, the *cruces* of New Testament criticism. The special object of this new work of Professor Ramsay is to investigate the Acts of the Apostles, in conjunction with certain Pauline Epistles, discussing the questions of the trustworthiness of these documents as occasion requires; and then, from this basis, to build up what the writer holds to be the true account of the missionary efforts of the great Apostle of the Gentiles from their commencement till the day of his death at Rome, A.D. 65. Chapter i. deals generally with the criticism of the Acts; chapters ii. to xv. with the missionary journeys and labours of St. Paul

himself ; chapter xvi. discusses the chronology of Early Church history—30-40 A.D., and the final chapter deals with the composition and date of Acts.

No one is better fitted in unravelling problems such as are presented to us by the Acts than a writer who, like Professor Ramsay, is intimately acquainted with every step taken by the Apostle himself in his unflagging efforts to plant the Christian Church in the soil of Asia Minor. Such first-hand knowledge is a very different thing from that second-hand acquaintance with remote districts, which writers can work up by laborious search amid literary archives ; first-hand knowledge on the part of the writer begets confidence in the reader, which a knowledge derived from books can never do. Consequently, Professor Ramsay is enabled to set right on not a few vital points even such a scholar as Lightfoot himself ; indeed, he goes so far as to say that the great Bishop's conception of the Acts is an "inconceivable phenomenon," and that, despite his genius, he has (on this point, at least) led English scholarship into a *cul de sac*. The working hypothesis with which Professor Ramsay starts is that Acts was written by a great historian (be it noted that German notions as to the author of Acts—represented by Clemen, Spitta, and others—receive short shrift at Professor Ramsay's hands), who set himself to record the facts as they occurred. Strong partisan he may have been, but for all that he was raised above mere partiality by his confidence that he had only to describe the facts as they occurred in order to make the truth of Christianity and the honour of St. Paul evident. So much, then, for the "scissors-and-paste" theory of the authorship of this remarkable document ; the curious, however, would not do amiss to compare, and contrast, the method of criticism and exegesis employed by so competent and judicious a scholar as Ramsay, on the one hand, and by so subtle and ingenious a theorist as Weizäcker, on the other (see the latter's "Apostolic Age" [E.T.]).

Professor Ramsay (page 7) says, that so far from entering upon his investigations with any prejudice in favour of his present conclusions, he began with a mind unfavourable to it, for "the ingenuity and apparent completeness of the Tübingen theory" had once convinced him. It would indeed be fortunate if all scholars were only candid enough to drop ingenious theorizing in like manner when disproved in the light of sanctified common-sense ; how many a wild guess or clever conjecture, both in New Testament and Old Testament criticisms, would then long since have been banished to the limbo of forgotten audacities !

Difficulties and even mistakes we must expect to find in the Acts, but these are not sufficient to upset the carefully-worded conclusion (given above) at which Professor Ramsay has arrived. And unsolved problems there must be, inevitably ; as Ramsay humorously remarks, "If every question were comfortably and satisfactorily disposed of, where would the philologists be ?"

As a specimen of Ramsay's style and method we may point to his chapter iv. (pp. 121-128) on the Ἐκκλησία, or to his extremely suggestive and thoughtful discussion (pp. 144 *sqq.*) of St. Paul's address to the Galatians. We are not quite certain whether in his section on "the coming of Luke"—who, we are told (page 201), entered into the drama of the Acts at Troas—Professor Ramsay has proved his contention that the "certain man from Macedonia," whom Paul saw in his dream, was none other than Luke himself. It is, however, very noteworthy that it is at precisely this place in the narrative (xvi. 9) that the "we" sections of the Acts begin. In xvii. 18 ("What will this babbler say ?") Ramsay suggests our vulgar expression, "bounder," as the nearest and most instructive parallel to the word σπερμολόγος [ignorant plagiarist]. The

happy but inadequate rendering "Picker-up of learning's crumbs" is ascribed to Dean Farrar; as a matter of fact, Farrar merely adopts it from Browning, who makes use of the phrase in that admirable study of his, "An Epistle of Karshish."

This volume of Professor Ramsay's is excellently equipped with a map, which folds into a pocket at the end; it has been made to illustrate the Pauline world from A.D. 44 to 60, and has the rare merit of not being overburdened with names.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

April, 1896.

Short Notices.

Revue Internationale de Théologie. Avril to Juin, 1896. Berne, also Oxford. James Parker and Co.

THIS review, which has been in existence more than three years, was called into being by the Old Catholic Congress at Lucerne. It may be called the Reunion Review of Continental Christendom. It contains articles in German, French, and English. Among Russian ecclesiastics, Bishop Ruzitschitsch, the Archimandrite Sergius, and Professor Papkoff, have contributed to this number. A proctor of a Greek university, Professor Kyriakos, discourses on Old Catholicism, as also on Alexandrian Theology in general, and Origen in particular. The Patriarch Anthimos of Constantinople sends a noteworthy letter to the editor, Professor Michaud, and the editor, a strong advocate for immediate reunion between the Old Catholics and the East, comments on the Patriarch's recent reply to the Papal Encyclical in very enthusiastic terms. Professor Langen deals with Scholastic and Tridentine Theology. Pfarrer Richterich gives a brief biographical sketch of the late Bishop Reinkens, and Professor Lauchert, besides a copious review of recent Russian theology, tells us how the celebrated Professor Hommel, while recognising the ability displayed in recent German Biblical criticism, holds fast, not only to the historical authenticity of the Old Testament in general, but of the Pentateuch in particular. The English articles are by "Anglicanus," who strives to make foreigners understand the somewhat peculiar position of English Churchmen in the matter of "controversies of faith," in which the "authority" of the Church does not seem to him to be very vigorously exercised; and the Rev. A. J. C. Allen, of Cambridge, reviews the posthumous works of Professor Hort, the discourses on Reunion of the Bishop of Ripon, and other works. This *Revue*, though by no means light reading, is, nevertheless, a sign of the times which no thoughtful man will be inclined to neglect.

Hearty Counsels. By the Rev. J. E. BIGG. Pp. 124. James Nisbet and Co. 1896.

Words of practical advice, addressed mainly to a cottage population in a rural district. No controversial subject is introduced.

The Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary. By the Rev. J. R. PALMER. Pp. 30. Price 6d. Elliot Stock.

This very useful handbook examines thoroughly into this unhappy superstition. It shows by quotations that both Fathers and Romanists in earlier days were opposed to the idea. It examines the Council of Constance in 1414, the Council of Basle in 1431, and the Council of Trent. It shows the tendency to idolatry and other serious consequences;

examines the nature of the Virgin Mary, and sums up the whole question with excellent good sense. It is an admirable manual of the question, and should be in the hands of all who have Roman Catholic friends and acquaintances.

The Parish Church of Llangurig. By Col. LLOYD-VERNEY. Pp. 88. Price 1s. Pulman and Sons.

There is hardly a parish in the country which should not have its history published. This work has been carefully and affectionately compiled by the nephew of Mr. J. Y. W. Lloyd, the antiquary, who restored the parish church at a cost of £11,000. There is a list of the Vicars with biographical notes, an account of the structure by Mr. Baker, the architect, and a description of the ten painted windows, many of which embody scenes from Welsh history and legends. It is a capital model for the construction of such a local history.

Moulton Church and its Bells. By SIDNEY MADGE. Pp. 98. Price 7s. 6d. Elliot Stock.

This is another local history, with eleven illustrations. A historical account of the village is first given, then of the church and its associations, then of the tower and the bells. A chapter gives peculiar uses and customs connected with the bells, and there are ten appendices, containing interesting antiquarian information; and the book concludes with a useful bibliography about bells and bell-ringing. Besides being acceptable as a contribution to local history, the book will be of special interest to all bell-ringers.

MAGAZINES.

We have received the following (April) magazines:

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

The Month.

THE *Daily News* gives an analysis of the new Education Bill, of which we print the chief part:

I.—THE NEW EDUCATIONAL AUTHORITY.

Its constitution: In *counties*, the authority to be a committee constituted at the discretion of the County Council. (Counties may combine and form one educational authority for a group of counties.) In *London*, the County Council to prepare a scheme for the authority

to be approved by the Department. In *Wales*, the committees under the Welsh Education Act to be the authorities.

Its powers: These fall under four heads, according as the work concerns (1) Secondary Education; (2) Technical Education; (3) Poor-law Children; and (4) Elementary Schools. The county authority will be empowered:

(1) With regard to *Secondary Education*: *a.* To aid existing schools out of the funds at its disposal. *b.* To take over and establish schools. *c.* With the consent of school boards to take over and manage higher-grade schools. *d.* To found scholarships, to promote sanitation, and "to give such information to the public as they thought fit."

(2) With regard to *Technical Education*: The new authority will have handed over to it all the powers of the County Councils under the Technical Education Acts.

(3) With regard to *Poor-law children*, it will: *a.* Have charge of children now in industrial schools; *b.* And also, by arrangement with the guardians, of all children in Poor-law schools.

(4) With regard to *Elementary Education*, the new authorities will—*a.* Administer all the Parliamentary grants, both those now subsisting and the new grant under this Bill (see below). *b.* Inspect all schools, in conjunction with the Education Department. *c.* Alter the Code, with the approval of the Department, so as to meet local needs. *d.* Be the School Attendance Committee for all places which have not a school board. *e.* Become the school board of the district in places where voluntary schools break down; but in this case the new authorities "must hand the control and management of the schools over to local managers, and must not themselves manage the schools." *f.* In other places the district will be left to choose whether it has a school board or entrusts the duties of a school board to the new authority.

[For some further powers, see under II. below.]

Its funds: These are of four kinds—(1) The existing Parliamentary grants, which the new authority will administer. (2) A new fund, to be provided by Parliament under this Bill, for the additional grant, described below. (3) The existing County Council rate for aiding technical education. (4) The whole of the "drink money" now given optionally for technical education purposes to the County Councils will be handed over to the new authorities "compulsorily for secondary education."

II.—Relief of Voluntary Schools.

1. An *additional grant* (to be administered by the new authorities) of 4s. per child for *all* voluntary schools and for board schools "in necessitous places." Sir John Gorst put the total amount of this new fund at a little over £500,000 a year for England and Wales.

[This additional grant in all cases to be devoted first to the improvement of the teaching staff, and only in cases where the teaching staff does not require improvement to be applied to other educational purposes.]

2. *Abolition of the 17s. 6d. limit.*
3. *Elementary Schools to be exempt from rates.*
4. *Schools* may be *federated* into groups, and the amounts to which the schools so federated are entitled may be paid in a lump sum, to be distributed according to a scheme to be submitted to, and approved by, the new authorities.
5. *Loans to Voluntary Schools.*
6. *Restriction of School Board Rate.*

III.—RAISING THE EDUCATIONAL STANDARD.

1. The age of full-time school attendance, irrespective of the standard passed by the child, to be raised from eleven to twelve. 2. The age at which half-time attendance becomes permissible is similarly raised from eleven (to which it was raised from ten by Mr. Acland's Act in 1893) to twelve.

IV.—THE RELIGIOUS QUESTION.

In every elementary school, whether board or voluntary, one of the conditions on which it receives the Government grant shall be, that if a reasonable number of parents of children require to have separate religious instruction, then it would be the duty of the managers of the school to permit all reasonable arrangements to be made for allowing that religious instruction to be given.

The *Record* says that an important announcement has been made to the general committee of the Church Missionary Society. "It is, doubtless, a familiar fact that the choice of Bishops for missionary sees, the stipend of which is paid by the Church Missionary Society, has been conducted in the following way. The society's committee has invited its secretaries, in consultation with a few of its own members, to place before the Archbishop of Canterbury the names of two clergy. One of these clergy the Archbishop has almost invariably appointed to the Bishopric. His Grace has intimated that for this procedure he will now substitute the following. The Archbishop will summon four prelates to aid him in the choice of a Bishop for the vacant see. To conference with this body will be invited a small body of representatives chosen by the Church Missionary Society. The society will, through them, submit names to the Archbishop and his council, and the appointment will, as before, rest with the Archbishop. It is possible that the action of the Archbishop may be misunderstood. It may be convenient, therefore, to keep a few facts in mind. In effect no change is proposed. The Archbishop's freedom has always been, and must always be, absolute. There is some reason to believe that he has not invariably adopted either of the names at first submitted in the past; nor have any ever been accepted without full and independent inquiry on his Grace's part. The Archbishop's choice has always, indeed, been a reality. In the next place, the privilege of suggesting clergy for vacant sees is not withdrawn, but retained. So far as this privilege has been of value, it remains just where it did before. The really important change now introduced is in the direction of limiting, not the society, but the Archbishop. Hitherto the Archbishop has acted alone. Now he will follow the procedure customary when Bishops have been chosen at the wish of Australian dioceses, and invite certain prelates to assist him. The Archbishop, it should be added, has expressed in the strongest terms his conviction that under this plan no one could be chosen of whom the society would not approve; but, as a matter of course, if the Bishop-elect were not in sympathy with the society, the society would decline to pay his stipend. Nothing can limit the society's monopoly of the power of the purse. The general committee of Tuesday by resolution expressed its readiness to act in accordance with his Grace's proposal."

The annual report of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts is now being issued. It deals with the 194th year of the society's work, and is, indeed, a marvellous record of spiritual effort both in the past and in the year 1895, with which it is specially concerned. There is hardly any part of the globe in which the society's beneficent labour has not, at some time or other, been manifested. Caring, in the

first place, for "the religious instruction of the Queen's subjects beyond the seas," it has been the means of planting the Church in every part of the British empire. With the solitary exception of the Falkland Islands, every colony in the empire has been, at some time or other, the recipient of its bounty. Many of these are now self-supporting. No fewer than 24 dioceses, which have thus been nursed into a condition of independence, now no longer appear in the society's Report. The work of the society is now being carried on in 55 dioceses in foreign parts, and the chronological list of countries and localities into which the society has penetrated, which are arranged round the impression of its quaint seal on the cover, from "the American colonies" in 1702 to "Delagoa Bay," which forms part of the diocese of Lebombo, is a striking record of progress. At the present time the society is maintaining 769 ordained missionaries, of whom 11 are Bishops. In this list there are no fewer than 133 natives of Asia and of Africa who have been admitted to holy orders. Lay teachers to the number of 2,900 are employed in the various missions, while in the society's colleges 3,200 students are receiving a high education, and 38,000 children are being taught in the schools. The society's missionaries in Korea, in China, and in Madagascar have had their share of peril and anxiety, in consequence of the wars which have prevailed in those countries; yet the Report states that none of them allowed their work to cease, and that at Antananarivo the daily services were not suspended for twenty-four hours. An interesting fact is mentioned, that in no fewer than five important missions the work is done by communities or brotherhoods, who live together under simple rules, but without vows. These are Delhi, Cawnpore, Hazaribagh, Lebombo, and Korea. Of the 16,254 churches in England and Wales, 8,560 support the society. That support amounted in 1895 to something over £90,000, while the total income of the society was £118,258 10s. 9d.

Sherborne School is rapidly advancing to its former position of prosperity under the present Head Master, the Rev. F. B. Westcott, the distinguished son of the Bishop of Durham. It was founded by King Edward VI., and the domestic buildings in the Abbey of Sherborne were transferred almost complete to its use. The magnificent abbey forms the southern side of one of the school quadrangles; and the school altogether is hardly surpassed in interest and beauty by any in the kingdom. The little town of Sherborne in the north of Dorsetshire is particularly healthy; the tone of the school is manly and Christian, and, as Mr. Westcott carries on the teaching of his eminent father, the religious instruction is exceedingly satisfactory. The list of honours on the boards in the new hall is very remarkable, and the school also maintains a high place in athletics. The total expenses of education there are only £100 a year.

The Archbishop of Canterbury has appointed the Rev. Philip Kemball Fyson, Principal of the Theological College at Osaka, to be Bishop of Hokkaido, in Japan, Mr. Fyson's name, together with that of another clergyman, having been submitted to his Grace by the Church Missionary Society. The Bishop-Designate is a member of Christ's College, Cambridge. He took his degree (First Class Classical Tripos) in 1870, and in 1871 he obtained a First Class in the Theological Tripos and was Hebrew prizeman. He was ordained by the late Archbishop Thomson to the curacy of Drypool, Hull, in 1871. He proceeded to Japan as a missionary of the Church Missionary Society in 1873, being stationed at Tokio. Here he laboured for sixteen years. In 1889 he became Acting Principal, and in 1891 Principal of the Church Missionary Society Theological College at Osaka.

The annual meeting of the Clergy Friendly Society was held April 25 at the church vestry of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate, the Chairman of the Board of Management, the Rev. J. W. Horsley, Rector of St. Peter's, Walworth, presiding. The fourteenth annual Report stated that the number of members at the beginning of the previous year was 229, and that 34 applications for membership were received during the year. Of these, three were declined and 31 accepted, thus bringing the number up to 260. The total assets amounted to £4,105, which showed that the average amount of funds per member was about £16. The object of the society is to secure the clergy a guinea or two guineas a week during disablement through accident or sickness. The meeting concluded with an expression of deep regret at the death of the Rev. William Rogers, who had been a steady friend of the society since its foundation in 1882.

Great success is attending the labours of Mr. Rogers, the Vicar of Great Yarmouth, who has now been four years in the parish. With his staff of twelve curates, his six churches, his missions, the vast church of St. Nicholas, the recognition of his work and worth by a Canonry from the Bishop, and the population of 40,000, Mr. Rogers occupies one of the most important positions in the Church. The congregations are increasing, and the number of communicants is larger than the previous annals of the church record.

The Bishop of Bath and Wells has appointed Canon Ainslie to be Archdeacon of Taunton, in succession to the late Archdeacon Denison. Canon Ainslie is one of the most popular and clear-headed men in Convocation, and a moderate High Churchman. The Bishop has presented the Rev. C. de Salis, Vicar of Milverton, to the Vicarage of East Brent. The Bishop has also offered a prebendal stall in the Cathedral of Wells to the Rev. H. P. Denison, who for twenty-five years has assisted the late Archdeacon in the parish.

Sermons in aid of the rebuilding fund of Swansea parish church were delivered in nearly forty churches in the neighbourhood on Sunday, April 12. Since 1885 the voluntary contributions to Church work in what was then St. Mary's parish, including now the four new churches of St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Thomas, and St. Gabriel, have amounted to £74,167, of which £42,607 was given for church extension.

Obituary.

THE death of Canon Jenkins, the most frequent contributor to this review, is a loss not only to ourselves, but to the Church at large. In his own peculiar branch of ecclesiastical and historical learning Canon Jenkins was unrivalled. He was for a great number of years the intimate friend of the late Archdeacon Sinclair, of Middlesex, who corresponded with him on every subject of interest of the day. Although all his life engaged in controversy against the Church of Rome, he maintained friendly relations with Cardinal Manning and other dignitaries, both English and foreign, of that Church.

. It is much to be regretted that so much learning, so facile a pen, and such enthusiastic loyalty to the Church of England as settled at the Reformation, should not have been utilized by the leisure and position of a residential canonry or deanery.

Canon Jenkins took his B.A. degree at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1841, and the M.A. degree in 1844. He was ordained deacon in 1841, and priest in the year following. From 1841 to 1843 he was curate of Willesden, and from 1843 to 1854 perpetual curate of Christ Church, Turnham Green. In the latter year he accepted the rectory and vicarage of Lyminge-with-Paddlesworth, and in 1869 became an honorary canon of Canterbury. He also held the position of honorary curator of the library of Lambeth Palace from 1881 to the time of his death, beside being a member of the Council of the Kent Archæological Society, and local correspondent for the Society of Antiquaries. He was the author of numerous valuable and interesting works on ecclesiastical and antiquarian subjects, among them being "On the Rite of the Pre-sanctified" (1840); "The Judgment of Cardinal Cajetan on the Immaculate Conception, with Introduction" (1858); "The Life and Times of Cardinal Julian, of the House of Cesarini" (1861); "An Account of the Church or Minster of St. Mary and St. Eadburg in Lyminge, from its Foundation in 633" (1858); "The Saxon Dynasty of Kent, and a Pedigree of Kentish Kings" (1867); "History of Canterbury," "Diocesan Histories" (1880); "St. Dunstan and the Church of Lyminge" (1881); and "The Jesuits in China, and the Legation of Cardinal Tournon" (1894).

Of Canon Jenkins' ecclesiastical researches and knowledge his works are the best evidence. His work on "Romanism: A Doctrinal and Historical Examination of the Creed of Pope Pius IV.," published by the Religious Tract Society, is an exhaustive treatise on the claims of the Roman Church.

His sincere love for and unswerving loyalty to our English Church, as established at the Reformation, caused him to regard with the deepest sympathy the Reformed Churches abroad; and his interest centred in the welfare of the French Refugee Church, which worships in the crypt of Canterbury Cathedral, and several of whose anniversary sermons he preached. The liberality of thought he exhibited towards religious bodies other than his own was great, and won for him true and widespread esteem. It was only in September last that he was the recipient of an expression of the good will entertained for him by his numerous friends from near and far on the attainment of his eightieth birthday.

The end of this truly learned and good man has followed very closely upon the death of his wife, which took place quite recently, and which, it is to be feared, he felt acutely.

Mrs. Elizabeth Rundle Charles, one of the most popular writers of a former period, has died at Hampstead, aged sixty-eight. She came of an old Devonshire family, and her father, Mr. John Rundle, represented Tavistock for some years in Parliament as a Whig. In 1851 Miss Rundle married Mr. Andrew Paton Charles (a brother of the present Mr. Justice Charles), who died in 1868. Before her marriage she had begun to write, her first published book being a translation from Neander, "Light in Dark Places: Memorials of Christian Life in the Middle Ages." Other works followed, and were well received; but a decided success was not achieved till, in 1864, appeared "The Chronicles of the Schönberg-Cotta Family." This may be described as one of the most spirited and sympathetic defences of the Reformation ever put into the form of fiction. In 1865 was published the "Diary of Mrs. Kitty Trevelyan"; in 1867, "On Both Sides of the Sea"; in 1871, "The Victory of the Vanquished." For some fifteen years or so Mrs. Charles had not written much; one of her last published works was entitled "Ecce Homo, Ecce Rex." She had always been a Churchwoman, and was the friend of distinguished Churchmen of all schools of thought.