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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

SEPTEMBER, 1896.

ART. I.—THE CHURCH AND THE STATE.

"My kingdom is not of this world."—JOHN xviii. 36.
"The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ."—REV. xi. 15.

THE relations of Church and State, like those of spirit and matter, of soul and body, of metaphysics and physics, of religion and science, have exercised the faculties of the wisest thinkers among mankind, and have given rise to theories and tenets the most diverse and the most contradictory. In the treatment of every one of these subjects there have been some who have laid a disproportionate stress on the supersensuous at the expense of the sensuous, and others who have so unduly exaggerated the natural as almost or altogether to lose sight of the supernatural. The hermit of old regarded the body as nothing but an encumbrance to the soul, as an evil thing incapable of being employed for good purposes. In his judgment it was not merely to be brought into subjection, after the example of the Apostle, but was to be reduced to a state of impotence and inutility. His exact converse, the materialist of the present day, looks upon the body as the only real part of our entity, and considers the soul a mere product of the cerebral tissues. And the mass of mankind have, consciously or unconsciously, adjusted the relations of soul and body in an infinite variety of ways between these two extremes. It has fared in like manner with the problem of Church and State. The mediæval Popes claimed the absolute supremacy of the ecclesiastical over the civil power in matters political no less than in matters religious. If they could have had their way, they would have abolished the secular rulers, and would throughout Christendom have swallowed up the State in one gigantic Church organization, absorbing into itself all temporal as well as spiritual authority. The modern Nonconformist,

however unlike the mediæval Pope in other respects, is one with him in his repudiation of any attempt to adjust the claims of Church and State. He does not, it is true, seek to accomplish the impossible, and to efface the State, but he would effect a complete divorce between it and the Church. Strange to say, he arrives at precisely the same practical conclusion as the secularist, who, standing at the opposite pole, despises religion altogether, and regards it as a baneful superstition. But, while their judgment is the same, they have formed it by entirely different processes of reasoning. The Nonconformist regards the State as, from an ecclesiastical point of view, an unclean thing, and stigmatizes as unholy any alliance with it on the part of the Church. To the secularist, on the contrary, any connection between Church and State is degrading to the State, and, as a citizen, he is anxious for its severance.

There is no doubt that the relations of Church and State, like other human arrangements, have at different times been grievously misdirected; and this misdirection has led to untold suffering and disaster. But the evil results of the abuse of an institution are no valid argument against its proper use. As reasonably might we eschew fire on account of the ruin produced by conflagrations. *Corruptio optimi pessima;* the more beneficial a thing is to mankind, the more fatal are the effects of its perversion. Conversely, therefore, the discovery that the misapplication of a principle produces consequences of a peculiarly baneful character furnishes of itself some ground for suspecting that the right application of the principle is of momentous importance. May not this be the case with reference to the union or connection of Church and State?

We cannot arrive at true notions respecting this union without first forming correct conceptions as to what the Church is, or ought to be, and what the State is, or ought to be, and also as to what are the proper functions of each. It is, in fact, owing to mistaken conceptions on these points that the relations between Church and State have been mismanaged in the past, and are in some quarters viewed with suspicion at the present time.

When we speak of the Church in connection with the State, we clearly do not mean the whole Catholic Church, the mystical Body of Christ. That Church consists of Christians who have passed away from this world centuries ago no less than of those who are now living. Any organic relation between it and such a transitory, sublunary institution as the State is manifestly impossible. Neither do we mean the entire Church militant for the time being here on earth. For that is diffused over the whole face of the globe, whereas the

State is strictly confined within territorial limits. What we mean by the word "Church" in this connection is, to use the phraseology of our Nineteenth Article, a congregation of faithful men possessing the characteristics mentioned in that Article, and located within the geographical area of the State. In theory, and according to right principle, all Christians so located ought to be in communion with each other, and to be members of one ecclesiastical organization.

In defining the State there is no similar need to guard against misconception. The State is clearly the whole body of the inhabitants of a country acting together in their political capacity. If all things were as they should be, this whole body would be Christian. The Church and the State, in fact, in a given country, would consist of the very same aggregate of individuals, viewed in the first instance in their spiritual and ecclesiastical aspect, and then in their temporal and civil organization. This is the condition of things contemplated by the famous preamble of the Statute of Henry VIII. prohibiting appeals to Rome (24 Henry VIII., c. 12), which reaffirms the position laid down in earlier histories and chronicles, that the realm of England is an empire governed by one supreme head and king, unto whom a body politic, compact of all sorts and degrees of people, divided in terms and by the names of spiritualty and temporalty, is bound to bear, next to God, a natural and humble obedience. But this identity of constituent parts, as the Statute goes on to expound, does not imply any identity of functions. The temporalty, or the State, is charged with the preservation of the people in peace and concord, the protection and regulation of their property, and (as is being more and more recognised in modern times) the general promotion of their physical and intellectual welfare. The spiritualty, or the Church, on the other hand, is entrusted with the maintenance of Divine worship, the instruction of the people in the mysteries of revelation, and the dissemination among them of those right motives and principles of conduct towards God and man which are the fruits of Divine life implanted in their hearts. In other words, the State deals with matters external and visible, the outward conduct and earthly well-being of the people; while to the Church is committed the charge of internal and invisible concerns—the thoughts and springs of conduct, and the well-being of the people in its spiritual and eternal sense.

Now, it is easy to see that, with man constituted as he is, these provinces of the Church and the State are incapable of being treated as absolutely independent, or of being walled off from each other by an impassable barrier. In the worship of

the Church there is a material as well as a spiritual element, and in the enlightenment and instruction of the hearts and consciences of men the employment of physical means is necessary. We have, as St. Paul says, our treasure in earthen vessels, and recourse must be had to the mammon of this world to assist in preserving and dispensing it. Moreover, the Church in all ages has not merely inculcated the Divine principle of love to one's neighbour, but has founded and carried on voluntary institutions for giving practical effect to that love by ameliorating the temporal condition of mankind in modes which the State at the time did not regard as falling within its province. At the same time, inasmuch as outward conduct depends much more on the condition of the heart than on external coercion, the State cannot be indifferent as to the nature and extent of the spiritual teaching which the Church administers to its citizens. The Church and the State can, therefore, never be wholly independent of one another. Disestablish the Church as absolutely as you please, yet she will be obliged to have occasional recourse to the civil tribunals for the protection of her property and the enforcement of discipline upon recalcitrant ministers or members of her community, and even to the civil legislature for laws enabling her to deal with her buildings and revenues in the manner required by shifting circumstances.

The history of the Nonconformist bodies in this country affords notable object-lessons on this point. Fifteen years ago a Chancery suit[1] was instituted to obtain a declaration that the minister of a Congregational chapel at Huddersfield was disqualified, on account of his opinions, from exercising the office of pastor in the chapel. In deciding the question, a Chancery judge had to determine what was the precise meaning of the doctrines of the universal and total depravity of man, the predestination of the elect, and the everlasting punishment of the wicked, as laid down in the trust deed of the chapel, and whether the minister complained of had in his writings used language inconsistent with those doctrines. Again, Nonconformists have continually obtained from Parliament Acts modifying or altering the trust deeds of particular chapels. Moreover, the State, on its side, can never concede absolute and unrestrained freedom to the Church. It must, for instance, always exercise a control as to the amount of land which it will permit to be held by a religious body in its midst. It ought in its courts to redress any injustice in respect of office or emolument which a minister or member of the Church has experienced at the hands of the Church authorities

[1] Jones *v.* Stannard.—*Times*, February 2, 1881.

in violation of the laws of the Church herself. It has the further right to repress any religious proceedings which would be injurious to the physical or moral welfare of the citizens. It is true that such proceedings are not easily conceivable on the part of the Christian Church at the close of the nineteenth century. But the principle would clearly apply if we can imagine an attempted revival of some of the licentious religious ceremonies of ancient Paganism. It would also apply if a body of Christians were to conceive the idea that they were in conscience bound to hold their worship and proclaim their faith in the open thoroughfare to the prejudice of the ordinary traffic. Moreover, if in the name and under the cloak of religion a misguided community, in their places of worship and schools, were to preach doctrines and inculcate principles offensively subversive of order and morality, the State would be justified in taking repressive measures; and it would be quite unreasonable to object to such measures as an infringement of religious liberty. The existence of a close relationship between Church and State in times past has been due to a keen appreciation of these axioms, while the mistakes so lamentably made in connection with that relationship have been caused by ignorance of the proper mode of translating the axioms into practice. The Church, unable by exhortation and argument, which are her proper weapons, to retain the whole body of the people within her community, has called upon the State to coerce, by temporal punishments and inflictions, the understandings and consciences of those who have dissented from her teaching. The State, recognising the importance of religion as a bond and bulwark of the body politic, has considered itself justified in applying this coercion to the thoughts and opinions of its citizens. We at the close of the nineteenth century have no difficulty in seeing that, in doing so, the State stepped out of its province and violated the principle of religious liberty. That principle, however, like the cognate principle of political liberty, was, until recently, but very imperfectly understood. In our country in the present day both of these principles are fully realized and acted upon; but we are apt to overlook the fact that both are justified on the same grounds, and are subject to limitations arising from the same considerations. In forgetfulness of this we are now in danger of running into the opposite extreme from our forefathers, and of claiming for religious liberty a latitude and license altogether beyond the bounds of reason and sound philosophy.

The true view is surely this: The kingdom of Christ is not of this world; its weapons are not carnal. The Church has no right to exercise physical compulsion upon the hearts

and consciences of men. Nor does this right belong to the State, since the thoughts and unexpressed opinions of its citizens lie outside its province. Where, therefore, there is a National Church in union with the State, there should be perfect liberty to dissent from it; and such dissent should not be visited with any temporal punishment, nor with any civil disability, except so far as the interests of the State as a whole clearly require it. (The insertion of this exception is, as we have already seen, necessary. It alone can be regarded as justifying, at any rate in the past, if not at the present time, the requirements laid down two hundred years ago, that the Sovereign of this country must be a Protestant and a member of the Church of England.) But the existence of Dissenters in the country does not render unjust or oppressive the maintenance of a National Church—or, in other words, the recognition by the State of one Church as the exponent of the religion of the aggregate nation—any more than the existence of conscientious Republicans and Anarchists in our midst renders it harsh or inequitable to continue the monarchy as our national form of government. Nor is it unrighteous for the State, if it so thinks fit, to tax for the support of the National Church those of its citizens who dissent from her equally with the members of her communion. We may very reasonably regard such taxation as inexpedient, and we may regard with satisfaction the fact that since the abolition of compulsory church rates in 1869 it has altogether ceased in this country. But if the State as a whole considers it desirable, in the interests of the nation, to spend a portion of the public money in the support of a particular form of religion, those who dissent from that form are no more wronged by its action than the taxpayers who conscientiously object, let us say, to the maintenance of warlike armaments are wronged by being required to contribute to the support of the army and navy. The remedy of the dissentients in each case lies, not in adopting the *rôle* of martyrs, but in converting the body of the country to their own view of the subject.

The union of the Church with the State will continue as long as it is considered expedient in the interests of the one and the other. In spite of some signs to the contrary, it may be safely affirmed that the present trend of political feeling is in favour of its maintenance. The State is being more and more influenced in its actions by Christian principles, and it is more and more inclined to undertake and carry on as national institutions measures for the temporal benefit of the people which in former ages have been left to private philanthropy—that is to say, to the domain of the Church. But,

however far the State proceeds in this direction, one work of paramount importance to the earthly welfare of its citizens—the maintenance, namely, of a loving and self-sacrificing spirit in their breasts, must ever remain outside its province, and must be left to the power of religion. Since the promotion of this work is essential not merely to the well-being, but even to the very existence of the State, nothing can be more natural than that the State should desire to have a hand and voice in it; but it can only do so by continuing its connection with the Church. On the other hand, it is not for the Church to stand aloof from any institution or any individual seeking to be associated with her, if the terms and conditions of the association are such as she can, consistently with her fidelity to her Divine Lord, accept. If other terms and conditions be insisted on, she must, of course, at all costs reject them; and in that case the responsibility for any harm or evil which may arise from the failure to associate will rest, not with her, but with the body or individual seeking to impose the unjustifiable conditions.

What, then, are the terms upon which the union of Church and State can be maintained without sacrifice of principle on either side? The only essential principle which the State need insist upon is that it should have a veto over the management and administration of Church affairs; and the only essential principle which the Church requires to safeguard is, that she should be required to do and submit to nothing which is contrary to the law and teaching of Christ. It is obvious, however, that if these are the two correct border-lines within which the relations of a State-recognised Church to the civil power can be adjusted, the relations of Church and State in England at the present day might be substantially altered in favour of the Church, without the severance of her connection with the State; and the fact that so considerable a number among the members of the State and of the State Legislature are not Churchmen renders some change in these relations both just and expedient. In the appointment of Bishops, a veto on the part of the Crown as the executive of the State must be retained so long as the Church is established. But, subject to that veto, the choice of them might be handed over to the Church, provided we are able to solve the very difficult problem of finding a satisfactory body to whom the selection of them might be transferred. So with the laws of the National Church. Parliament must always retain a right of veto; but, subject to that right, the power of making and altering ecclesiastical laws might be relegated to the Bishops and representatives of the clergy and laity of the Church chosen by a satisfactory method of election. In the same

way, the ultimate decision in ecclesiastical litigation must always rest with the Crown, as representing the supreme judicial authority of the State; but the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is not necessarily the best exponent of that authority.

It is, in short, in an amendment, and not in a dissolution of the relations between Church and State, that the path of true progress lies. The ideal set before us is that state of things in which the kingdom of Christ, "not of this world" in its origin—"a stone cut out without hands"—shall have overcome and absorbed into itself all the kingdoms of the world, so that they have become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ; and the time shall have arrived when all "the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into" the new Jerusalem, which is the Church, the Lamb's bride. This ideal requires for its complete realization two conditions—the Christianization of the whole world, and the unification of Christendom. As in the case of other ideals, there may be, and there have been, mistaken attempts to attain to it; and it requires for its fulfilment a spiritual as well as a visible accomplishment. But past failures are no reason for abandoning the quest of the true standard, and the need of the presence of the spiritual element is no ground for neglecting the visible side of the organization. The severance of Church and State, if invested with its logical consequences, means that the State—or, in other words, the nation in its corporate capacity—knows nothing of duty to God and nothing of worship, and, if it recognises the Christian Church at all, recognises disunion as the normal and legitimate condition of Christians. The connection of the Church with the State, on the other hand, means that the State regards duty to God as the foundation of human society and morality, and worship as an essential part of that duty. It means, further, that the State recognises Christianity as the true religion, and unity, not polychurchism, as the Christian ideal. Can we for a moment doubt which of these attitudes it is right for the State to adopt? Can we doubt that it is our duty as patriotic citizens to do all in our power to maintain the State in connection with the Church, and as loyal Churchmen to use our utmost endeavours to adjust the connection upon terms which, while rendering to the State its due, shall also secure to the Church her full rights and privileges?

PHILIP VERNON SMITH.

Art. II.—GROSSETÊTE, BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

THE rapacity of the Court of Rome in the Middle Ages was the subject of general criticism and the ground of general complaint, and nowhere did it show itself in a bolder and more unblushing form than in England. Burdens were laid upon the monarch, upon the clergy, upon the barons, and upon the people at large. They were felt in the remotest hamlet as well as in the high places of the land. There seemed no end to the aids and subsidies demanded by the Pope to fill his exhausted treasury. Exaction followed exaction, tax succeeded tax. The rights of lay patrons were set aside, and presentations to benefices were sold to the highest bidder in the Papal market. Italian clergy were thrust into the best livings of the Church, non-residence and pluralities were carried to the shamefullest lengths. One favoured ecclesiastic is said to have held at the same time as many as seven hundred livings; interdicts and excommunications were lavishly fulminated for purely secular ends, exemptions purchased from Rome shielded the scandalous lives of canons and monks from all episcopal discipline, and everything was done to extort money from this kingdom for the benefit of the Papal exchequer. It was estimated that the benefices held by the Italian clergy in England amounted to 60,000 marks a year, "a sum," says Hume, "which excelled the annual revenue of the Crown."

At last the people, who "preferred to die rather than be ruined by the Romans," rose up in revolt against those tyrannical usurpations, perversive of Christian truth, hurtful to Christian life, and fatal to Christian liberty. "The Pope has no part in secular matters," they cried. Shakespeare makes John say that "No Italian priest shall tithe or toll in our dominions." His tax-collectors were beaten, the tithes they had gathered were seized and given to the poor, the old reverence for the Papacy began to fade away before the universal resentment at its political ambition, its insatiable cupidity, and its degradation of the most sacred ordinances into engines of secular aggrandisement. This courageous English spirit found a powerful and intrepid voice in Robert Grossetête, Bishop of Lincoln. His whole life was spent in a brave and patriotic resistance to the unjust and arbitrary claims of the Roman Pontiff.

Grossetête was born, it would seem, of humble parentage, in the village of Stradbroke, in Suffolk, about the year 1175. We know little or nothing of his early days, but in due course he appeared at Oxford, where he gave himself earnestly to study. He became a proficient in the Greek language, and made himself master of Aristotle, whose works, though exceed-

ingly popular, had up to this time been only read through the medium of translations, and of the New Testament, whose divine teaching he drank in with avidity. Here also he commenced the study of Hebrew, that he might be able to read the Old Testament in the original language. At Oxford he won the admiration of Roger Bacon, no undiscriminating eulogist, who always speaks of him with profound respect. Fra Salimbene, a Franciscan and contemporary of Grossetête, styles him "unum de majoribus clericis de mundo." The influence and example of Grossetête gave an impulse to learning, which was then cultivated with much zeal at the University. But the most renowned seminary in Europe at that time was Paris, and to it Grossetête went, and gave himself, with his usual enthusiasm and energy, to the acquisition of all the knowledge available in the schools of the day. He prosecuted his studies in the Greek and Hebrew tongues, and became, it is said, a perfect master of the French language. Knowledge was then, as may be supposed, in a backward condition. Printing had not yet been invented, nor classical literature revived. But Grossetête, notwithstanding these disadvantages, became a most distinguished scholar. In theological and philosophical learning especially he was, according to the ideas of the age, profoundly skilled. And the consequence was, that he drew on himself from some of his contemporaries the suspicion of magic, as did the famous Roger Bacon, who flourished much about the same time. The reader will remember the reference to both these men in *Hudibras*. Of Sidrophel it is said:

> Yet none a deeper knowledge boasted,
> Since old Hodge Bacon and Bob Grosted.

A new era was coming upon the world. There was a yearning in the hearts of men for relief and liberty and higher life. They were looking with wistful eyes for the dawning of a better day.

> 'Tis time
> New hopes should animate the world, new light
> Should dawn from new revealings to a race
> Weigh'd down so long, forgotten so long.

The day was at hand. The clouds were beginning to break, and the light to shine. Human thought was waking from its long sleep, and struggling to climb up some few of those great altar stairs

> That slope through darkness up to God.

Human reason was grappling as it had not done for centuries with the old gray questions of life and duty and immortality and man and God. It was in this century lived William de

St. Amour, and St. Francis of Assisi, and St. Louis of France, and Joachim di Flor, and Bonaventura, and Thomas Aquinas, and Cardinal Hugo, who all, though not free from many dogmatic errors, helped forward the Kingdom of God in the earth.

After his return from France, Grossetête became Archdeacon of Leicester. And here he showed the same conscientiousness and devotion to duty as he had hitherto done. In one of his letters occurs the following passage: "Nothing that occurs in your letters ought to give me more pain than your styling me a person invested with authority, and endued with the lustre of knowledge. So far am I from thinking as you do, that I feel myself unfit even to be the disciple of a person of authority; moreover, in innumerable matters which are objects of knowledge, I perceive myself enveloped in the darkness of ignorance. But did I really possess the great qualities you ascribe to me, He alone would be worthy of the praise, and the whole of it ought to referred unto Him, to whom we daily say: Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but to Thy name give the glory."

In the year 1235 he was elected by the dean and chapter Bishop of Lincoln, and King Henry III. confirmed their choice. In those days the See of Lincoln was much larger than it is at the present day; and the new Bishop, with an ardour and energy almost unprecedented, entered upon his episcopal duties. He set himself at once to reform abuses; he visited the various archdeaconries and rural deaneries, addressed the clergy, and admonished the people to come together, that they might be confirmed and hear the Word of God preached, and observe the Sacraments of the Church. On these occasions, the Bishop himself usually preached to the clergy, and some friar of the Dominican or Franciscan Order addressed the people.

An eminent writer playfully characterizes the period of which we are writing: "Mankind in the thirteenth century knew not the heavens nor the earth, the sea nor the land, as men now know them. They went to sea without compass and sailed without the needle. They viewed the stars without telescopes, and measured altitudes without barometers. Learning had no printing-press. The lover was forced to send his mistress a deal board for a love-letter. The richest robes were the skins of the most formidable monsters. They carried on trade without books, and corresponded without the postman. Their merchants kept no accounts, their shop-keepers no cash-books." But the evils of the age were not only negative, they were, alas! startlingly positive. The people in general were coarse and ignorant and brutal; the clergy were vicious and ill-informed, only a grade higher in moral and mental standing than their flocks. The state of the Church was tragic, a base

self-interest pervading every class, and misery rife among the poor. The times were sorely out of joint. Roger Bacon's picture of the intellectual attainments of the clergy in his day may be interesting to the reader. He often speaks with severity and reprehension of the studies of his time: how boys were admitted into the religious orders and proceeded to theological study without having laid the groundwork of a sound grammatical education; how the original languages of Holy Scripture were neglected; how children got their knowledge of Scripture, not from the Bible itself, but from versified abridgments; how lectures on the "Sentences" were preferred to lectures on Scripture, and how Scripture was neglected on account of the faults of translation. He tells us further how young men were drawn away from the sacred writings to the study of civil law, which was then the chief source of promotion both in Church and State. Philosophy and theology were discredited, literature in its purer forms was almost extinct, so that Bacon himself, to use his own pathetic words, lived "unheard, forgotten, buried." There was no one to appreciate the greatest genius of his time.

This was the kind of material on which Grossetête had to work, and he set himself with indefatigable activity, and with a zeal that showed itself at times too intolerant, to effect a reformation of manners in his diocese as well as in the Church at large. It was in the domain of practical evils more than of doctrinal errors that the Bishop showed the strength of his mind. Here he never failed to act with sincerity and vigour. Matthew Paris styles him "religiosorum fatigator indefessus." With him Christian morals were inseparable from Christian faith. He endeavoured to bring back the festivals of the Church, which had grown into disuse, or had been converted into occasions of riot and debauchery, to their sacred character. But it was against the clergy he chiefly inveighed, and them he specially sought to elevate and reform, knowing that their example would inevitably influence the morals and habits of the people. Could he inspire them with something of his own spirit, it would be, he felt, the prelude to an immediate and general improvement of the people.

We must remember that Grossetête held the highest hierarchical notions. Sacerdotalism was the very life of his soul. The clergy were with him God's vicegerents upon earth, invested with the tremendous prerogatives claimed by the Church of Rome for those who minister at her altars in every age. He was not a reformer in the sense of Luther or Cranmer or Knox, or even as Reuchlin, Erasmus, or Colet. He adhered to the strictest orthodoxy of his time; his views of reformation embraced only the discipline and administration of the Church,

and though he did not hesitate to speak of an individual Pope as Antichrist, he stoutly maintained that it was only through the papacy all ecclesiastics could derive their commission and spiritual power. Anselm or Becket did not assert the immunities and privileges of the priesthood with greater intrepidity and assurance than did Grossetête. Rebellion against the clergy was with him as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness under the yoke of the Church as iniquity; but those immunities, he was careful to point out, implied heavier responsibility, and those privileges demanded a holier vigilance and labours more abundant. The sacrament of "Holy Orders" was vain unless it carried with it in their lives the evidences of a holy, exemplary, and unworldly spirit. With that spirit they would be mighty through God to the pulling down of all strongholds.

By way of counteracting in some measure the abuses of the secular clergy, and making up for their lack of zeal and ability, Grossetête took the friars, Dominican and Franciscan, under his episcopal patronage, and used them as his allies in the war against evil. He addressed letters of confidence to the generals of both orders. He encouraged mendicants to hear the confessions of the laity, to enjoin them penance, and in every proper way to promote the interests of the Church. They seem to have been better educated and more zealous and active than the clergy, and the Bishop unhesitatingly used their services for the well-being of the people. Thus supported, these busy evangelists invaded parishes, derided the ministrations of the secular clergy, sought to draw the people away from their own churches. They won popularity through their diligence; their services were shorter, livelier, and more attractive than those to which men had been accustomed; they preached with more fervour, administered the Sacraments with greater reverence, and directed consciences with more scrupulosity and care than the ordinary pastors of the people. But their object was not always disinterested; in too many instances they sought only the advancement of their order, and their own enrichment at the expense of those to whom they ministered. And in the course of time the friars proved themselves to be equally venal, ambitious, dissolute, and indolent with the worst of the secular clergy, bringing upon themselves the whip of Wycliffe and Langland, the keen ridicule of Erasmus, and the heavier punishment of Henry VIII.

> Before the curing of a strong disease,
> Even in the instant of repair and health,
> The fit is strongest; evils that take leave,
> On their departure most of all show evil.

The history of the friars is an illustration of these lines of the poet.

Grossetête's eyes seem to have been opened in time to the real character of his mendicant agents. In 1247 two English Franciscans were sent into England with credentials to extort money for the Pope. The words of their commission are as follows: "We charge you, that if the major part of the English prelates should make answer that they are exempt from foreign jurisdiction you demand a greater sum, and compel them by ecclesiastical censures to withdraw their appeal, any privilege or indulgence notwithstanding." This was the famous *non obstante* clause by which the Pope, in the plenitude of his sovereign authority, claimed the same dispensing power in the Church which James II. did long after in the State. His agents applied to prelates, abbots, and whomsoever they thought would be likely to replenish the Papal exchequer. England was tauntingly spoken of in that day as "the Pope's farm." Grossetête at once opposed the imperious demands. They showed him the Pope's Bull authorizing the levy to be made, and demanded six thousand marks from the diocese of Lincoln. The Bishop still refused, but in a polite manner. "Brother," answered he, as Matthew Paris tells us, "with all reverence to his Holiness be it spoken, the demand is as dishonourable as it is impracticable. The whole body of the clergy and the people are concerned in it equally with me. For me, then, to give a definite answer in an instant to such a demand, before the sense of the kingdom is taken upon it, would be rash and absurd."

In the following year he obtained at great expense letters from Innocent IV. empowering him to reform the religious orders. He saw with pain the waste of large revenues made by those orders, and he resolved to take into his own hands the rents of the religious houses, and apply them to the moral elevation of the people. But the monks appealed to the Pope, and Grossetête was obliged in self defence to plead his cause in person before the Pontiff at Lyons. It was an age of chicanery and venality; the monks purchased the interest of the Pope, and his Holiness, who seems to have been always ready to sell himself to the highest bidder, decided the cause against the Bishop. Grossetête was indignant at so unexpected a decision, and he spoke sharply to his superior. "I relied on your letters and promises," said he, "but am entirely disappointed." "What is that to you," answered the Pope; "you have done your part, and we are disposed to favour them. *Is your eye evil because I am good?*" A sense of responsibility evidently sat lightly upon the head of the Church. No wonder that the Bishop murmured, but so as to be heard by those

around: "O money, how great is thy power, especially at the Court of Rome!" "You English," retorted the Pontiff, "are always grinding and impoverishing one another. How many religious men, persons of prayer and hospitality, are you striving to depress that you may sacrifice to your own tyranny and avarice!" On this occasion the "tyranny and avarice" were certainly on the side of his Holiness. It was this Pope who represented with cynical frankness how lucrative England was to them in Italy, when he said, according to Matthew Paris: "Vere hortus noster deliciarum est Anglia et puteus inexhaustus; et ubi multa abundant de multis multa sumere licet." The Bishop came away from the interview depressed and disheartened, leaving, however, behind him a strong testimony against the evils of the Papacy in the shape of a sermon, a copy of which he delivered into the hands of the Pope. In this discourse he "sketches with satiric salt," to use the language of Erasmus, the flagitious practices of the Court of Rome, and the evil doings of the monks, characterizing the clergy of the time as "wolves and bears." It was with a heart full of sadness that Grossetête returned to his diocese; and "even his firm mind," as Dean Milman remarks, "was shaken by the difficulties of his position." He formed the intention of resigning his bishopric and retiring from the intractable world. Renan observes: "A feature which characterizes great European men is at certain times that they admit the wisdom of Epicurus, by being taken with disgust while working with ardour, and, after having succeeded, by doubting if the cause they have served was worth so many sacrifices." Grossetête never "doubted" that the cause he had taken up was the cause of God, and therefore worth all possible sacrifices; but he was depressed and heart-sick at the enormous evils that were around him, and the base and unjust conduct of those who should have sympathized with him in his efforts to purge the house of God and advance His kingdom, and under the influence of this feeling he meditated retirement. However, it was only for a moment that this unworthy thought swayed his mind. He could not forget that he was a

> Sworn liegeman of the Cross and thorny crown;

and he shook off the ignoble sloth, and commenced a visitation of his diocese which was unprecedented in its stern severity.

> The present time's so sick,
> That present medicine must be minister'd,
> Or overthrow incurable ensues.

The contumacious clergy were compelled to submit and accept his conditions. The monasteries opened their reluctant

gates and acknowledged his authority, and some show of improvement seems to have taken place in the general aspect of the diocese. But the evils and abuses were so great and deep-seated, and of such long standing, that they foiled even the genius and energy of Grossetête; the attempt to deal single-handed with them reminds us of the fabled labours of Hercules in the Augean stable. But he did all that one man could do. He resolutely took his stand on his right of refusing institution to unworthy clergy. He refused to admit to benefices pluralists, boys, persons employed in civil offices, and in many cases foreigners. He "resisted alike Churchmen, the Chancellor of Exeter; nobles, he would not admit a son of the Earl of Ferrars as under age; the King, whose indignation knew no bounds; he resisted the cardinal legates—the Pope himself." He "defied the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune" to shake him from his solid base, or turn him aside from the path of duty. It would seem as if the Master with a scourge of cords had again appeared in the temple. Grossetête knew no fear in the discharge of his episcopal functions. Conscience governed him. He was a kind of Knox before the days of Knox, with "the same inflexibility, intolerance, rigid, narrow-looking adherence to God's truth, stern rebuke in the name of God to all that forsake truth."

In 1253 the Bishop received command to confer a canonry of Lincoln on the nephew of Innocent, Frederick of Lavagna, a mere boy, who knew nothing of English, and was altogether unfit for the sacred office. The Pope wrote to his agents in England, ordering them to complete the appointment, with his usual clause of *non obstante*, which was the great engine, as we have already intimated, of the Papal dispensing power. Grossetête firmly refused, and wrote an epistle on the occasion full of that bold honesty which has made his name immortal.

It was said that when this letter reached the Pope it drew from him the most passionate exclamations of anger: "Who is this dotard," he cried, "who presumes to judge my actions? By St. Peter and St. Paul, if I were not restrained by my generosity, I would make him an example and a spectacle to all mankind. Is not the King of England my vassal, rather my slave? Would he not at a word from me throw this Bishop into prison, and cover him with infamy and disgrace?" The Cardinals, who saw the danger of giving way to the Pope's blind fury, reasoned long and earnestly with him, and at length were enabled to moderate his resentment. They pointed out the inexpediency of resorting to violent measures, pleaded the irreproachable life of Grossetête, and, in words, admitted the truth of the charges which he had brought against the Holy See. "He is a holy man," said they, "more so than we

ourselves are; a man of excellent genius and of the best morals; no prelate in Christendom is thought to excel him." They went on to say that his learning and high character were known to all the clergy, both of France and England, for "he is held to be a great philosopher, an accomplished scholar in Greek and Latin literature, zealous in the administration of justice, a reader of theology in the schools, a devout preacher, a lover of chastity and an enemy of simony." Moderate counsels prevailed. Innocent, recognising that "discretion is the better part of valour," yielded to the exigencies of the time. Letters were issued which mitigated to some extent the abuses of these Papal provisions. It was set forth that all who possessed such benefices were to be guaranteed in their free enjoyment, and that they were not to go down, as it were, by hereditary descent from Italian to Italian; on decease or vacancy, the patron, prelate, monastery, or layman might at once present.

Grossetête was as fearless in dealing with the King's nominees as with the Pope's. A favourite of Henry, Robert de Passelewe, had been elected by the Chapter of Chichester as their Bishop. And when Boniface, the Archbishop of Canterbury, insisted on testing his fitness for the office, Grossetête undertook the part of examiner, and set him aside on the ground of ignorance. Neither Pope nor King could turn aside from the path of integrity and right-doing him who lived

As ever in his great Taskmaster's eye.

The "Lyra Apostolica" says:

There are two ways to aid the Ark,
As patrons and as sons.

Grossetête never forgot that he was a loyal son of the Church of England; and in the exercise of patronage, or in dealing with patronage, his great aim was "to aid the Ark." He made himself enemies, but that was a small matter to a man whose

Brazen bulwark of defence

was

Still to maintain his conscious innocence.

In the end of the summer of 1253 Grossetête was seized with a mortal disease, the nature of which does not seem to have come to light. And as he lay on his sick-bed, his mind often dwelt upon the evil state of the Church and the miseries of these last days. He sent for Friar John de St. Giles to talk over the affairs of the diocese and of the Church at large with him. To him he spoke of the conduct of the monks, both Franciscan and Dominican, with much severity, because, though their Orders were founded in voluntary poverty, they did not rebuke, but rather pandered to, the vices of the great.

"I am convinced," said the old man, "that both the Pope, unless he amend his errors, and the friars, except they endeavour to restrain him, will be deservedly exposed to everlasting death."

Grossetête died at his palace at Buckden on October 9, 1253. And at the time of his death, it was believed that music was heard in the air, church bells tolled of their own accord, miracles were wrought at his grave and in his church at Lincoln. The Pope heard of his death with pleasure, and said, "I rejoice; and let every true son of the Roman Church rejoice with me that my great enemy is removed." The inexorable Pontiff even entertained the design of having his body cast out of the church and his bones scattered, and wrote a letter to the King of England to that effect. The Cardinals, however, opposed the tyrant, and the letter was never sent.

The chief design of Grossetête, as we have intimated, was to remedy the practical evils of the Church. In his episcopal career he never forgot that aim. He put forth the most vigorous efforts to carry out that ameliorative policy.

> Thy spirit in thee strove
> To cleanse and set in beauty free
> The ancient shrines.

He visited his diocese, preached in the churches, and sought to purge away error and elevate the moral tone of society. And to the labours of the episcopal office he united those of the pen. His scholarly attainments were of a high order, and when he could spare time from the more active duties of the episcopate, he employed it in congenial literary pursuits. He translated into Latin "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," a Jewish writing of about the end of the first century, which has come down to us with extensive Christian interpolations belonging to the second or third century. Renan tells us that it only became known to the Latins through the translation of Robert of Lincoln, made about 1242. He also translated the works of John Damascene, and of Dionysius the Areopagite, and illustrated them with commentaries.

From his early years Grossetête was always busy. He loved work, and the only recreation he seems to have taken was to vary his work. He wrote many letters and sermons which are still extant in manuscript, and which throw much light upon the political and ecclesiastical life of the time. Through the crust of error which environed him in that age of intellectual darkness and thraldom, there shone ever the soft light of a holy and beautiful piety. What his lips spoke his heart believed, and what his heart believed his life reflected. And ever, as he grew older, his heart was drawn nearer to God. He belonged to that elect company which Browning describes as

> Soldier-saints, that row on row
> Burn upward each to his point of bliss.

Conscience was to him the voice of God in his soul, and his ear was ever attuned to its music. Duty was the "stern daughter of the voice of God," and for him she wore "the Godhead's most benignant grace." It was his devout allegiance to Duty that constrained him at times to employ such strict measures in dealing with the abuses around him. Like a surgeon, he had to use knife and cautery.

A distinguished living Cambridge professor tells us that we ought to cherish the memory of the good and wise, for the implacable effect of research is to diminish their number. To us it seems clear that the name of Grossetête can never be removed from that honoured band—the good and the wise! He was endowed with great mental gifts, and he used them for the noblest purposes, and in his life illustrated the beauty of goodness and truth, showing an example to his whole diocese of "whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honourable, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report."

WILLIAM COWAN.

ART. III.—THE POPE'S ENCYCLICAL.

ON St. Peter's Day the Bishop of Rome issued an encyclical letter on the subject of the unity of the Church. It is addressed to "our venerable brethren, the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, Bishops, and other ordinaries in peace and communion with the Apostolic See." Translations of it, or of large portions of it, appeared on the following day in our principal English papers.

For such documents to be issued from time to time by the ecclesiastical head of a Christian community for the guidance of its members is but a natural procedure, and for members of another body ordinarily to canvass and examine them might properly be considered uncalled for. But we venture to think that the avowed object of this particular manifesto renders some public notice of it by English Church-people perfectly justifiable. For, though formally addressed to the hierarchy of the Roman Church, it is intended specially for the perusal of non-Roman communities. Thus it opens: "It is sufficiently well known to you that no small share of our thoughts and of our care is devoted to our endeavour to bring back to the fold, placed under the guardianship of Jesus Christ, the chief Pastor of souls, sheep that have strayed. Bent upon this, we have

thought it most conducive to this end and purpose to describe the exemplar and, as it were, the lineaments of the Church. Amongst these the most worthy of our consideration is unity. Nor is it improbable that ignorance may be dispelled, as false ideas and prejudices are dissipated from the minds, chiefly of those who find themselves in error without fault of theirs. We earnestly pray that God will graciously grant us the power of bringing conviction home to the minds of men."

When a heretic is addressed, even he may claim the right to reply.

The task will doubtless be taken up by those who are accepted as representative members of our English Church. Meanwhile, it is surely but safe and wise that we of the rank and file of her teachers should in some far less adequate fashion approach the subject, and endeavour to the best of our poor ability to furnish our people with a few salutary thoughts upon it.

I. A few weeks ago Mr. Gladstone wrote a letter to the Archbishop of York on the validity of our ministerial orders. This letter excited much interest. It was elicited by consideration of the laborious inquiry on this question which is now being prosecuted by the central authorities of the Roman Catholic Church. In it the writer exalts the magnanimity of Leo XIII., revealed in authorizing the inquiry. "What courage," he writes, "must it require in a Pope, what an elevation above all the levels of stormy partisanship, what genuineness of love for the whole Christian flock, *whether separated or annexed,* to enable him to approach the huge mass of hostile and still burning recollections in the spirit and for the purposes of peace!" And with expressions of the same grateful appreciation of the motives of this investigation, the letter closes: "Be the issue (of these proceedings) what it may, there is, in my view, no room for doubt as to the attitude which has been taken by the actual head of the Roman Catholic Church in regard to them. It seems to me an attitude in the largest sense paternal; and while it will probably stand among the latest recollections of my lifetime, it will ever be cherished with cordial sentiments of reverence, of gratitude, and of high appreciation."

With the Papal letter open before us, we may fittingly ask, Must not the gratitude of our brilliant statesman now have parted with something of its warm glow? Of Mr. Gladstone's letter, the Pope is said to have remarked that it tended rather to render more delicate and difficult the solution of the question, and the Cardinals are stated to have concurred in this opinion. But if any in England were at the date of the Hawarden letter inclined to echo its hopeful prognostications, this latest en-

cyclical must have effectually dispelled the illusion.[1] An "attitude in the largest sense paternal" has to be reconciled with a reaffirmation of the old arrogant assumptions of universal supremacy, with which the Papal conception of unity is bound up. As the *Times* of June 30th describes it, the argument of the document is but an expansion of the misinterpreted text which runs round the dome of St. Peter's: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church." The leader on the subject in the same paper adds that the propositions based upon this text are "assumed, but not attempted to be proved." This is not quite accurate; and we venture to think that the few attempts that *are* made in the course of the letter leave it considerably weaker as an intellectual effort than had pure and unrelieved assumption marked it throughout.

We select specimens of these methods of substantiating the transcendent claims of the Roman Pontiff; and the reader is asked to remember that we are listening to as solemnly *ex cathedrâ* a communication as could ever demand for itself the unquestioning homage due to an infallible authority. What can we think, then, when we find in one place the pontifical sanction accorded to an amazing etymology of "Cephas" from "head," based on the jingling alliterative resemblance between this word and "caput" and "cephale"? What shall be said of the reference to St. Cyprian as teaching that heresy and schism arise and are begotten from the fact that due obedience is refused to "the supreme authority," it being left to the ignorance of the reader to gather that by the phrase "supreme authority" is meant the Roman See? A glance into Church history shows no Father so vigorously and even contemptuously repudiating the supremacy of Rome, barely willing to concede even its primacy, as that of Canterbury is understood amongst ourselves.

Milman's words are unequivocal: "Cyprian confronts Pope Stephen not only as an equal, but, strong in the concurrence of the East and of Alexandria, as the Pope's superior."[2] He circulates a letter of another Bishop, Firmilian, still more unmeasured in its censures. His correspondent exposes what he calls "the manifest folly of Stephen in boasting of the place of his episcopate, and contending that he holds the succession from Peter."[3]

Still more to our purpose is Cyprian's third Treatise "On the Unity of the Church." Take this sentence: "Assuredly

[1] In his prefatory letter communicated to the papers with extracts, Cardinal Vaughan mentions this probable effect of the Encyclical.

[2] "History of Latin Christianity," vol. i., pp. 66, 67 (edit. iv.).

[3] Cyprian, "Epistles," No. LXXIV.

the rest of the Apostles were also the same as was Peter, endowed with a like partnership both of honour and of power." But now mark against this the following words to be met with in received copies of this Treatise: "Upon Peter, being one, He builds His Church, and (to him) commits His sheep to be fed." "And the primacy is given to Peter, that there might be shown one Church of Christ and one See." "Does he who deserts the chair of Peter, upon whom the Church is founded, trust that he is in the Church?" Does Leo, then, find something in this Father to serve his turn? Not at all. Before citing these passages, or referring to the substance of them, he has a formidable task before him of textual reconstruction, for below these three friendly sentences bristles an awkward triplet of editorial footnotes:[1] "This passage is beyond all question spurious." "This passage is spurious." "This passage is undoubtedly spurious." Infallibility supports its claims with passages in the text of a notoriously hostile authority, which are infallibly unauthentic. And this is to be accepted by the faithful as patristic evidence.

Nor are the references of the Encyclical to the relations between primitive Popes and Church Councils much happier. The following is the passage in which these allusions occur: "The Popes have ever unquestionably exercised the office of ratifying or rejecting the decrees of Councils. Leo the Great rescinded the acts of the Conciliabulum of Ephesus, Damascus rejected those of Rimini, and Adrian I. those of Constantinople. The 28th Canon of the Council of Chalcedon, by the very fact that it lacks the assent and approval of the Apostolic See, is admitted by all to be worthless."

Examining this passage, the first thing to be carefully observed is that in the list of synods to be found here no distinction is drawn between œcumenical and other Councils. Three of the four mentioned were not œcumenical, and therefore for the Bishop of Rome to rescind their acts proves nothing to the purpose.[2] The whole argument of Leo requires that the Bishop of Rome should prove from history (for we have here a professedly historical proof) that he is above *General* Councils. The only Council of the four which bears this character is that of Chalcedon, and from the enactments of that assembly he takes the 28th Canon, and of this he tells us that it "is admitted by all to be worthless," as lacking the approval of the Apostolic See, filled at the time by Leo

[1] Cyprian, Treatise III., chaps. iv. and v.

[2] Owing to the fortunate accident of a decrepit Pope being represented at Nice by two priests, his successors were sometimes glad to avail themselves of a precedent which seemed to favour the sentiment that a Pope's dignity was best consulted in staying away.

the Great. But so far from this Canon being "worthless," it was incorporated in the decrees of the Council in spite of the opposition of the legates from Rome, and has come down to us just as much an integral portion of those decrees as any other of its Canons. True, it does not appear in all the Collections, but (as has been well pointed out) we are indebted to the opposition for the best proof of its authenticity. At Florence, in the fifteenth century, it was confirmed. The Papal influence at this Council was supreme. Eugenius's authority was unquestioned.

It is not surprising that the Bishop of Rome should have opposed it through his representatives at the Council, for by it Constantinople is made a "new Rome"; and the primacy of Rome (not supremacy) is affirmed as based on the *accident* of that city being imperial. One sentence from history will reveal the entanglement that is involved in this rejection of a Canon of the Council of Chalcedon. This Council was the fourth General Council of the undivided Church. The whole of Latin Christendom has accepted these four Councils absolutely; our Reformed Church by 1 Elizabeth, cap. i., section 36, has done so, and this acceptance was reaffirmed at Lambeth in 1867. All Roman Catholics have done so. Pope Leo XIII. has done so. Gregory the Great says that he "venerates these four as the four Gospels," and describes them as "the four square stones on which the structure of faith rests."

II. In what has been so far offered, this review has been mainly occupied with details of criticism. It seemed hardly desirable to touch the subject of this document at all, and yet leave its appeals (slight as they are) to history unchallenged. But a broader survey shall now be taken of the Papal position.

And first, let it be noted that appeals to history, as to Holy Scripture, are quite inconsistent with the latest dogma of Rome, Papal Infallibility. This dogma stultifies all such appeals. For these appeals to established precedent are tantamount to distinct invitations to the world to examine and weigh, and form a judgment upon the utterances of infallibility; in other words, they actually solicit men to revolt from the principle of authority, and exercise the right of private judgment, of which right the doctrine of infallibility imperiously demands the unconditional surrender. In fact, it is keeping within the bounds of strictest intellectual sobriety to assert that an infallible authority dishonours his own attribute of infallibility when he invites me to examine his claims (whether to infallibility or supremacy, or any other pontifical deposit) in the light of history.

Very curious it is to mark the shifting of the controversial

ground occupied by Rome through the changed front of the Protestant opposition.[1] At the period of the Reformation the battle was fought on the fair field of Holy Writ. Both sides endeavoured to make good their case by a concurrent appeal to God's written Word. Beaten from this field, Rome entrenched herself behind the dogma of Tradition. Only part of Christ's truth was committed to the canonical Scriptures. To the Church had been committed the deposit of reserved truths. The contention then of the Papacy was that examination of her teaching at any given date would always reveal the perfect accord of that teaching with primitive tradition. She had never changed.

But from this ground also she was dislodged. The task was not a difficult one to prove that she was not primitive; that she had added to the early faith; that *all* her distinctive errors were of modern birth; that transubstantiation was unknown as an Article of the Faith till the thirteenth century; that communion in one kind was not ordered till the fifteenth; that the seven sacraments were not added to the Creed until the Council of Trent in 1546; that the Council of Florence is responsible for the tenet of purgatory (1439); that the stream of the ages need be ascended no higher than to the Council of Trent for the authoritative promulgation of the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass, the adoration of images, and the invocation of saints; while the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary (1854), and the decrees of the Vatican Council pronouncing the Pope infallible (1870), belong to our own day. What was to be done now? To prove herself unchanging with all those innovations paraded before her face might appear a hard nut to crack. But the timely doctrine of Development, a doctrine with which the writings of Cardinal Newman have familiarized an English public, came to her aid. Tradition was abandoned. All these so-called innovations in her creed were but legitimate developments. Their unevolved germ was imbedded in the past. In an embryonic state they were all there.

It was a bold move. Not a few of Rome's children felt, no doubt, it was too bold. For it required her to trace the links that connected the fully matured doctrine with the germ, and to trace, too, the successive stages of the gradual doctrinal evolution.

And now, since the Vatican Council, the disputants have retired from this ground, which offered too exposed a situation to the fire of the foe. Into the citadel of infallibility they

[1] In what follows under this head we are much indebted to Dr. Salmon's "Infallibility of the Church," a book which it is impossible to over-praise.

have retired; and by it Scripture, Tradition, and Development are all necessarily superseded. An unerring living guide has rendered all reference to past authorities, whether Scriptural or ecclesiastical, an impertinence.

An interesting question arises out of these considerations. When driven from this position, will the latest prove the last? What entrenchments can lie beyond infallibility? Are any conceivable? And when the outraged reason of some future age, shaking itself free from the emasculated æstheticism and sentimentality of to-day, rises up against the insupportable incubus thus imposed upon the free intellect of man, to what inner stronghold can the beaten withdraw? Will the adoption of a fifth dialectical expedient be contemporary with the discovery of a fourth dimension?

Beneath the amazing assumption of infallibility lies the assertion of the succession of the Bishops of Rome from St. Peter. Everything depends upon this. If this rock gives way, everything drops to pieces like the "baseless fabric of a dream."

History surely speaks with no uncertain sound on a point of such vital import. Solid and cogent must be the evidence of a fact of such enormous weight in the Divine economy for the spiritual weal of mankind. Providence could never permit the shadow of a doubt to remain after an impartial examination of the authentic records of the past. An unbroken catena of unimpeachable witnesses must run through the early annals of the Church to quell every misgiving and convince the most sceptical. To the Roman Christians of Apostolic days a long letter has been preserved in the New Testament. St. Peter must be the writer of it. To Rome the same sacred source of information represents him as going, a prisoner of Jesus Christ, and there he dwells for two years in his own hired house, "teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him." Is the writer here liable to correction by the youngest? Is he under the cruel necessity of substituting Paul for Peter? And, stepping outside the narrative of the New Testament, must he make out a case for the Chair of the Fisherman from the historian of the Church? Here, then, are facts forming the commonplaces of every student. The earliest lists of Bishops of Rome are headed by three names, i. Linus, ii. Anacletus, iii. Clement. Linus was a personal friend of St. Paul, who is mentioned (the identity has been established by Irenæus and Eusebius) by the Apostle in 2 Tim. iv. 21, and his appointment to the oversight of the Roman community was as much St. Paul's work as St. Peter's. This is the earliest account we possess of the line of Roman Bishops, but another list appeared subsequently. At the end of the second or the beginning of

the third century a work was brought to Rome. This was the "Recognitions of Clement," a kind of theological romance. The writer has no intention of presenting actual facts to his readers. Prefacing this book was[1] a letter purporting to be written by Clement (the third Bishop) to James the Just of Jerusalem, and in it Clement relates how he was consecrated by St. Peter. Touching this book, this circumstance should be accentuated, that the doctrinal portions of the work were rejected by the authorities at Rome of that day, while the narrative portions (which were historically worthless) were readily received. And another list was eventually published, based on this romance, with Clement pushed back past Anacletus and Linus, and made to head the line. But a peculiarly trustworthy proof of the correctness of the earlier list is actually afforded by the Roman Liturgy of to-day, in which the names of the first Bishops are commemorated in the earlier and not in the later order.

Into what a neighbourhood has our inquiry conducted us! The base of a vast system of beliefs, to which two hundred millions of the human race now living are professedly committed, revealing itself as a passage in a sort of religious novel, the doctrines set forth in which have been pronounced heretical by the very Church that is under such immense obligations to the portions which its ban has spared! Could the irony of the situation be more biting? But supposing it could conclusively be proved that St. Peter was the first Bishop in Rome, that without a single break in the line stretching through nineteen centuries the imposition of hands had carried down the ages whatever gifts may be supposed to accrue to his successors, would the Roman claims to universal supremacy be much more valid? Instead of being grounded as they now are upon an unhistorical legend, they would be grounded upon an unwarranted textual gloss. If our Lord had meant that He would found His Church upon St. Peter, and not upon the Rock of the Incarnation then revealed not by flesh and blood to His Apostle, how singularly misleading were His words as He substituted "Petra" for "Petros"—the "rock" for the "stone."

A few words may be subjoined on our own posture towards the unreformed Western Church. From the perusal of the latest Papal encyclical letter, we rise with the reflection: The matters dealt with here, weighty as they may be in the estimate of members of the Roman Catholic Church, are after all of subsidiary importance as bearing upon the relations of honest,

---

[1] We emphasize "was" as it now prefixes the "Clementines," while it is referred to by Rufinus in his extant preface to the "Recognitions."

straightforward Protestantism with the real question.[1] They do not touch the main issue of our age-long quarrel with Rome. Let our English orders be pronounced valid by the highest Italian authority to-morrow; let the tenet of Infallibility, added to the creed twenty-six years ago by Pius IX., be expunged by Leo XIII.; let that of the Immaculate Conception, not yet fifty years old, be rescinded also, would the way be practically more open for us English Church-people to surrender our spiritual liberties—the priceless heritage for which the martyrs bled? Would it be found compatible with loyalty to our purified formularies, our scriptural Articles, that we should regard the idolatries of Mariolatry, the mercenary compact of Indulgences, the veneration of relics, the perils and pollutions of the Confessional, the materialism of the Mass, as a mere bagatelle—an insignificant barrier, over which, with scarce a shock to the most scrupulous conscience, we might pass again into the old fold? Not so. Until Rome repudiates these errors, and in sorrowful repentance for her long defection returns to the faith once delivered to the saints, the estrangement must be prolonged. Long may our beloved Church, rebuking those of her members who chafe under the restraints of her beneficent guidance, maintain her righteous protest against traditions of men that make void the message of her Lord.

"We are of Cephas" only so far as Cephas is "of Christ." But when he "walks not uprightly, according to the truth of the Gospel," the Pauls of Protestantism have but one course before them, to "withstand him to the face, because he is to be blamed."

And if any nearer home "come in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they may bring us" once more "into bondage," to these "we will give place by subjection, no, not for an hour."

A. PEARSON.

---

[1] The outspoken utterances of the Archbishop of Canterbury in opening his Diocesan Conference at Lambeth on July 14 merit the respectful thanks of all loyal Church-people. We quote a sentence or two: "The attitude of the Church of Rome is an absurdity, contrary to doctrine and to English history. The Church of England was always Protestant, and long before the Reformation she was always protesting and Catholic. She protested against innovations and encroachments and to foreign jurisdiction. In all her resistance, the Church and the nation used their greatest men and performed their greatest acts."

ART. IV.—A MEDIÆVAL MONASTERY.

WHEN, at the time of the Great Rebellion, Waller's troopers took possession of Winchester, they twice ransacked the Cathedral library and scattered its treasures to the winds. John Chase, the worthy Chapter Clerk, who places this spoliation of the library on December 14, 1642, afterwards succeeded, with much labour and expenditure of money, in recovering many of the most valuable MSS., some from the hands of local tradesmen, and some from the gutters and waste places of the city. Among the documents thus recovered and returned to the Cathedral library, many of them still bearing traces of the dirt out of which they were rescued, were a series of rolls, known as "Obedientiary Rolls," relating to the convent of St. Swithun. These rolls, some sixty-four in number, have been transcribed and edited by Dean Kitchin, whose labours deserve the gratitude of all students of Church history. They are, we believe, the first collection of obedientiary rolls ever printed, and they are of exceptional interest as throwing much light on the inner life and management of a Benedictine monastery.

It is uncertain at what period the system of "Obedientiaries" first came into general use among the Benedictines, but at the time when we meet with it in these rolls of St. Swithun's, in the early part of the fourteenth century, it is in full organization and exercising a beneficent influence on all around. The time was long since passed when the monks framed their lives on the grand doctrine of *Laborare est Orare*, when all work was regarded as sanctified by Christ's blessed example, when every morning from the chapter-house they set forth cheerfully, two and two, to their varied and laborious duties in the convent or the fields. As time went on wealth and position clustered round the ancient buildings; the monastic *land-owner* became, as Dean Kitchin says, "a *land-lord*, and no longer won a blessing for himself by tilling the soil. He preferred to sit in cloister, torpid in winter, and in summer drowsy, while the lands were let out on farm on easy terms." And thus there grew up about a great conventual body a large number of servants or lay-brethren, to whom were deputed the humbler and more menial duties of the establishment, while the more important offices were distributed among the monks themselves. These monks were known as *Obedientiaries*, the name signifying that they were under special obligation of obedience to the Lord Prior. They may be roughly divided into those who were responsible for the conduct of Divine worship, and those whose duties were connected with the estates and internal arrangements of the

establishment. The full number of Obedientiaries in a well-ordered house would be from eighteen to twenty, but there was nothing to prevent the same brother from holding more than one office. Of some of these offices, as the Precentor, the Infirmarian, who looked after the sick in hospital, the "Circa," or "Roundabout," who acted as policeman to the brethren, the Refectorian, who had charge of the Refectory, the Porter, the Hortulanus, or gardener, no rolls exist at Winchester. Among those, however, transcribed by Dean Kitchin will be found the Sacristan's; the Anniversarian's, the monk entrusted with the care of the anniversaries or obit-days of benefactors; the Receiver's, who received the rents of the estates belonging to the priory; the Hordarian's, the brother set over the "Hoard," or common stock of the convent; the Almoner's, whose office it was to seek out and to relieve the sick and needy, and the Chamberlain's; together with two "Diet Rolls," which reveal to the curious what manner of food the monks were wont to enjoy.

Under the guidance of the learned Dean we propose to examine these rolls more closely, as they throw a curious light on the customs and manners of a mediæval monastery. It will be well to notice in passing that the plea on which the income of St. Swithun's was apportioned was the complex one of assigning certain definite estates, or charges, to the different offices, each Obedientiary being responsible to the community for the management of his stewardship.

Let us glance first at the Prior. We catch sight of him in the rolls as a great noble or feudal prince, sometimes moving about the country from place to place, accompanied by a large retinue of followers, and not above enjoying the sports of hunting and falconry. In the year 1311 we find an entry of 3d. in a Compotus Roll for bread bought to feed the Prior's hounds, he being then on his way to hunt in the forest of Savernake. In the same year we find a serving-man at Crondal with seven hares awaiting the Prior's arrival for a few days' coursing over the wilds of Aldershot. At another time we read that the convent built the Prior "a new house for his dogs within the precincts." There is an entry of the purchase of spurs for the Prior at the cost of 3d., *i.e.*, about 3s. of our money, in the Receiver's Roll of 1337-38. "And of sport we hear something, too, when he buys nets to catch foxes, rabbits and partridges, at the large outlay of 22s. 6d. John le Coucherier we also find 'existens in patria,' out in the country parts from time to time to catch partridges; and there is an item in the same roll of 8d. for gloves for the same person, and for bells for the falcons." But we must not think of this great ecclesiastic as wholly engrossed in the pleasures

of the chase. Other and more important matters occupied the attention of the Prior. A large part of the administration of the convent fell to his lot. He presided at the daily chapters; he took the chief place in the solemn services of the Church; he entertained with due hospitality the great barons and princes who chanced to be passing through the city. Every September, on the occasion of the famous St. Giles' Fair, he "went up the hill in state and took possession of a richly-fitted chamber, with new robes for himself and his suite, fresh furniture and a delightful change in food and hospitality, hard by the booths and stalls at which the convent kept shop, and sold their wines, their furs and spiceries." In addition to the almost unceasing calls of hospitality, we find that the Prior had to provide the whole body of monks with bread, butter, cheese and beer, and to strew the refectory with clean rushes seven times in the course of the year, thrice in winter and four times in summer. Unfortunately no roll of the Prior's estates has come down to us, but his rent-roll must have been considerable in order to enable him to meet the many calls on his property. Besides his official income, it was customary for him to receive a number of small gifts from the various Obedientiaries of the priory. Thus the Almoner sent him wine five times a year, and a "Courtesy"—the original "curtsey" was in money, not, says the Dean, in "a graceful female salutation"—at the time of St. Giles' Fair. The Chamberlain and the Warden of the Works also sent wine five times yearly, and in addition the Hordarian provided two pigs and two calves at Christmas-time.

The Receiver's Roll of 1335 gives us a vivid picture of the business arrangements of the convent. The Receiver at this time was one John de Merlawe, who afterwards succeeded to the dignity of Prior, and apparently a man of sound practical ability. And he needed whatever capacity for business he possessed. The liabilities on the office were so great, that though the receipts from all sources amounted to £1,266 (equal to about £15,000 of our money), he was forced, before the year was over, to borrow from a foreign merchant—one Guy of Lucca—the sum of £192 3s. 2d., or in money of to-day of about £2,305. Some of the items of expenditure, even when we remember that at this time the priory contained sixty-four monks, strike us as enormous. The wine-bill—forty casks of red wine and two pipes of white—came to over £90. It seems likely, however, that part of this £1,000 worth of wine was intended for sale at St. Giles' Fair. This may also have been the case with the spices, which came to £47. Some of these items are curious. Almonds are bought in large quantities, a drink known as "milk of almonds" being

in high favour among the monks. Ginger, cinnamon, pepper, saffron, are mentioned, and several kinds of sugar. Six pounds of "galengi" is purchased, a plant which grows in Java, the root of which is used in medicine, especially for disorders of the stomach. Indeed, "the spiceries so largely used were part of the old botanic medicines, in which spices, and pepper, and sugar were not articles of diet, but part of the pharmacy. The principal ailments of the monastic and cathedral life were neuralgia, rheumatism, sciatica, rheumatic gout, and kindred diseases, brought about by living and serving in the great damp and unwarmed buildings through the winter-time; hence the reason for furs—a large item in the expenditure of the convent. Fasting also led to much illness; and our great comforters, tea, coffee, and cocoa, were unknown, and drugged and spiced wines had to take their place, when the chilled and congested liver, kidneys, and stomach were unable to take the gross food of the age."

The Receiver's Roll also deals with the expenses of the kitchen. From Michaelmas, 1334, to Michaelmas, 1335, the weekly bills came to £104 11s. 10d., or almost exactly £2 (*i.e.*, £24) a week. In addition to this, the house consumed 536 sheep, 11,300 white herrings, 42,000 red herrings, 222 salt salmon, etc., besides the bread and cheese and beer provided by the Prior. Exclusive of this last item, the kitchen expenses, taken as a whole, came roughly to about £58 of our money weekly. This cannot be considered a mean allowance for sixty-four monks, even when we remember the calls of hospitality and the number of lay brethren attached to the house. The Diet Rolls, to which we have referred, give us a very clear notion as to the manner of food enjoyed by the good monks of St. Swithun's towards the end of the fifteenth century. At this time the number of brethren was reduced, from various causes, from sixty-four (as in 1335) to not more than thirty-five; but the average cost of living per head seems to have been about the same. These rolls, it should be remembered, take no account of the bread and beer provided by the Prior, nor of the supply of vegetables, which came from the convent garden; and they refer only to the two chief meals of the brethren—namely, breakfast and supper. The Dean gives us one or two days as specimens, of which we will take the following: "On the Monday next before Christmas, 1492, the brethren at their two meals sat down to the following fare. They had moile (a dish of marrow and grated bread); 170 eggs; nombles (the flesh of a deer, taken from the tenderest parts, usually from the inside of the thigh), as a kind of *entrée;* beef; mutton; calves' feet; meat for a special dish for the Third Prior and Hordarian, as well as for the Sub-Prior.

These extra dishes set apart for the officials were a kind of perquisite and reward, and a sign of dignity in return for their toil, so making their posts enviable and desired. The total cost of the day's dinner was 8s. 4d., or about £5 in our money." The average allowance of butcher's meat seems to have been about a pound and a half per head; on fast-days, of course, no meat was allowed. The fare, however, was not contemptible. On one Good Friday the brethren consumed the enormous number of 1,000 eggs, besides 5s. worth (£3) of red herrings, and figs as an *entrée*. Eggs were eaten in the monastery in huge quantities. In spring-time, when hens lay freely, it was nothing uncommon for as many as 250 to 300 to be used daily. Even in November, when (with us, at least) eggs are luxuries, the good monks would somehow manage to obtain 140, or perhaps 160, two or three times weekly. Another item that sets one wondering is that of mushrooms, which were largely used at St. Swithun's on fast-days, even in winter. It was nothing uncommon for 3s. 4d. (*i.e.*, £2 in our money) to be spent on mushrooms in a single day. The downs around Winchester no doubt produced them in abundance, and it is possible that a supply was in some way preserved for the winter. The charge for mustard (1½d.) runs through all the fast days, the brethren, as Dean Kitchin suggests, no doubt needing something to warm and stay their poor stomachs. The cost of fish was very heavy. "Drilynge," or salt cod-fish, would sometimes come to 5s. 7d. (£3 7s.) for the day, with perhaps minnows as *entrée*, or mussels, or oysters, or eels. Now and then, for supper, a dish of lampreys was provided. They were formerly abundant in the clear chalk streams of Hampshire. Minnows were apparently a favourite dish; they were sometimes made into a "sew" (a sort of soup) for supper! Mussels, too, were dressed in the same way. Once or twice we find the brethren enjoying tripe for supper; and in one roll we come across the entry: "Paid to the woman who cleaned and prepared the intestines of pigs, 2s. 10d." Pork seems only to have been eaten on the three days following Martinmas. At Michaelmas the Almoner would send a goose for the sick brethren in the infirmary. Nor were tarts and puddings unknown in the refectory. "Batir" pudding, with meat in it, was a common dish. "Tartes" were made of fish as well as of fruit. The items "flavons" (perhaps cheese-cakes) and "lagana" (a pancake) now and then occur, and "tansey" pudding is once mentioned. On All Souls' Day, and sometimes on other festivals, a little treat was given to the monks in the shape of "crisps," a cake or biscuit so baked as to become *crisp*. "These trifling indulgences," adds the Dean, "seemed very important to them, for their life was

monotonous, and their feelings very like those of schoolboys."

From the Chamberlain's Roll we learn, among other things, that he paid the brethren, apparently as pocket-money, the sum of 13s. 4d., in four instalments, yearly—this would be about £2 quarterly in our money. He also defrayed the cost of shaving and keeping trim the tonsures and beards of the monks. There were only thirty-six "Rasturæ," or shaving-times, in the year, so the brethren could only have been made clean and comfortable about once in ten days! The entire cost of this shaving business only came to 4s. 6d. (£2 14s.) for the year ending Michaelmas, 1417! According to Archbishop Lanfranc's decrees the Chamberlain was responsible for changing the hay in the monks' pallets once a year, and also for cleaning out the dormitory once a year. "The general condition and odour of this chamber, in which thirty or forty monks, sometimes many more, slept for a year on the same hay, must," as the Dean says, "have been *terrible*."

Among the duties assigned to the Cellarer, we come across one which throws light on the tastes of some of the brethren. He had to feed and look after "animalia a diversis fratribus per multa tempora adquisita." It is strange to think of such creatures in a convent, probably bears, apes, and peacocks as pets of the brethren; and, moreover, it reveals, not only the existence of expensive habits, but also, as the Dean points out, "a singular development of private property," for these beasts are distinctly said to be bought, not by the brethren collectively, but by "divers brethren," each man for himself.

Another Obedientiary, whose rolls have been preserved in the Cathedral Library, was the Almoner. His business it was, at least in theory, to seek out and relieve the sick and needy; but in going through the numerous Almoners' Rolls of St. Swithun's—no less than thirty-two are extant—one cannot, says Dean Kitchin, help feeling a certain sense of surprise and disappointment at finding how little they show of any such benevolent care for the sick and suffering. In the Roll of Adam of Hyde, who was Almoner in 1312, there is the usual annual payment to the sisters of the Sustern Spital, Winchester, and to their chaplain, and other charges for wax and incense. There are also doles of 1s. 1d. at the funerals of Emma Claverle and of Christina de Coombe, two of the poor sisters above alluded to, and various gifts of beer and wine to the sub-prior, on the occasion of blood-letting, to the Boy Bishop, and other officials. The Almoner, too, had an attack of illness, and his expenses in the infirmary came to 15s. (£9). The Prior's horse also was sick, and had to be bled and plastered up. All these items we find, together with many

"courtesies," and similar expenses; but of actual charity to the poor there is hardly a trace. The Almoner's manor was at Hinton, some eight miles from Winchester, and here the brethren of St. Swithun's were wont to ride over on horseback for a day's holiday. In some years the Almoner appears to have spent a considerable time at the manor-house. The rolls reveal to us the stock on the farm and the provision made for the brethren's entertainment. In addition to the poultry and the live stock, large quantities of cheese and bacon were always in readiness. Much, too, of the produce of the estate was sent into the convent. Oatmeal for their porridge was sent to the good ladies of the Sustern-Spital; the geese, however, went to St. Swithun's, and capons and hens 129 in number, and pigeons more than 200. Cider, too, was made on the farm, perhaps for the labourers who got in the harvest. Of these there were no fewer than seventy in the early autumn of 1345, when they were fed on red herrings.

In 1404 a great disaster fell on the Almoner's estate. Hinton manor-house was burnt down, and most of the stock perished. The consequences appear in the payments. The poor sisters' allowance is cut short, and they get nothing whatever towards their clothing, "because," says the roll, "*of the inability of the office*, due to the fact that the manor-house, with the exception of the chamber and the kitchen, had by mischance been burnt down, with forty quarters of corn, three horses, two oxen, and five carts with all their gear, on the 13th of April in the preceding year." It is significant, however, that the Prior, the sub-prior, the chaplain, and the other obedientiaries, received their accustomed dues, and that the boys got their beer-money. At the end of the year the deficit only amounted to £4 15s. 3d., which the Almoner appears to have made good out of his own resources.

On many points on which we would gladly have some information the Rolls of St. Swithun's are silent. They tell us nothing of the monastic library, which was doubtless of considerable size and interest, and nothing of the labours of the Scriptorium. There is only one allusion to art—in the Hordarian's Roll for 1405-6—where we find one John Langreod spending the sum of 10s. on three linen "dossors," painted with the "Five Joys of Mary." It is pleasant to think, as the Dean says, of this pious and intelligent monk intent on beautifying the walls of his chamber. The rolls are also silent on many of the curious customs of a Benedictine priory. Nothing is told us about the teaching of the boys, which went on daily in the cloister, or about the training of the novices. Of the arrangements for tonsuring and blood-letting we have no details, and the summer "meridiana," or snooze in the

dormitory after dinner, a privilege much valued by the brethren, is not alluded to. Neither, unfortunately, do we catch a glimpse of the "Circa," or "Roundabout," whose duty it was to creep about the cloisters, keeping a wary eye on erring and gossiping brethren. At service, too, after supper, he was to patrol the choir, lantern in hand, "and if he found a brother oppressed with sleep, he was to set down the lantern before the culprit, and return to his place. The light in the erring brother's face, and maybe a little friendly shaking, soon opened the sleeping eyes, and then the offender, 'throwing off drowsiness,' was bidden to fall on his knees and pray for pardon; then he had to take up the lantern, and in his turn 'pergyret et ipse chorum,' till, if he had the luck to find another brother drenched in sleep, he might treat him likewise, and so return to his own place." Of the world outside the cloister walls there is, naturally, very little mention. The monks were self-centred, and had few interests beyond the daily round of conventual duties. The rolls throw no light on the social, and political, and religious changes which the country underwent during the long period which they cover. There is not so much as an allusion to the Wars of the Roses, and even the troubles in connection with Lollardism are not mentioned.

In concluding this brief notice of the Obedientiary Rolls of St. Swithun's Priory, which, under the able editorship of Dean Kitchin, form a most important contribution to the history of monastic life in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, it is satisfactory to notice that in one particular our monastery compares most favourably with similar establishments of the time. It appears to have enjoyed, and, as the Dean says, to have merited, an excellent character. The graver scandals which disgraced so many of the monastic houses found no entrance within the venerable walls of St. Swithun. If in the matters of learning and personal industry the brethren had fallen far short of their ancient and nobler predecessors in the early days of Benedictine rule, yet as regards morality they might at any rate "look the world in the face without fear."

JOHN VAUGHAN.

ART. V.—THE ORNAMENTS RUBRIC.[1]

WHETHER the words so described ought properly to be spoken of as a Rubric or not, at any rate there they stand as a direction in the Book of Common Prayer before the offices for Morning and Evening:

"*And here it is to be noted that such ornaments of the Church, and of the ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be retained and be in use as were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth.*"

Although it is perfectly clear from the history of the question that this direction means exactly the contrary of what it seems to mean, yet the words, taken by themselves, appear not only to warrant, but to require all our clergy to wear alb, chasuble, and other eucharistic vestments at all times of the service.

The extraordinary thing is, that from the year 1552, when the mediæval vestments passed out of use in the English Church, till the year 1853, when they were revived in the church of St. Thomas the Martyr at Oxford, for three hundred years in every parish church in England the simple white surplice was the distinctive garment of every minister during the performance of Divine worship. It never occurred to one of them during all those three hundred years that he ought to wear an alb, chasuble, dalmatic, tunicle, or other eucharistic vestment. When Hooker argued with the Puritans, it was not in defence of the pre-Reformation attire, which was never mentioned, but in support of the plain white surplice.

The conclusion is inevitable. One of two things—either

(1) The direction had been nullified by more authoritative directions;

(2) Or a different interpretation of it has to be taken than that on the surface.

If the vestments of the minister ought to be the same as that of the Roman Church, then an outcry against the universal neglect and departure would have been inevitable, especially in the days of Archbishop Laud.

Before the Reformation you would have seen all kinds of vestments suitable to the miracle of the Mass: amice, alb, girdle, maniple, chasuble, dalmatic, or tunicle, and the rest. The one thing you would never have seen was the Mass-priest in a surplice. A surplice was never allowed to a celebrant.

What said the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI. in 1549? It was a return towards simplicity. Nothing was said about

[1] I wish to express my obligation in this Article to the writings of my friends the Rev. F. Dyson Hague and Mr. J. T. Tomlinson.

dress in the first part of the book. But in the Communion Office, which was called "the Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass," after the three first rubrics, which are still the first three in our Book of Common Prayer, a direction was given for the dress of the officiating priests:

"The priest . . . shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration, that is to say, a *white* alb *plain*, with a vestment or cope"; and any priests or deacons helping were also to have corresponding vestures, "that is to say, alb with tunicles."

When I say this was a move towards simplicity, I mean this: The dress of the celebrant had hitherto been the chasuble. It was now to be the cope, which was not sacrificial at all, but a dress of dignity. And the plain alb was what was worn by choir and sexton; the sacrificial alb had square embroideries before and behind, and was often coloured.

The second Prayer-Book came three years afterwards, in 1552. In place of our present Ornaments Direction were these words:

"And here it is to be noted that the minister at the time of the Communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use neither alb, vestment, nor cope; but being Archbishop or Bishop, he shall have and wear a rochet; and being a priest or deacon, he shall have and wear a surplice only."

This Prayer-Book was established by an Act of Uniformity, and alb, vestment, and cope became illegal. The Mass vestments were forbidden because the Church no longer held the doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and in spite of all tradition and association, they chose for the celebrant the one dress in which he had never been allowed to celebrate—a simple white surplice.

Then came Queen Mary. Prayer-Books of 1549 and of 1552 were alike abolished, and the old Romish garb and ritual restored.

Then came Queen Elizabeth. In the first year of her reign the second Prayer-Book, that of 1552, was restored, three slight changes being authorized therein, "and none other or otherwise."

It had its own Act of Uniformity, which legalized its restoration. In the twenty-fifth section appear these words:

"Provided always, and be it enacted, that such ornaments of the Church, and of the ministers thereof, shall be retained and be in use, as was in this Church of England by authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth, until other order shall be therein taken by authority of the Queen's Majesty, with the advice of her Commissioners

appointed and authorized under the Great Seal of England for causes ecclesiastical, or of the metropolitan of this realm."

This Act of Uniformity gave the Queen power to take further order in the matter. And this she did afterwards by her Advertisements and her Injunctions, which therefore have the same force as the Act of Uniformity which authorized them.

This same Act of Uniformity, by section 3, enacted the second Prayer-Book of Edward VI. as the law of the land, which, as we have seen, enjoined the wearing of "*a surplice only.*"

The difficulty arose from what was found printed in Elizabeth's Prayer-Book when it first appeared in 1559:

"And here it is to be noted that the minister at the time of the Communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use such ornaments in the Church as were in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VIth, according to the Act of Parliament set in the beginning of this book"—that is, Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, restoring the second Prayer-Book and the surplice.

This was a professed summary of part of the Act of Uniformity, made privately, and interpreted without any authority as a rubric. The Act to which it refers expressly states that the direction was only provisional till further order shall be taken, which was done by the Advertisements and Injunctions. The same Act, as we have seen, restored the second Prayer-Book, with its exclusive use of the surplice.

This note was put in to please Elizabeth, who liked to see the cope in the Communion Service. From the very first time it appeared it was regarded as mere waste-paper, self-contradictory, and against the law, and from that day to this the vestments in question have been abolished in the Church. They were abolished deliberately and absolutely by law.

In this same year, 1559, the Commissioners referred to in the Act of Parliament at the beginning of Elizabeth's Prayer-Book did frame and prepare a set of authoritative orders to the clergy in explanation and enforcement of the Act, to show them clearly what they were to wear and do as clergymen of the Church of England; and these orders were issued by the Queen, with the advice of her Commissioners, in strict accordance with the authority given her by the Act of Uniformity.

These orders were known as "Elizabeth's Injunctions," and they provided for the church garments in the clearest possible way:

"Item, Her Majesty being desirous to have the prelacy and clergy of this realm to be had as well in outward reverence as otherwise regarded for the worthiness of their ministries,

thinking it necessary to have them known to the people in all places and assemblies, both in the Church and without, and thereby to receive the honour and estimation due to the special messengers and ministers of Almighty God; willeth and commandeth that all Archbishops and Bishops, and all other that be called or admitted to preaching or ministering the Sacraments . . . shall use and wear such seemly habits, garments, and such square caps as were most commonly and orderly received in the latter year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth."

The Queen's "Injunctions," authorized by the Act of Uniformity, thus swept away chasuble, alb, cope, tunicle, and the rest; and the 30th Injunction ordered the surplice only.

From henceforth the restored Marian garments were abolished. New editions of the Injunctions were constantly put forth, even till 1600. They are held in law to have the same force as the illustrious Act of Uniformity which gave them birth.

In the year 1566 a slight alteration was made in favour of the cope in cathedrals and colleges. There was a new set of ecclesiastical directions known as "Queen Elizabeth's Advertisements," issued by the Queen's Commissioners in her name, under authority of the Act of Uniformity. They had the same force as the Injunctions, and were referred to as the binding law of the Church on vestments by the Canons of 1571 and of 1604. The Advertisements expressly ordered that the minister, without any exceptions whatsoever in the case of parish churches, and at all services, should wear the surplice. In cathedrals and college chapels only, the cope was permitted (to the exclusion of chasubles and tunicles) in the ministration of the Holy Communion (the cope not having any sacrificial significance), and even in cathedrals and collegiate churches, at all other services, a surplice was to be worn.

Thus the so-called ornaments rubric or direction, was obviously repealed, and vestments, albs, tunicles, and the rest, were to be regarded, not merely as unauthorized and illegal garments for any minister of the Church of England, but as things associated with Popish superstitions and therefore to be destroyed.

Contemporeanea expositio fortissima est in lege—contemporaneous explanation is of all others the strongest in law. There can be no doubt about the authority of the Advertisements, for the Archbishops and Bishops were determined utterly to extirpate the old vestments, as anybody can see by the Visitation Articles of Archbishop Parker, Archbishop Grindal, Archbishop Whitgift and Archbishop Piers. Chasuble,

alb and tunicle disappeared from vestry and chancel and perished in the flames. Even in cathedrals, copes, which had only been retained to please the pomp-loving eyes of Queen Elizabeth, fell into disuse. Universally the clergy recognised the surplice as their only legal vestment. Chasuble, tunicle and cope in parish churches were universally discarded as illegal.

In 1603-4 came the Canons of the first year of King James I. They were authorized by the King, and passed by both Convocations. They modernized, modified and codified the Acts, Injunctions and Articles of Edward VI. and Elizabeth, especially the canons of 1571 and 1597.

The 24th Canon expressly provides that, according to the Advertisements published Anno 7 Elizabeth, the principal minister, with Gospeller and Epistler agreeably, in all cathedrals and collegiate churches, at Holy Communion shall *on certain great feasts* wear a decent cope.

This repeats the authority of Elizabeth's Advertisements, which abolished the vestments of Edward VI.'s First Prayer-Book, and confined the non-sacrificial cope to cathedrals and colleges. Also it dressed Gospeller and Epistler in copes like the principal ministers.

The 25th Canon says that in cathedrals and colleges when there is no Communion it shall be sufficient to wear surplices.

The 58th Canon declared the law for parish clergymen:

"Every minister saying the Public Prayers, *or ministering the Sacraments, or other rites of the Church*, shall wear a decent and comely surplice with sleeves, to be provided at the charge of the parish."

The only legal parochial vesture is thus the surplice. Copes on occasions are for cathedrals and colleges; chasuble, alb, tunicle and the rest are absolutely illegal.

These canons were considered by the Convocations which passed them to be entirely consistent with other canons, 14th, 15th, 56th, which enjoined the strictest possible conformity with the orders, rites and ceremonies prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer without addition, omission or alteration. If the old Ornaments Directions possessed any statutory authority, then these canons were directly contradictory to it and to each other.

But the Advertisements possessed legal force, and had repealed and abrogated the old direction, and thus the canons were absolutely and completely consistent.

Some say that the Mediæval Canons, authorizing mediæval vestments under a statute of Henry VIII., were still authorizing them; but that statute expressly provided that such canons were only to be in force when not against the law of

the land, or until further orders had been given. Now, whatever may be the case with regard to others of the Mediæval Canons, those on clerical vestments were most unquestionably abrogated by the Acts of Uniformity; and in the second place the canons of 1603 and 1604, compilations of Acts and Injunctions of previous reigns, being authorized by the King and accepted by the Church in the two Convocations, disannulled the former canons wherever they contradicted them. They, in short, took the place of them.

In the year 1662 comes the great puzzle. You remember the words of the old obsolete direction:

"And here it is to be noted that the minister at the time of the Communion, and at all other times in his ministration, shall use such ornaments in the Church as were in use by authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward VI. according to the Act of Parliament set in the beginning of this book."

You will recollect how the Act of Parliament referred to was the Act of Uniformity of Elizabeth, which prescribed the ornaments of the Second Prayer-Book, abrogating those of the first, and authorizing only the surplice.

We now find, in 1662, a new edition of this obsolete direction:

"And here is to be noted that such ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof at all times of their ministration, shall be retained, and be in use, as were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth."

In this new edition of King Charles II., the saving reference to Elizabeth's purgative Act of Uniformity is omitted, and apparently the law of the Church in the year 1548 and 1549, the year of the First Prayer-Book, becomes the law once more, and the semi-popish vestments of that era, chasuble, alb and tunicle, become the compulsory and legal vestments to the exclusion of all others.

But stop a moment from this hasty conclusion. The Act of Uniformity of Charles II. legalizing the Prayer-Book of 1662 did not repeal Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, but left it still in force, the guiding principle of the whole.

Elizabeth's Act most effectively overruled the old obsolete Ornaments Directions, and there is no escape from the fact that Charles II.'s Act of Uniformity, by retaining Elizabeth's, overruled that direction in precisely the same way.

In other words, the law remained in the same state in which it had been up to that date.

Up to that date the surplice only was the law for parishes,

copes on certain days for cathedrals and colleges at Communion.

Notice the words in Charles II.'s direction, "shall be retained." How could things be *retained* which for one hundred years had been disannulled, abrogated, declared illegal, and destroyed? They would have to be "restored," not "retained."

The legal authorities in England have held that as Elizabeth's Advertisements unquestionably abolished the sacrificial vestments, and as what is not in existence cannot be retained, the words of Charles II. authorized only those vestments to be retained as were in use up to that time, 1662.

Did the revisers of 1662 intend to restore the vestments that had been abolished by law for one hundred years? How could they expect an obscure direction in a corner of the Prayer-Book to override great Acts of Uniformity?

In the opinion of the legal authorities, the rubric was intended to keep the law as it was up till 1662, and to *retain* in use the dress of the last hundred years. It was expressly stated by Convocation that the alteration in its form was not material, but only verbal.

You must remember that for one hundred years the similar direction had been printed in the Prayer-Books, and had been entirely governed by the Act of Uniformity. No one ever dreamt that it could overrule the laws of Elizabeth, her "Injunctions and Advertisements," or invalidate the directions of the Canons of 1603-4.

There it stood all the time, inoperative, ineffective, emasculated, impotent, overruled, because invalidated and overridden by subsequent, expected, supremer legislation.

Did the rubric in its new form in 1662, modified not materially, but only verbally, do what it could not do before? Did it abrogate all the legislation on vestments, turn out the surplice, and restore chasuble, tunicle, and alb? Certainly not. Inoperative, ineffective, invalidate it had been; inoperative, ineffective, invalidate it remained. Nobody took any more notice of it than before. No clergyman ever dreamed of putting on the vestments of the Mass. For two hundred years all the clergy to a man acted on it in one way: they wore the surplice according to the Injunctions and Advertisements of Queen Elizabeth, the Act of Uniformity, and the Canons of 1604.

Contemporanea expositio fortissima est in lege. What did the makers of the change do themselves? Surely they must have known its meaning. If they intended to restore the vestments of the Mass, and override the law of the Church and realm, did they proceed to order and wear them? Not one.

In fact, as a matter of history, Baxter, in commenting on this very place in 1690, twenty-eight years after the revision of 1662, says of the alb and tunicle they are "things that we see nobody use." "We see that *all* those that subscribe or consent to this *yet use them not.*"

The Bishops drew up the words of revision with great care. They knew what they intended, and what they intended they showed by their practice. They never revived the disused garments; they never asked anybody else to revive them. They themselves used the grave and plain dress of the reformed Bishops, and they insisted on the clergy wearing the surplice, and the surplice only.

The change in the form of the words of the direction was, in fact, made in consequence of objections by the Puritans at the Savoy Conference. They said:

"Forasmuch as this rubric seemeth to bring back the cope, alb, etc., and other vestments forbidden by the Common Prayer-Book 5 and 6 Edward VI. [the Second Prayer-Book, A.D. 1552]; and so our reasons alleged against ceremonies under our eighteenth general exception, we desire it may be wholly left out."

The Bishops replied:

"For the reasons given in our answer [to the general demand for the abolition of certain ceremonies], we think it fit that the rubric should continue as it is."

The Puritans had in this general demand objected to the use of the surplice, and the Bishops had defended it. There had been no reference in the general demand to the older vestments. The Bishops were referred to their previous defence of the surplice.

Subsequently, however, they did alter the Ornaments Direction, with a view to contenting the Puritans.

The previous Direction had mentioned the time of Communion and all other times of ministration. The new Direction abolished this difference, and introduced the expression "at all times of their ministration" absolutely, thus bringing the Direction into conformity with the language of the 58th Canon.

If the contention of the Ritualists is right, then the clergy are compelled to wear the vestments of the Mass not only at Communion, but at all their ministrations.

It is quite clear that what the Bishops intended was to enforce the surplice at all their ministrations.

Note these facts:

(1) The Puritans objected to the Direction as seeming to bring back the sacrificial vestments.

(2) The Bishops altered it in consequence of this objection.

(3) The Bishops, far from having the least notion of having done anything to bring back the vestments, insisted always on the surplice, and on the surplice only.

Why was the rubric left there at all?

The Ritualists say that the Bishops were speaking only of a minimum, and that the legal maximum was the gorgeous vestments of Henry VIII.

But there is not one jot of evidence to show that in the reigns of Elizabeth, James, and Charles the surplice was only the minimum, with copes in cathedrals on great days. On the contrary, it was the only vestment *permitted* and *ordered*. Laud would only have been too happy if the sacrificial vestments had been legal, and if he could have enforced them. The Acts were not Acts of Biformity, but Uniformity. All the legislation of the day was characterized by extreme exactitude. There was no breath of suspicion of a minimum and maximum; the object was uniformity for all Churchmen.

Others have held the view that the Direction is to be interpreted literally, and that for three hundred years every Bishop and clergyman of the Church, up to the time of Mr. Chamberlain at St. Thomas's, Oxford, did not know what they were about, and acted illegally universally every Sunday.

The answer to this is simply that there never has been a single instance of the user of the surplice being held to be a lawbreaker, nor has there been even so much as one instance of such a prosecution.

On the contrary, it has been decided by the highest court of the land that anyone who wears these vestments at the administration of Holy Communion is committing a legal offence against the Church of England (Purchas judgment).

The law of the land and the law of the Church alike is that the surplice is the only lawful vestment for the clergyman at all times of his ministration.

What is the explanation of the perplexing Direction?

This. The Direction is not to be regarded as a rubric at all, for a rubric it never was, but simply as a kind of reference note to the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity, which remains now, as before, the primary authority as to ornaments.

In its original form the Direction (which was not a rubric, for it was an entirely unauthorized and imperfect article) referred the people to the great Statute of Uniformity, which was to settle the question.

In its final form its intention still was to retain the standard then existing, as provided for by the Act of Elizabeth.

That this explanation is the true one from the standpoint of the Church of England is proved by the fact that neither

the inserters of it or their antagonists ever regarded it as a fresh enactment determining the vestments of the clergy.

The original reference to the second year of King Edward VI. was a provisional reference to the Prayer-Book of 1549, but it was explicitly governed by its own reference to Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, which ordered the surplice only. It was explicitly governed by the authority the Act gave the Queen to take further order with the advice of her Commissioners, when they should have had time to consider the question.

It was only the intense conservatism of printers and of authorities in matters of antiquarianism and history that kept this rubric being printed in edition after edition, time after time, long after it had been superseded by the expected Injunctions, Advertisements, and Canons. It is an antiquarianism of the same kind, though not in the same matter, as the obsolete and ridiculous address to King James still printed at the beginning of the Authorized Version.

It is in the highest degree uncritical and unconstitutional to pick out a sentence of the Prayer-Book—especially one that is the most difficult in the whole volume—and interpret it literally, in the face of facts, without regard to history and intention.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

Notes and Queries.

AN INCIDENT, WITH THE MORAL OF IT.

IN the days of Saladin, that renowned Sultan who so well fought against our own Richard Cœur de Lion, Bohadin, a renowned historian and judge, was on the seat of judgment. An old merchant tendered a bill of complaint, and insisted that it should be opened. "Who is your adversary?" inquired the judge. "My adversary is the Sultan," responded the merchant; "but this is the seat of judgment, and it is said that you are not governed by regard for persons." Replied the judge: "The case cannot be decided without the adversary being first apprised." The Sultan was informed, condescended to appear, produced his witnesses, justly defended and gained his cause. The old man's bravery and confidence in the law so pleased the Sultan that he dismissed him with a robe of honour, a rich donation, and an assurance of friendship.

The Moral.—We, with all creation changing moment by moment, we, like a flower of the field to-day, and to-morrow cast into the oven, are all before Thee, our glorious God. We would be wise, not defer our work till to-morrow; to-morrow's sun we are not sure will rise. Israel was invited: "Come now, and let us reason together." She would not. We, Lord, would reason: "Hast Thou made us to be sold for naught? Do we, like Asaph, cleanse our heart in vain, wash our hands in innocency, and chasten ourselves every morning? Hast thou deceived us? and are we

deceived, as said the most sorrowful of the prophets? Nay, Lord, Thou art mightier, truer, more loving and wise than any earthly monarch. Thou wilt not leave us, Lord, to be of all creatures most miserable because of sin in ourselves and weakness in nature. Let our cry come unto Thee. Tell us we are Thine."

A voice as from heaven, speaking by beloved Paul, responds: "The creation was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but in hope; because the creation shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God."

We thank Thee, Lord: now shall our heart be glad, and our spirit rest in hope.

Short Notices.

Temptation and Toil. By the Rev. W. HAY-AITKEN. Pp. 304. Price 3s. 6d. Isbister and Co.

THE publishers have brought out another useful volume of sermons. Striking and original in matter and persuasive in treatment, they bear out Mr. Aitken's high reputation as a powerful influence in winning souls to Christ.

The Great Problem of God. By the Rev. GEORGE JAMIESON, D.D. Pp. 367. Elliot Stock.

No more important subject than the existence of God, and our means of apprehending it, could engage the attention of a philosopher and theologian. This powerful and most interesting work consists of a historical résumé of philosophical speculation from Descartes and Spinoza to Kant and Hegel; an examination of Hume and Huxley on problems of mind; an examination of Mr. Balfour's "Foundations of Belief," with a final examination, in fifteen sections, into our knowledge of the being of God. The work deals with great reverence, clear sight, and notable breadth of view, with the deepest and most difficult problems which the mind of man can face.

The Biblical Illustrator. By the Rev. J. S. EXELL. 1 Corinthians. Vol. i., pp. 588; vol. ii., pp. 596. Price 7s. 6d. each. Nisbet and Co.

This is a work of immense industry, in which almost every known writer on the subject has been laid under contribution. It is a treasury of well-arranged thought and suggestion, and full of well-devised help for the busy Churchman. These two volumes contain a whole library of valuable matter.

Christ in the Old Testament. By the Rev. HENRY LINTON. Pp. 270. Elliot Stock.

All Christians believe that the Old Testament was a preparation for the coming of the Messiah, and many helps to Bible study have given lists of types, prophecies, and sacrificial prediction; but nowhere has this been done with so much thoroughness as by Canon Linton. The book will be a most useful manual to the Biblical student and teacher.

Present-Day Tracts. Pp. 60. Price 2s. 6d. R.T.S.

The present volume of this excellent series contains six essays—Nos. 73 to 78—*i.e.*, "Life and Immortality brought to Light by Christ," by Dr. William Wright; "Hereditary and Personal Responsibility," by the Rev. M. Kaufmann; "The Unity, Continuity, and Systematic Complete-

ness of the Scriptures a Proof of their Divine Origin," by the Rev. R. Bedford; "The Historical Deluge in its Relation to Scientific Discovery and to Present Questions," by Sir William Dawson; "The Jews in their Present Condition Witnesses to the Bible," by Revs. W. Burnet and Lukyn Williams; "The Early Witness to the Four Gospels," by the Rev. Walter Green. The subjects have been carefully treated, and the writers bring together a great deal of useful information. The treatment is candid and the reasoning fair.

The Laws of the Church of Ireland. By the Right Hon. R. R. WARREN. Pp. 141. Dublin: McGee; London: Stevens and Haynes.

This able, comprehensive, and well-considered work is very interesting to English Churchmen, as illustrating the internal condition and working of a kindred Church which has been severed from the State, and has had to reform its own constitution. It is needless to speak of the ability, clearness, good sense, and breadth of view of the distinguished author.

Sacred Books of the East. Translated by JAMES DARMESTETER. Pp. 390. Price 10s. 6d. Vol. iv.: "The Zend-a-Vesta," part i. Clarendon Press.

The volume contains the Vendidâd, the Book of the Laws of the Parsees—more exactly, the Code of Purification. Two more volumes of the series complete all the relics of the Parsee literature. These interesting "remains" contain, "What was the Religion of Cyrus, Darius, and Xerxes?" But for the battle of Marathon, it is thought that it might have become the religion of Europe. The Zend-a-Vesta forms to the present day the sacred book of the Parsees, the so-called Fire-worshippers of India. The religion has been almost extinguished in its original home—Persia, or Iran—by Mahometanism.

This great collection of translations is edited by Professor Max Müller, and has the sanction and co-operation of the Secretary of State for India. It consists of forty-nine volumes, and is a monument of industry. It contains materials for a great philosophical work on the natural religions of the East. The present volume contains eighty-nine pages of most valuable and interesting introduction by the late lamented translator, in which he gives a historical account of the writings, and traces the various influences—Greek, Jewish, and others—which have helped to produce them. The religious ideas of every thoughtful race are interesting, and the religion of the Parsees is one of the most elevating of its kind.

The Expositor's Bible: The Second Epistle to the Corinthians. By the Rev. JAMES DENNY, B.D. Pp. 387. Price 7s. 6d. Hodder and Stoughton.

Mr. Denny writes with deep sympathy and insight of the Apostle's belief and character. For the purposes of continuous meditation, there is a great advantage in the form of the "Expositor's Bible." This volume, for instance, consists of twenty-eight essays or dissertations, with the passage of the epistle to which they refer printed in small type at the head. The object of the work is not dogmatic, but expository.

Texts and Studies: Biblical and Patristic. Edited by Professor ARMITAGE ROBINSON. Vol. iv., No. 1: "The Athanasian Creed and its Early Commentaries." By A. E. BURN. Pp. 68. Price 5s. Cambridge University Press.

This exhaustive and valuable collection is designed to re-establish the position of Waterland, whose critical history of the Creed has been a standard work for one hundred and sixty years. Waterland's conclusion was that it was composed by Hilary, once Abbot of Lerins, and next Bishop of Arles, about the year 430. In Germany latterly a two-portion theory has prevailed, and has been supported by Harnack, which has been

supposed to put Waterland out of court. Mr. Burn shows that these critics had not consulted many newly-discovered MSS. He distinguishes between Augustinian and Gallican elements, and suggests that the Creed was designed to meet the heresy of Priscillian, which was spreading in Gaul at the beginning of the fifth century. The work forms an invaluable monograph on this interesting Church document.

History of Christian Doctrine. G. P. FISHER, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale University. Pp. 583. Price 12s. T. and T. Clark.

This is the fourth volume of the "International Theological Library.' It is a comprehensive survey of the field of Christian philosophy and doctrine, and manifests wide research, immense reading, and a fair, candid, and dispassionate spirit. The writer is able to give an impartial account of the different views with which he deals. He ends with a series of quotations from Dean Church and Dr. Dale of Birmingham. Dean Church speaks of the limitation of our conceptions as to Eternal Punishment, the Incarnation, and the Atonement. The quotations from Dr. Dale suggest that, while theological truth remains inviolable, the expression of it may in certain cases require restatement. It is only by the choice of the quotations from these two great writers that the author indicates any special view of his own.

The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old, considered in the Light of General Literature. By FRANKLIN JOHNSON, D.D., Professor in the University of Chicago. Pp. 409. Price 7s. 6d. London: Baptist Book Society.

The writer deals with the utmost frankness with eleven objections brought against New Testament writers for their usage in quotations. He shows that they do not err against the laws of literature, that, where a quotation will not bear the burden of argument, it is used rather as an illustration. He deals with the immense mass of quotation in a very candid manner; and even when the reader does not agree with him, he will find the treatment suggestive, penetrating, and useful.

Israel My Glory. By JOHN WILKINSON. Sixth edition. Pp. 310. London: Mildmay Mission to the Jews.

Mr. Wilkinson is the founder of the Mildmay Mission to the Jews. He deals with great skill with the various objections brought by Jews against Christianity. Few men could speak from greater experience in this matter, as few have laboured with more untiring zeal. No one who attempts to preach to Jews or to convert them should be without this exceedingly practical work, penetrated as it is with the fullest and sincerest belief in the message of God to mankind through Old and New Testament.

Robert Whittaker McAll. Pp. 252. Price 6s. R.T.S.

Robert McAll was descended from a family belonging to the Isle of Coll, in the Hebrides. He will be chiefly remembered for his celebrated mission in Paris. He was educated at the Independent Lancashire College, and held pastorates at Sunderland, Leicester, and Hadleigh. These interesting memorials are from his own note-books and from the pen of his wife. He died in 1893, and seems to have had a singularly happy life, blessed by successful work, widely acknowledged by the French, and testified to by Theodore Monod, Dr. Noyes, of the English Church, Pastor Hollard, of the Free Church, and by many others. The biography will be a great encouragement to all who believe that when the heart is absolutely devoted to Christ, the powers of Divine grace are as effective as ever.

The Month.

MEMORIALS.

Bishop Pelham.

A MEMORIAL to the late Bishop Pelham has been unveiled in Norwich Cathedral. It consists of a recumbent effigy of the deceased prelate, in his episcopal robes, resting upon a cenotaph of handsome design. The base is of Kilkenny marble, surmounted by Derby alabaster, beautifully carved, and inlaid with tablets in Connemara marble. On the west panel of the cenotaph there is a mitre, on the south side the arms of the See impaled with the Pelham arms, and on the north side the Pelham arms alone. The effigy, in purest Carrara marble, is a work of great beauty, and was executed by Mr. James Forsyth, of Finchley Road, Hampstead, who was the sculptor employed upon the Goulburn pulpit erected in the nave of the cathedral. The inscription is as follows: "The Honourable John Thomas Pelham, D.D., 65th Bishop of Norwich, 1857. Died 1894, aged 82. Erected by a few of the many friends who loved him." The memorial is placed in the north transept in front of the door through which for many years it was the custom of the late Bishop to enter the cathedral from the palace gardens. The idea of erecting the memorial originated with the late Mr. Henry Birkbeck and members of his family, and was so warmly taken up by personal friends of Bishop Pelham that an appeal for public subscriptions was rendered unnecessary. The ceremony of unveiling was of a very simple character, and was performed after evensong by Canon Patteson, one of the Bishop's most esteemed and trusted friends, who, on behalf of the subscribers, committed the effigy to the charge of the Dean and Chapter.

Dr. Arnold.

The Dean of Westminster has unveiled a bust, by Mr. Alfred Gilbert, R.A., of Thomas Arnold, of Rugby. It had been intended that the ceremony should take place on Arnold's birthday—June 13th—but it was unavoidably postponed. The bust is at the south-west corner of the nave, anciently the baptistry and once the consistory court; and the bust is opposite that of the great headmaster's son, Matthew Arnold, and in the company of those of Wordsworth, Keble, Frederick Denison Maurice, and Fawcett. Among those present were the Archbishop of Canterbury (formerly a master at Rugby) and several old pupils of Arnold's, including the Bishop of Gibraltar, Dr. Lake (late Dean of Durham), Sir Gardner Engleheart, and Admiral Blake. Three American gentlemen, warm admirers of Arnold and of Rugby, were also present—namely, Mr. W. G. M'Cabe, of Richmond, Virginia; Mr. Silas M'Bee (North Carolina), and Mr. J. W. Wood (New York), vice-president and secretary respectively of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew. In the course of an eloquent address, the Dean of Westminster (himself an old pupil) said:

"We are paying honour to the memory of the great Christian reformer, as we may well call him, of the whole life of our English public schools, whose influence, direct and indirect, is felt far and wide even now. . . . We honour the memory of the historian, student, and teacher of history, whose brief appearance in the months before his death at the University which he loved so dearly as by some magic spell won the heart of a suspicious or a hostile Oxford. And we honour not least the memory of one who early in life and late in life recognised the growing importance of all social questions, and who two years before his death spoke of the real and Christian elevation of the working classes as an object more precious to him than any other in the world. . . . We rejoice to see and

to remember for one moment the joy with which his pupil and biographer would have seen his memorial placed by the side of the Keble, whose sacred poems some of us may still almost seem as they read them to hear as they heard them for the first time recited by the deep-toned voice of Arnold, with the light falling through a window placed there by an American citizen in honour of the Christian poets Herbert and Cowper—in a line with the Wordsworth, whom he had learned so early to appreciate as almost a boy at Oxford, and whose friendship and intimacy he so dearly prized in his home at Fox How.'

A Fortunate Parish.

Prebendary Eardley-Wilmot has issued the annual report of the work and funds connected with the parish of St. Jude's, South Kensington. It is an exceedingly interesting pamphlet, and shows how thoroughly the highly-favoured congregation of St. Jude's have learnt to appreciate "the luxury of doing good." The amount of the voluntary contributions for the various objects is upwards of £7,150, being more by £1,165 than the amount subscribed last year. "It is a great satisfaction," says the Vicar, "to feel that St. Jude's is maintaining its position as one of the foremost churches in helping on the work of the Church of Christ in the diocese, and indeed all over the world. This is the position which our peculiar circumstances, free as we are in a great measure from parochial claims, demand from us. I rejoice to feel that it is realized and met." St. Jude's has two "affiliated parishes"—St. Mary's, Whitechapel, and St. Clement's, Fulham. Substantial grants are made to both parishes; but more important still is the large amount of personal sympathy which is shown by the ladies of St. Jude's, some forty of whom visit and work in these parishes with great regularity.

The New Clergy Sustentation Fund.

The committee appointed to consider the subject of clergy sustentation by the letter of the Archbishops, dated March 16, 1896, have now formulated a definite scheme, which will receive the name of "The Clergy Sustentation Fund," and will embrace in its operations the two provinces of Canterbury and York. Its objects are to be:

1. To impress upon all the members of the Church of England the clearly-defined Christian duty of contributing towards the support of the clergy.

2. To supplement and extend the diocesan organizations for the support of the clergy, to elicit contributions in this respect from the richer towards the poorer dioceses, and generally to promote the further sustentation of the clergy. The methods by which it is proposed to advance these objects are:

(*a*) The affiliation of the existing diocesan organizations for the sustentation of the clergy, and the formation of such organizations in dioceses where they do not at present exist.

(*b*) The establishment of a central fund, which shall consist of contributions from the affiliated diocesan organizations and the general contributions to the fund itself, and be applied in making annual grants in augmentation of the income of needy benefices, the grants being apportioned among the affiliated dioceses according to their necessities, and being made in a block grant in each diocese for allocation and distribution.

(*c*) The acceptance and administration of special funds for the clergy, whether by way of permanent endowment, or in any other manner, according to the wishes of the donors.

(*d*) Co-operation with other institutions having similar objects.

The governing body of the fund will be a board of laymen, consisting of three members elected by each diocese. Subject to the control of this

board, the fund will be managed by an executive committee of forty-two laymen. Of these, six will be nominated by each of the two Archbishops, and the remaining thirty will be elected by the board, ten in each year, to hold office for three years. As it is impossible all at once to attain a complete elected representative body, thirty members, with the sanction of the Archbishops, are in course of being appointed to act, in the first instance, with the nominees of the Archbishops, as the executive committee; and of these one-third will retire at the first three annual elections in 1897, 1898, and 1899 respectively, but will be eligible for re-election.

The two Archbishops have sent the following letter to Lord Egerton of Tatton, warmly approving of the scheme:

"*June* 26, 1896.

"DEAR LORD EGERTON OF TATTON,

"We have considered the scheme and constitution of the Clergy Sustentation Fund which has been submitted to us, and, as was to be expected, considering the source from which they emanate, they seem to us to be drawn upon excellent lines, and to be likely to elicit from loyal laymen the support required for the promotion of the Church's efficiency.

"We earnestly commend the whole scheme to the Church and people of England.—We are, yours very truly.

"EDW. CANTUAR,
"WILLELM. EBOR."

Obituary.

THE BISHOP OF QU'APPELLE.

THE Right Rev. William John Burn was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he took his B.A. degree in 1874, and M.A. in 1882. In the former year he was a Wrangler in the Mathematical Tripos. He was ordained deacon in 1874 and priest in the following year, and was curate of Chesterton from 1874 to 1876, when he became curate of St. Paul, Jarrow, where he remained until 1881. In that year he was appointed to the vicarage of St. Peter, Jarrow, which he left in 1887, and from 1890 to 1893 he was Vicar of Coniscliffe, in the diocese of Durham. On March 25, 1893, he was consecrated Bishop of Qu'Appelle, in the North-West Territories of Canada, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the ceremony taking place in Westminster Abbey, and the same year he received the honorary D.D. degree.

ARCHDEACON BARDSLEY.

Archdeacon Bardsley, Vicar of Bradford, died suddenly on June 23 at the age of 71. He was in good health until a few weeks ago, when he developed alarming symptoms, and his medical advisers had determined upon an operation. He belonged to a family of prominent Churchmen. He was educated at Queen's College, Cambridge, where he graduated B.A. in 1849, proceeding M.A. in 1859. He was ordained deacon in 1849, and priest in 1850. From 1857 to 1860 he was perpetual curate of St. Silas, Liverpool; from 1860 to 1869 secretary of the London Diocesan Home Mission; and from 1869 to 1880 Rector and Rural Dean of Stepney. In 1880 he became Vicar of Bradford, and in the same year was made Rural Dean of Bradford. The Lambeth degree of D.D. was conferred upon him in 1881. He was Honorary Canon of Ripon from 1884 to 1895, and in the latter year became Canon. In 1894 he was appointed Archdeacon of Craven.

ARCHDEACON COOPER.

Very general regret has been felt in the North of England at the announcement of the death of Archdeacon Cooper, which took place at the Abbey, Carlisle. The late Archdeacon was, according to the

Yorkshire Post, the youngest son of the late Mr. Samuel Cooper, of Tranby, Hull, and brother of the late Sir Henry Cooper, M.D., senior physician of Hull Infirmary. Born on March 16, 1813, he was educated at Shrewsbury School, and proceeding to Cambridge, became a scholar of Trinity College. He secured a double first, being a Wrangler and first class in classics. Ordained in the year of her Majesty's accession, he remained at Cambridge for twenty-one years, being Senior Dean from 1855 to 1858, when he was appointed to the Trinity College living of Kendal. Six years later he was appointed Archdeacon of Westmoreland. His work in the county and the diocese has been of a most vigorous and beneficent character. In March last he resigned the living of Kendal in consequence of failing health. Archdeacon Cooper was much endeared to the people of the town and district by reason of his devotion to their welfare, and the readiness with which he gave of his own means to philanthropic and religious objects. He was a member of Convocation, and held numerous Church offices in the diocese. Thirteen years ago he was collated to the first canonry in Carlisle Cathedral.

The Dean of Ferns.

The Deanery of Ferns is vacant by the death of the Very Rev. Charles Hind, reported from Plymouth. The Dean, who was in his seventieth year, came to Ireland in 1877, after more than twenty-five years' successful work in England. He was ordained in 1850 in the diocese of Winchester, and was curate of Rotherhithe up to 1856, when he was appointed to the curacy of Stapenhill, in Derbyshire. He remained there until 1863, and then went to Bolton, where he acted as curate until 1866. From 1866 to 1872 he was perpetual curate of St. Paul's, Bolton; and was Vicar of Christ Church, Silloth, from 1872 to 1877, when he was appointed Rector of Ferns. He was Prebendary of Kilrane in Ferns Cathedral from 1877 to 1891, and Chancellor from 1891 to 1892, when he was elected Dean.

The Dowager Lady Dynevor.

The late Dowager Lady Dynevor, whose death took place on the 5th of August at her London residence, 112, Queen's Gate, was the eldest daughter of the Rev. Henry Carnegie Knox, Vicar of Lichlade, Gloucestershire. She married in 1856—as his second wife—the Rev. the Right Hon. Francis William Rice, fifth Lord Dynevor, who died in 1878. She leaves one son, the Rev. the Hon. W. Talbot Rice, Rector of St. Peter-le-Bailey, Oxford, and three daughters. The Dowager Lady Dynevor was deeply attached to the true principles of the Church of England, and took a warm and active interest in the work of the Church Pastoral Aid Society. She was president of the Ladies' Home Mission Union, and was indefatigable in her efforts to promote its usefulness as the handmaid of the C.P.A.S. Only a few days before her death the August number of *Church and People* was in her hands, and she said to her daughter, the hon. secretary of the L.H.M.U., alluding to some very urgent cases of parishes needing help, "These cases, A. and D., must be helped." At the last meeting for the season of the Ladies' Home Mission Union Committee on June 20, when Lady Dynevor was present and able to take her usual active part in the proceedings, she remarked to a friend after the meeting, "I cannot tell you how thankful I feel to the C.P.A.S. For many years past it has been a subject of deep interest to me, and has given me such pleasant occupation."

Note.—In the review in a recent number of a work on the "Millennium," it should have been noticed that the account from the first verse of the twentieth chapter of Revelation to the first half of the fourth verse is described by the author as the state of the Church on earth during that period, while the next two verses relate to the state of the Church in heaven. The book, which is not long, will be found full of thoughtful suggestion, and worth study.

INDEX TO VOL. X.

Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row, London.