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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

FEBRUARY, 1897.

ART. I.—STRONGHOLDS OF THE CHURCH IN BRITAIN.

WINCHESTER.

IT is difficult, in the short space of a single paper, to do justice to the city and diocese of Winchester. The capital of the kingdom for centuries before London, the cradle of English civilization, the most historic of English towns, the city of Alfred and the Saxon kings, the see of the statesmen-bishops of the Middle Ages, the earliest seat of learning, and the home of the first great public school, Winchester occupies a unique position in English history. Her splendid cathedral, with its massive grandeur and noble architecture, is, with the one exception of Westminster Abbey, the most famous church in England. Here in the mortuary chests lie the bones of the Saxon kings. Here the great Cnut, and Emma, lady of the English, and the mighty Earl Godwin are buried. Here lie St. Birinus, the apostle of the West Saxons, and St. Swithun, and Archbishop Stigand, and Walkelyn, and Henry de Blois, the first founder of the hospital of St. Cross. Here may be seen the splendid chantries of William of Wykeham, of Bishop Wayneflete, the founder of Magdalen College, Oxford, of Cardinal Beaufort, and of Bishop Fox, the founder of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Here, too, lie Stephen Gardiner, and the saintly Bishop Morley, and the latitudinarian Bishop Benjamin Hoadley. In Prior Silkstead's Chapel Izaak Walton, "the Prince of Fishermen," is buried; while in the north aisle of the nave lies the celebrated novelist, Jane Austen.

Of Winchester in Roman times history is silent. We know nothing beyond what may be learnt from the discovery of coins and ornaments, of tessellated pavements and Roman bricks. After the conversion of Constantine, Roman Britain

probably became nominally Christian, and Christian basilicas were almost certainly erected at Winchester, Silchester, Portchester, and other Roman settlements. But such Christianity as may have existed in Roman times had entirely disappeared when in the year 634 Birinus began his mission to the West Saxons. Soon afterwards King Cynegils was baptized, and before long Winchester became the seat of the Wessex bishopric.

During the Saxon period there is little of interest to relate till we come to the time of St. Swithun, the instructor of the good King Alfred. It was in his days, and probably owing to his influence, that King Æthelwulf made his famous "donation" to the church, in which, as the old chronicle has it, "he booked the tenth part of his lands to God's praise and his own eternal welfare." This document was written at Winchester, and laid with great solemnity, in the presence of St. Swithun and the Witan, on the high altar in the cathedral church. When the good Bishop died he desired that he might be buried, not in the church, but in the churchyard, "where the rain of heaven might fall upon him." One hundred years afterwards it was decided to remove his bones into the cathedral; then it was that the heavens opened and the floods came, with which in popular tradition the name of St. Swithun is inseparably associated. About this time the monastic revival took place under the celebrated Dunstan, when a strange scene was enacted in Winchester Cathedral. The canons at Winchester were seculars, and were mostly married men; these the Bishop, backed up by Dunstan and King Edgar, determined to displace by monks of the order of St. Benedict. So, on the first Saturday in Lent, 964, Bishop Æthelwold strode into the choir, accompanied by one who carried a large bundle of Benedictine cowls, which were flung down in front of the Bishop's throne. As soon as the chanting of the Psalms ceased, the Bishop in a loud voice, and pointing to the heap of Benedictine clothes, bade the canons "take up the garb, or go, and forfeit your places." Whereon three only obeyed; the rest were at once thrust out of their canonries. While this drama was being enacted, a party of monks from Abingdon Abbey, says Dean Kitchin, "stood peering in at the door, eager to possess the land; they gladly came in and filled the vacant seats."

With the Norman Conquest a great change passed over the fortunes of Winchester. The unfortunate Stigand was deprived, and remained for the rest of his days in captivity, while a kinsman of the Conqueror was set upon the vacant seat. In 1079 Bishop Walkelyn began to build his stately cathedral, large portions of which, especially the massive

transepts, remain almost unchanged to the present day. The stone for building came from the Binstead quarries in the Isle of Wight, while the timber for the roof was granted by the King—as many oak-trees in Hempage Wood as could be cut down in three days. Whereupon the Bishop got together "carpenters innumerable," and to the immense indignation of the Conqueror, swept away the entire wood, and carted it into the city! It is worthy of mention that at Winchester the famous Domesday Book was compiled, and the curfew-bell first began to be rung.

Bishop Gifford, who succeeded Walkelin, is chiefly memorable for having introduced the Cistercian Order into England. In 1129 he founded Waverley Abbey, near Farnham; and later on monasteries were established at Netley, Beaulieu, and at Quarr in the Isle of Wight. But unfortunately no Cistercian church has been preserved in the diocese; only the picturesque ruins of Netley and Beaulieu tell the story of their former magnificence. The permanent mark which the Cistercians have left is of another kind. "We may read," says Mr. Shore, "the story of their industry on the surface of the lands which they brought into cultivation, on their great estate at Beaulieu, where the remains of the great barn, one of the largest in England, may still be seen at St. Leonard's Grange."

The episcopate of Henry de Blois, the younger brother of King Stephen, was one of the most eventful in the annals of Winchester. It was an age of castle-building, when, as we learn from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, "every rich man built his castle, and the land was full of castles." The Bishop was not behind the barons in this respect. He built Farnham Castle and Wolvesey Castle at Winchester, and castles at Bishops Waltham and Hursley, and other places. It is not, however, as a builder of castles that Henry de Blois deserves our gratitude; it is rather as the founder of the hospital of St. Cross, "one of the most precious relics of antiquity which Hampshire possesses. It has memories of kings, bishops, and crusaders, of many distinguished men in Church and State who have guided its fortunes, of countless pilgrims of high and low degree, and of the poor of more than twenty generations who have claimed hospitality there, and had their claim allowed."

We have already noticed how, in 1129, Bishop Gifford introduced the famous Cistercian Order into England; it was reserved for another Bishop of Winchester to take the not less important step of bringing the Preaching Friars into this country. This was the work of Bishop Peter des Roches, who in 1225 built the Dominicans a house in Winchester; and

shortly afterwards a Franciscan monastery was established. Unlike the Cistercians, who loved to build their houses amid quiet scenes of beauty, the Friars, Black and Grey alike, sought out the busy haunts of men, where, in the lowest and most crowded districts, they could grapple manfully, and face to face, with the sin and misery around them. At Winchester both orders settled in the poorest quarter on the north side of the city.

With William of Edington begins the long series of statesmen-bishops which lasted up to the time of the Reformation. He had been Master of St. Cross, and was a man of great capacity and wisdom. He held the office of Lord Chancellor, and when the Order of the Garter was established he was made chief officer, a position which has passed to the Bishops of Winchester ever since. To Bishop Edington is due the credit of having introduced the Perpendicular style of architecture in the cathedral at Winchester; and to him is ascribed the famous saying that "if Canterbury be the highest rack, Winchester has the deepest manger." Edington was succeeded by William of Wykeham, the greatest and most famous of all the Bishops of Winchester. The son of poor parents, born in an obscure village in Hampshire, he rose by his own merits to be one of the foremost men in Church and State. There is, no doubt, some truth in Wiclif's innuendo that he owed his advancement in the Church to his architectural skill; yet, on the other hand, while no one will dispute his abilities, he was a man of such blameless life that it was said that his enemies in attacking him were "trying to find a knot in a rush." The splendid nave of Winchester Cathedral, one of the finest specimens of Perpendicular work in England, is in the main his work; while he also repaired the Bishops' palaces at Farnham, Wolvesey, and Bishops Waltham, and a large number of churches throughout the diocese. It is, however, as the inaugurator of our grand system of public schools that William of Wykeham is mainly memorable. He has been well called "the Father of the English public school system"; and as the founder of Winchester College and of New College, Oxford, his name is rightly honoured by thousands of Wykehamists throughout the world. He died in his stately palace at Bishops Waltham in the eightieth year of his age, on "Saturday, September 27, about 8 o'clock in the morning, in the year 1404." His body was carried in solemn procession to Winchester, and buried in the chantry which he himself had founded on the exact spot where, as a child, he had loved to meditate and pray.

After Wykeham came Henry Beaufort, one of Shakespeare's Cardinals, less of a prelate than a statesman; indeed, "the only

Englishman of his day who had any pretensions to be called a politician." Shakespeare's famous picture—not an altogether fair one—of his character and death is well known. "He is consigned," says Dean Milman, "to everlasting torment by a decree, as far as the estimation of mankind, more powerful than Papal. His death of despair, described by Shakespeare, painted by Reynolds, is indelibly imprinted on the mind of man." "Lord Cardinal," says King Henry VI., standing by the awful death-bed,

> "If thou think'st on heaven's bliss,
> Hold up thy hand, make signal of thy hope.
> He dies, and makes no sign."

His chantry, thought by some to be the most elegant and finished in the kingdom, is inscribed with the touching scroll, "Tribularer si nescirem misericordias tuas." Bishop Waynflete, who succeeded Beaufort, was the founder of Magdalen College, Oxford, using the revenues of the suppressed priory of Selborne as part of its endowment. Just before the Reformation the see was held by good Bishop Fox, who founded the college of Corpus Christi, Oxford, not for "a company of bussing monks," as he had originally intended, but for secular students, "abandoning the attempt to pour new wine into the old bottles of monasticism." Ten years before his death the Bishop became blind, and retired from Court to his palace at Wolvesey, where he lived at peace with all men. "There is a tradition," says Dean Kitchin, "that he was led daily by his chaplain into the cathedral, and guided up the steps in his chantry, and there left to sit and meditate on the chequered incidents of his past life, and the unknown future which lay before him." Wolsey, the very type of an ambitious Churchman, who had long been eagerly watching for Fox's death, managed to succeed him, but he only held the see for two years, and does not appear to have ever visited Winchester.

At the time of the dissolution of the monasteries, under Henry VIII., the diocese of Winchester suffered spoliation with the rest of England. The great establishments of Winchester, Romsey, Netley, Titchfield, Southwick, Quarr, Waverley, Chertsey, as well as all the smaller houses, were swept away and their revenues confiscated. Two famous foundations, however, most fortunately escaped, though for a time they were in danger of suppression—Wykeham's College at Winchester and the hospital of St. Cross. On the accession of Mary, Stephen Gardiner, who had been deprived under the Protectorate of Somerset and confined to the Tower, was at once restored to his see of Winchester, and made Lord Chancellor of England. He crowned the Queen in West-

minster Abbey, and later on received her and Philip at Winchester, where the ill-starred marriage was celebrated—the chair in which the Queen sat being still on show in the cathedral. During her miserable reign, but not during the lifetime of Gardiner, four Protestants were burnt in the diocese for their opinions. In the time of James I. the saintly Lancelot Andrews was for nearly twenty years Bishop of Winchester. As a preacher, and especially as a writer of devotional literature, his reputation is deservedly supreme, and he has been well called "Doctor Andrews in the schools, Bishop Andrews in the diocese, and Saint Andrews in the closet." It was during his episcopate that the Channel Islands, which for many years after their union with England remained under the episcopal jurisdiction of the Bishop of Coutances, were finally transferred to the diocese of Winchester.

During the period of the Civil War many stirring incidents took place in the city and diocese of Winchester. The city was captured by Waller, and the victorious troopers broke into the cathedral during morning service, with drums beating and colours flying, and "rode up through the body of the church and the chancel till they came to the altar." They then proceeded, it is said, to sweep away such ornaments as remained, to demolish the organ, to ransack the muniment room, to break open the mortuary chests, and to fling the bones at the stained-glass windows. Wykeham's chantry, however, remained untouched, owing to the zeal of one Nathaniel Fiennes, an officer in the Parliamentary army, and an old Wykehamist, who stood at the doorway with drawn sword and saved it from injury. Then, we are told, "the troopers rode through the streets in surplesses with such hoods and tippets as they found; and that they might boast to the world how glorious a victory they had achieved, they held out their trophies to all spectators; for the troopers, thus clad in the priests' vestments, rode carrying Common Prayer-Books in one hand, and some broken organ-pipes, together with the mangled pieces of carved work, in the other." Wolvesey Palace was dismantled, and has remained a ruin ever since. The stately palace at Bishops Waltham shared the same fate, the Bishop barely escaping, according to local tradition, in a farm-cart, covered over with a layer of manure. Farnham Castle, too, fell into the hands of the Parliament, and the dungeons were filled with Royalist prisoners. It is interesting to notice that some of Cromwell's letters are dated from Farnham. The historic siege of Basing House need only be alluded to, and the bloody battle of Cheriton, the last fought on Hampshire soil. A "famous fight" took place in Alton Church, where a

number of bullets may still be seen embedded in the pillars. Colonel Bolles was shot in the pulpit, and a memorial commemorating his death may be seen in Winchester Cathedral.

After the Restoration, George Morley, who had been chaplain to Charles II. during his exile, was made Bishop of Winchester. No more honourable or saintly man ever occupied the ancient see. A man of immense wealth, he lived the life of an ascetic, and his little room under the stairs at Farnham Castle may still be seen. Farnham Castle he almost rebuilt; the stately staircase, the magnificent hall as we now see it, the chapel with its rich carving, said to be the work of Grinling Gibbons, are due to him. He also built a new palace at Winchester close beside the ruins of Wolvesey Castle, now used, owing to the energy of Bishop Thorold, as a church house for the diocese. Two intimate friends of the good Bishop call for honourable mention. One was Thomas Ken, the author of the Morning and the Evening Hymns, at that time a Prebendary of Winchester, who built for himself an everlasting name by refusing to give "poor Nelly" a lodging. The other was Izaak Walton, the grand old fisherman, and brother-in-law of Thomas Ken, who often fished in the clear streams at Winchester and Farnham. The diocese is also indebted to Bishop Morley for the cathedral library, which he bequeathed to the Dean and Chapter, "but not for their benefit only, but also for the use and benefit of such clergymen and country parsons, vicars and curates, as have not a sufficient stock of books of their own, nor yet money to buy them."

On the death of good Bishop Morley, Peter Mews, the soldier-bishop, succeeded to Winchester. He is memorable, not for learning or piety or munificence, but for actually taking a part in the battle of Sedgemoor; and the defeat of Monmouth is said to have been due in no small degree to the skill with which he led the King's artillery into action. In the Bloody Assize which followed the rebellion one revolting incident took place at Winchester. Dame Alice Lisle, of Moyle Court, an aged lady of noble and kindly disposition, was condemned to death by the infamous Jeffreys for giving shelter to two of Monmouth's followers. The cathedral clergy remonstrated with the Chief Justice in vain, and the illustrious lady was beheaded on a scaffold in the market-place of Winchester on September 2, 1685.

Sir Jonathan Trelawney, who followed Mews, was one of the seven bishops committed to the Tower by James II. for presenting the famous petition against the Declaration of Indulgence, and the once popular song, "And shall Trelawney die," referred to him. Of the Whig bishops the most celebrated

was Benjamin Hoadley, "the object," says Gibbon, "of Whig idolatry and Tory abhorrence." He was a powerful pamphleteer, a latitudinarian of the latitudinarians, and the practical cause of the suspension of Convocation, a step which he regarded with distinct approval. He has been accused of holding Arian opinions, a charge to which his son replied that, "if it were so, he knew how to distinguish between private opinions and the practice of the Church." Hoadley was the Bishop who, when urged to restock Waltham Chase with deer, refused, from a motive, says Gilbert White, worthy of a prelate, that "it had done mischief enough already."

It is pleasant to be able to turn from the Church history of the last century, with its spiritual lethargy and flagrant nepotism, to the simple, unambitious, but most fruitful life of Gilbert White of Selborne. He was content to spend his days amid the beautiful surroundings of his native village, beneath the shadow of the beech-grown hill, noting the ways of birds and beasts, and holding communion with Nature. His celebrated letters on "Natural History" have made Selborne classic ground to all English-speaking peoples; and year by year hundreds of English and Americans visit the quiet spot in the churchyard where a simple headstone, with the letters "G. W." inscribed upon it, marks the spot where the great naturalist is buried.

In the present century it is impossible even to mention the distinguished names connected with the diocese of Winchester. It may be remembered, however, that in the early part of the century the most popular religious work, "The Annals of the Poor," was the outcome of Legh Richmond's ministry in the Isle of Wight; while in 1817 one of the most gifted of English writers, Jane Austen, was laid to rest in Winchester Cathedral. In the middle portion of the century three conspicuous names in the world of literature must be mentioned — Charles Kingsley, of Eversley, John Keble, of Hursley, and Richard Chenevix Trench, who, until he was made Dean of Westminster, was Vicar of the little village of Itchenstoke, near Alresford. Of later celebrities it would be invidious to speak, but we may be pardoned if, in conclusion, we call attention to the long line of distinguished prelates who since 1827 have occupied the throne of St. Swithun. For over forty years the princely Bishop Sumner, whose name is intimately associated with the Evangelical revival, ruled the diocese; then followed Samuel Wilberforce; then for seventeen years the saintly theologian Edward Harold Browne; then the wise and munificent Bishop Thorold, whose striking biography has lately been reviewed in the pages of this magazine.

JOHN VAUGHAN.

Art. II.—THE IDEA OF THE CHURCH.

The Question Stated.

BY the "Idea of the Church" is to be understood the formative idea, the essential and fundamental principle of which the Church is the embodiment, that which makes the Church to be the Church, which determines its *esse*—its essential being.

This is a fundamental question in regard to which clearness and definiteness of conception are all-important. Here vagueness and uncertainty become the prolific source of error.

It is surely the duty of every teacher of theology, and of every Christian pastor, to possess and impart clear and well-defined instruction upon such a subject. "Qui bene distinguit, bene docet." It is only by means of such clearness and accuracy in theological study that we can hope to find the unity of truth, or to mediate between conflicting opinions. So far from the tendency of such definiteness being towards a narrow and intolerant dogmatism, it is the chief means by which real comprehension and reconciliation can be achieved, and by which we can be brought into the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God.

In the past the history of Christendom has been largely moulded and controlled by false ideas of the Church. The developments of the future will in a great measure be determined by the conception of the Church which becomes dominant — hence the vital importance of the topic to be discussed.

The Church is built upon Jesus Christ. It has, and can have, no existence apart from Him. Hence our ultimate appeal must be to Christ's idea of the Church. But that idea has been variously understood. Divers bodies exist which profess, more or less completely and faithfully, to embody it. Amid the differences and discordances of Christendom can we find any clue to assist us in our inquiry?

Two Antagonistic Theories.

If we compare the different definitions of the Church in the creeds, confessions, and theological systems of Christendom, it will be found that all agree at least in this: that the Church is a religious fellowship—a society, company, or brotherhood of men—standing in certain defined relations to God as revealed in Christ.

But under this apparent agreement a radical difference quickly discloses itself, which separates all these definitions into two opposing classes, according as they make the ground

of this fellowship to lie in one or other of the two sides of the religious life of Christendom—the ethical and spiritual, or the ritual and ecclesiastical.

The one theory defines the Church by its outward characteristics of form and organization; the other theory defines it by the inward characteristics of faith and the fruits of a living faith in the heart and life. The former theory makes the existence of the Church depend upon what is external and visible, the succession of the ministry, and the due administration of the Sacraments. The latter theory makes the essential nature of the Church to consist in what is spiritual and ethical in the great realities of truth, love, and righteousness—in the life of God in the hearts of Christians through the presence and power of the Spirit of Jesus Christ.

The former theory may be called the Roman from its chief political embodiment, or the sacerdotal from its dominant religious conception.

The latter theory we believe to be Biblical and Evangelical—that which is set forth in the Divine Word, and which embodies the spirit and life of the evangel of Jesus Christ. It may also be called the Reformed, because it was that idea of the Church which the Reformation vindicated and embodied, in opposition to the conception and doctrine of the unreformed Church.

The Broad Church view is not a distinct theory. It must either sink to a barren humanitarianism, so far as it tends to identify the Church with the world, or, escaping that tendency, it will continue to oscillate vaguely and indefinitely between the only two possible positive systems, according as its chief emphasis is laid upon the ethical and intellectual, or upon the external, institutional, and political side of Christianity.

The "Esse" and the "Bene Esse."

The sacerdotal theory of the Church makes its *esse*—its essential being—to lie in that which constitutes its visibility; the Evangelical in that which constitutes its invisibility. All admit and maintain that there is but one Church, out of which there is no salvation. Both also admit that to this one Church belong, at least in some sense, both visibility and invisibility. These are both attributes of the one Church, not two Churches. All the Protestant confessions maintain that the Church has visibility—that it manifests its unseen fellowship by means of visible ordinances. And, on the other hand, even Roman Catholic theologians admit that, in some sense at least, the Church possesses or contains within it what is invisible and spiritual.

But herein lies the vital and distinctive difference between the two. The Evangelical doctrine of the Church makes what is visible in the Church the consequent and result of the invisible—the outcome of the unseen life. The sacerdotal theory reverses this order, and makes what is visible—the external order and organization of the Church—the antecedent and cause of what is invisible and spiritual in the life of the Church.

The philosophical Roman divine, Möhler, gives what he calls[1] "a short, accurate, and definite expression" of "the differences between the Catholic and the Lutheran view of the Church." "The Catholics," he says, "teach: the visible Church is first, then comes the invisible; the former gives birth to the latter. On the other hand, the Lutherans say the reverse: from the invisible emerges the visible Church; and the former is the groundwork of the latter. In this apparently very unimportant opposition," he emphatically adds, "a prodigious difference is avowed."

The sacerdotal doctrine admits, indeed, that there is, or ought to be, in the Church an inner life and spiritual realities invisible to the human eye; but it looks upon these spiritual realities as merely accidental or subsidiary, and not at all essential to the existence of the Church, which, it asserts, depends upon what is external and visible in its organization and ordinances.

The evangelical doctrine, on the contrary, affirms that the being of the Church lies in what is invisible and spiritual, and that its visibility is the result and manifestation, and not the ground and basis, of the former. Herein we find the crucial difference between the two systems, as Möhler himself affirms, a difference which is fraught with the most radical and far-reaching consequences. It is, therefore, of vital moment to ascertain which of these theories represents the true idea of the Church—Christ's idea of it.

Let us, accordingly, first briefly discuss the grounds upon which the Evangelical theory rests, and then inquire into the origin and effects of the opposite and antagonistic doctrine.

The Church in the Old Testament.

From the classical use of the Greek ἐκκλησία we gather at least this, that it stands for the fellowship of the enfranchised, the freemen who constitute the commonwealth. There was, therefore, a natural fitness in the selection of this word by the LXX. writers to represent the Hebrew קָהָל (*kahal*), the Old

[1] "Symbolik," § 48.

Testament designations of Israel viewed in its religious unity, the body corporate, the community in its organic completeness.

The *kahal*, or *ecclesia*, of the Old Testament had its beginning in Abraham and in the covenant into which God entered with him. He was called by God into fellowship with Himself. Great emphasis is laid upon this call throughout the Scriptures. He is described as the friend of God, called, chosen, and faithful. The covenant into which Jehovah entered with him is repeatedly referred to in the Old Testament. In the New Testament its identity with the Gospel covenant is affirmed. Christ came, as the Holy Ghost by the mouth of Zacharias declared, in fulfilment of "the holy covenant, the oath which God sware unto Abraham our father" (Luke i. 72, 73).

Now, the covenant can have but one meaning, and so it is interpreted by the prophet Jeremiah and by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews: "This is the covenant that I will make with them: I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people." As Professor Davidson tersely states it[1]: "The covenant is a state of relation in which God is our God and we are His people. It is a divinely constituted fellowship of men with God. 'The everlasting covenant' is the expressive designation applied both in the law and the prophets to the fellowship of God with His people."

The Church and the Covenant.

The *kahal*—the *ecclesia* of Israel—was based upon this covenant. And the covenant was antecedent to the law, which was, as St. Paul affirms (Rom. v. 20), a parenthetical dispensation. Its design was to mediate between the promise and its fulfilment. It had its position and purpose altogether with a view to the covenant. Herein its function was twofold. Its first function was to show what was the great obstacle to the realization of the covenant, the great barrier to the Divine fellowship with man. It was added because of transgressions (Gal. iii. 19), to reveal them, and so to convict man of sin and guilt. Its second function was to reveal the means by which guilt would be removed and reconciliation effected between God and man, and thus, the fellowship consummated. This it did by means of the Levitical symbolism, which centred in the priesthood and the sacrifices, and which prefigured the one sacrifice of the one priest, Jesus Christ, which alone, as the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews demonstrates, is effective to make the worshipper perfect; that is, to bring

[1] "Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews."

him into true and abiding fellowship with God. It was by the exercise of these two functions that the law made way for the realization of the covenant of grace in Christ, which was, as St. Paul affirms, the very same covenant which was "confirmed beforehand by God, and which the law, which came 430 years after, doth not disannul, so as to make the promise of none effect" (Gal. iii. 17). The law, then, did not supersede the promise as the original basis upon which the fellowship of Israel was constituted.

This original covenant was one of grace. The word used to designate it implies this. It was a διαθηκή (*diatheke*), not a συνθηκή (*suntheke*)—a gracious arrangement of God, not a bargain with man. The choice of the former word, in preference to the latter, to express the nature of the Divine covenant, is, says Bishop Westcott,[1] easily intelligible. "In a Divine covenant the parties do not stand, in the remotest degree, as equal contractors. God, in His own good pleasure, makes the arrangement which man receives." The Divine promise, says Bishop Lightfoot,[2] "is always a gift graciously bestowed, and not a pledge obtained by negotiation." As Oehler observes[3]: "Israel's adoption to be the covenant people" is "an act of the Divine love," and "in no way dependent on man's desert." On man's part the condition of the covenant is, solely and absolutely, faith, which culminates in the self-surrender of the man to God. Abraham believed God. By faith he became the friend of God and the heir of the world. He was thus the typical Israelite and the father of all who believe. He is not a Jew who is merely one outwardly. "They which be of faith, the same are sons of Abraham" (Gal. iii. 7). The promise was made for Abraham and his seed. It was essentially not a natural, but a spiritual seed. Christ, St. Paul tells us, is the true seed of Abraham. The term "seed," as Bishop Lightfoot points out,[4] is used collectively. As Fairbairn shows,[5] "it is applied to Christ, not as an individual, but to Christ as comprehending in Himself all who form with Him a great spiritual unity."

It is plain, then, that notwithstanding its externalism, which was due to its preparatory character, the Old Testament Church was constituted upon the ground of faith, not of works. The external and visible was subordinate to the inward and spiritual. The more the Israel after the flesh declined, the more manifestly the believing remnant was seen

[1] Westcott on the Epistle to the Hebrews.
[2] Lightfoot's Commentary on the Galatians.
[3] Oehler's "Theology of the Old Testament."
[4] Lightfoot on the Galatians, p. 142, *sq.*
[5] Fairbairn's "Typology," vol. i., p. 460.

to be the true Israel. When, for example, King Ahaz, instead of trusting in Jehovah, sought the help of Assyria in an alliance which soon proved the temporal destruction of Judah, the little band of faithful men who rallied around Isaiah formed the real church within the nation. The unifying principle of this fellowship was faith in God. It formed "the holy seed" which made restoration possible, for upon it, and not upon any external institution, depended the continuity and permanence of Judah. "This," says Principal Rainy,[1] "is that which abides and persists amid all the siftings and scatterings. A tenth, a holy seed, is the substance of the people" (Isa. vi. 13).

The House of Jehovah.

But another supplementary and confirmatory line of thought is opened up to us in the word "Church," which, as the best etymological authorities affirm, is derived from the Greek *Κυριακὸν*, and signifies the house of the Lord. The house here is *οἶκος*, not *οἰκία*—the household, not the material dwelling; the family as a unity, knit together by ties of kinship, in relations of common privilege and responsibility under a representative head.

The Hebrew equivalent, בַּיִת, is used in two special senses, the household of Israel and the place of God's special manifestation of His presence. In the latter sense it was first used by Jacob when under the open heaven in the visions of the night he realized the Divine presence and received the assurances of Divine protection, and he said: "This is none other than the house of God." It was not the material structure, whether of the ruder Tabernacle or the more splendid Temple which constituted the house of Jehovah, but the fellowship there symbolized and realized between God and His people. Hence the expressive designation of the Tabernacle, "the tent of meeting," the tent of tryst (as Principal Douglas aptly suggested to the Old Testament revisers), because Jehovah said, "There I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee" (Exod. xxv. 22).

This is the fellowship which the Psalmist vehemently desires when his "soul longeth, yea, even fainteth for the courts of the Lord"; his heart and his flesh crieth out for the living God; and he is comforted with the assurance that he "will dwell in the house of the Lord for ever" (Ps. lxxxiv. 2; xxiii. 6).

These two conceptions—the household of Israel and the house of Jehovah—draw closer and closer together, until

[1] "Delivery and Development of Christian Doctrine," p. 339.

they become identified. The house of Israel is the house of Jehovah. The two are united in the one conception—the fellowship of God with His people. Thus, under this expressive form, bound up with the worship of Israel, there are set forth the covenant relations of God with His people, upon which is constituted the *kahal*, the *ecclesia*, the Church of the old dispensation.

It is most instructive to recognise, what a careful study of the Old Testament plainly shows, that even in its rudimental and preparatory form, when the Church was, as St. Paul declares, under bondage to the elements of the world, kept in ward under the law—a necessary discipline during the period of its spiritual childhood—even then the *esse*, the essential being, of the Old Testament Church did not lie in those external institutions, but in the great spiritual realities of faith and fellowship with Jehovah.

Faith, the Basal Principle of the Church.

When it is so plain that the constructive principle of the Jewish Church, notwithstanding its seminal and preparatory character and the externalism of its pupilage, was living and spiritual, much more manifestly is it so in the case of the New Testament Church.

If even the law was, in its ultimate design and result, a minister of grace, beyond all contradiction the Gospel is the Epiphany of grace; and if faith were the absolute and indispensable condition of fellowship under the forms of the Old Testament Ecclesia, much more plainly is it the vital and constructive principle of the Church of Jesus Christ, in which we all, both Jews and Gentiles alike, are householders of the faith.

"Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ" (John i. 17). Christ is the Truth, the self-revelation of God. "He that hath seen Me, hath seen the Father." But this self-revelation was accomplished by means of the grace, the self-giving of God. God is love, and love is self-sacrifice, self-giving. Hence, God could never be fully revealed except in a revelation of grace. The Incarnation is the first step in this self-revelation; and it is always viewed in the New Testament as preliminary to the cross and passion. The supreme revelation is given in, and by means of, the death of Christ, the crowning act of Christ's self-sacrifice, when He suffered in our stead, the Just for the unjust. God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself (2 Cor. v. 19). He, the Father, "made peace by the blood of the cross," the cross of His Son, "through Him to reconcile all things to Himself." The death of Christ was accordingly the ratification of the covenant, as is said in Heb. ix. 16, 17:

"For where there is a covenant, the death of him who made it must needs be represented. For a covenant is sure where there hath been death, since it doth not ever have force when he that made it liveth."[1] So our Lord declared at the Last Supper: "This cup is the new covenant in My blood." Thus, on the Divine side, the covenant is consummated, the Church is constituted by grace, by the Divine self-giving in the Incarnation and Atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ.

And, on man's side, the Church is constituted, the Divine fellowship entered, by means of faith and by faith alone. This is the one unique and imperative condition and requirement. He that believeth is justified, is reconciled, is brought into fellowship with God in Christ, and, consequently, with all who believe in Christ. And so throughout the whole Christian life faith is the essential requirement. Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, personal trust in Him, is the basal principle of the Christian life, the primary and essential characteristic of a Christian, without which he could not be a Christian in reality, whatever he might be in profession. Now, the basal principle of the Christian life is the basal principle of the Christian Church. The Church in its essential being is simply the fellowship of believers in Christ. The Holy Catholic Church is, as the Apostles' Creed defines it, "the communion of the saints, the fellowship of believers." For thus the latter clause is regarded both by Protestant and Roman theologians,[2] although they differ radically in their conceptions of faith and saintship.

Thus the Christian Church has no existence apart from believers. They constitute it. As Westcott says, "Christians, as such, are essentially united together in virtue of their relations to Christ."[3] That which makes a man a Christian makes him a member of the Catholic Church, viz., faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Nothing could be more explicit than the statement of Bishop Ridley: "That Church which is Christ's body and of which Christ is the head, standeth only of living stones and true Christians, not only outwardly in name and title, but inwardly in heart and truth." Hooker declares:[4] "That Church which is Christ's mystical body consisteth of none but only true Israelites, true sons of Abraham, true servants and saints of God." "The mere profession of Christianity," says Bishop Jeremy Taylor,[5] "makes no man a member of Christ; nothing but a faith working by love." Again he

[1] Bishop Westcott's translation in his Commentary on the Hebrews.
[2] Litton on the Church, p. 50.
[3] Westcott's "Gospel of the Resurrection," p. 206.
[4] Hooker, "Eccles. Pol.," iii., i., 8.
[5] "Dissuasive from Popery," part ii., bk. i., s. i.

says: "The invisible part of the visible Church, that is, the true servants of Christ, only are the Church." The late Bishop McIlvaine, of Ohio, truly voices the formularies of the Church of England: "So we must say of all the baptized and the communicating that, while they all have the visibility of the Church, none of them have any part in its reality except they be joined by a living faith to Christ."

The Church and the Kingdom.

Our Lord uses the word "church" but twice. The word "kingdom" ("kingdom of heaven," or "kingdom of God," or "My kingdom") He uses 112 times. Evidently the terms stand in closest connection. It is not necessary to enter into the discussion as to their equivalency. Whether they be regarded as synonymous, or the term "kingdom" be the larger, inclusive of, but exceeding in its fulness, the term "church," "it is plainly," as Oosterzee[1] observes, "a spiritual communion, to become a member of which, without a spiritual change, is impossible." The word has, indeed, as Bishop Westcott points out, a twofold application, internal and external, just as the word "church," but the essential nature of the kingdom is spiritual. Its blessings are always represented by our Lord as spiritual, not external. It is righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost, as St. Paul affirms. All its signs and attributes are spiritual and ethical; they relate to holy living and loving service, and not to ecclesiastical office or to acts of ceremonial.

In the Epistles the word "church" predominates, appearing 112 times, while the word "kingdom" occurs but 29 times, the reverse of the usage in the Gospels. Cremer, the distinguished New Testament lexicographer, notes that in the New Testament *ecclesia* denotes the community of the redeemed in its twofold aspect, and he makes the primary and fundamental signification of the word to be the entire congregation of all who are called by and to Christ, all who are in the fellowship of His salvation. Its application to local and visible bodies he holds to be secondary.

The Spiritual House.

The Epistle to the Ephesians is distinctively the ecclesiastical epistle. Its central thought is the Church in its relations to Jesus Christ, and these relations are set forth under two expressive analogies—the Church is the House of the Lord, the holy temple builded together for the Divine indwelling; and it is the body of Christ, which He fills with His Divine

[1] "Biblical Theology of the New Testament," p. 70.

fulness. The first of these analogies recalls at once the Old Testament designation of Israel, and evidently St. Paul had this in mind, for he is insisting upon the unity of believers, both Jews and Gentiles. These two races, so bitterly hostile, were now brought together in Christ, who "has made in Himself of twain one new man, so making peace." And, joyfully addressing the Gentile believers, he reminds them that they are "no more strangers and aliens, but fellow-citizens with the saints and members of the household of God," having been built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief Corner-stone, in whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom you also are being builded together for an habitation [a permanent abode] of God in the Spirit." Such, then, is this great living sanctuary. It is built upon Christ. It is built in and by the Spirit. And so St. Peter (1 Pet. ii. 5) describes it as a spiritual house, built of living stones. In this passage we have St. Peter's own comment upon the words addressed to him by Christ: "Upon this rock I will build my Church." It was not Peter's person, but Peter's faith, which was the fundamental matter in Christ's mind. It is to Peter, as the man of faith, the typical New Testament believer, as Beyschlag pertinently comments, that the great promise is given. These words of Christ, says Origen, refer to Peter only as far as he had spoken in the name of all true believers. The true Church is founded on all true Christians who are in doctrine and conduct such that they will attain to salvation. St. Peter makes it plain that he regarded Christ Himself as the Living Stone upon which the Church is built, and that it is built up of men of faith—of those who, through faith in Christ, become living stones in the temple, members of the great fellowship which is the Catholic Church. Observe St. Peter's words: "Unto whom coming as unto a living stone, ye also as living stones are built up a spiritual house." So Archbishop Leighton, in his comment on this passage, says: "To be built on Christ is plainly to believe on Him." Each Christian comes to Christ personally and individually in the act of faith. It is by means of this coming that each becomes united to Christ, becomes a partaker of His life, and thus a living stone in the spiritual house, a living member of that living fellowship which is the Catholic Church. Thus Bishop McIlvaine plainly puts it: "The soul's coming to Christ is his life; his drawing life from Christ is his union with Him; and in that very union unto Christ is contained and involved his being built up in His true Church." So an old divine (Perkins) of the sixteenth century says: "This union with Christ maketh the Church to be the Church." And Hooker

says: "That which linketh Christ to us is His mere [pure, unqualified] mercy and love towards us. That which tieth us to Him is our faith in the promised salvation revealed in His Word of Truth," and therefore he declares: "Faith is the ground and glory of all the welfare of this building" (the Church).

The Body of Christ.

The second analogy, which St. Paul employs in the Ephesians and elsewhere, brings out more fully and specifically the vital character of the fellowship which constitutes the Church, and its absolute dependence upon Christ. God "gave Him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is His body." "Unum corpus sumus in Christo." We are one body in Christ. But what is a body? Not a mere congeries of disconnected atoms without unity or completeness. Nor is it a mere machine, which, however complex or compact in its unity of many parts, is formed from without and regulated from without. A body is formed from within. It is an organic unity, built up out of many and various elements, composed of many and different members, constituted and moulded by the life of which it is the product, controlled and unified by the indwelling Spirit. Such is the Church of Christ. There is one body and one Spirit, who pervades and energizes it. It is not constituted by any external and mechanical process. It is a vital growth, constituted and built up by the Spirit of Christ. As Luthardt[1] well says: "It is not external forms and customs, but the Holy Ghost, which makes the Church really the Church. He is the soul that fills and animates her, and combines all her individual members into the unity of one body." "There is one body and one Spirit." The body is not the external polity and organization, as some say, but the fellowship of believers; and the Spirit is the Holy Ghost, who, as St. Paul declares, dwells in each Christian.

The absolute dependence of the Church upon Christ is emphasized in the concluding clause of St. Paul's definition in Eph. i. 22, 23: "The Church is the body of Christ, the fulness of Him who filleth all in all." The Church, as Meyer renders it,[2] is *the Christ filled*—that which is filled by Him, that in which He by His Spirit dwells and rules, producing all Christian life, and penetrating and filling all with His gifts, and with the life-forces and powers that proceed from Him. It is a living and a life-giving indwelling by His Spirit.

The Church, as the body of Christ, is constituted by the life-

[1] "Lectures on the Fundamental Truths of Christianity."
[2] Commentary on the Ephesians.

giving presence of Christ. As Ignatius wrote, in his letter to the Smyrnæans: "Wherever Jesus Christ is there is the Catholic Church." And this presence is conditioned on the Divine side by the Spirit, whom Christ sent, and whose office is to reveal Christ and impart the life of Christ to men. And on the human side this Divine indwelling presence is conditioned and mediated by faith—"that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith" (Eph. iii. 17). It is faith, as Principal Moule observes,[1] "which is alone the effectuating and maintaining act."

The External Organization.

Such, then, is the Apostolic conception of the Church, and we find the doctrinal teaching of the Epistles fully corroborated by the actual history of the Apostolic Church as recorded in the Book of Acts. As the Lord had refused to set up a kingdom of this world, and insisted upon the spiritual nature of His kingdom, so the Apostles did not begin with an external polity. They went forth, as their Master did, and preached the Gospel. When those who heard believed, they, by their faith itself—a faith confessed and declared in baptism—were made members of the Divine fellowship of which Christ is the living Head and Centre. In the expressive words of St. Luke, "they were added to the Lord."

In this inward and spiritual relation to Christ was involved the essential being of the Church. The invisible is first; then follows the visible, as its result and manifestation. The faith of the heart must be confessed with the mouth. From faith proceed, as its expression and fruit, all the actualities of worship and of service. Love for Christ and for the brethren must manifest itself in works of love and mercy, and in all the ministries and services by which it seeks to advance the glory of the great Head of the Church and the well-being of men.

Believers united together in worship and in work at first without any definite organization; but as the Church increased organization became necessary. As necessities arose, provision was made for them. Thus it was, as Lechler[2] observes, that "an external association arose out of the internal community of faith."

Three things are here noteworthy. First, the Divine work in the world is entrusted to the operation of the great social and psychological laws which govern the structure of human society. Man's social and political constitution is not

[1] Commentary on the Ephesians in the "Cambridge Bible for Schools" Series.

[2] "Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times."

antagonized, but utilized and transformed, by Christianity, and made the means of its promulgation. Secondly, it was out of elements already in existence in society that the external organization of the Christian Church was constructed. In the case of the Jewish Christian Churches, the synagogue, itself the offspring of necessity under Providential guidance, was the chief mould which gave form to the nascent organization. As the Church extended amongst the Gentiles other elements were added, drawn from the civil and social life and the municipal institutions of Greece and Rome. In this way, as Bishop Westcott[1] has pointed out, "the Church organization which the vital force moulds, and by which it reveals itself," was "fashioned out of elements earthly and transitory. Thirdly, it is plain how abundantly the Book of Acts, as well as the Apostles' teaching, confirms the Reformed and Protestant doctrine of the Church. Throughout the whole course of the history, as Lechler observes, "the law holds good that creative power lives within, in spirit and personality, and that the external is produced and built up from within." The study of history and the teaching of the Scriptures alike confirm the evangelical doctrine that the visible and external in Church organization and order is the result and consequent of the invisible realities, the outcome and manifestation of the inner life. Consequently, the essential and constructive principle of the Church—its *esse*—lies not in the external form, but in the inward and spiritual life, which is the gift of God to every one who believes. As Bishop Westcott pertinently says: "The essential bond of union is not external, but spiritual; it consists not in one organization, but in a common principle of life. Its expression lies in a personal relation to Christ, and not in any outward system."[2]

The formative idea of the Church, then, is faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. In its essential being the Church of Christ is the fellowship of believers in Christ, the household of faith.

The Secularization of the Church.

When the Apostolic idea of the Church stands forth so distinctly, the rise and prevalence of an antagonistic conception seems the more surprising, and it will be instructive to inquire into its origin.

The doctrine of the Church is intimately connected with the doctrine of salvation. This was remarkably brought out in the process of the Reformation, which began with the anxious inquiry of the Philippian jailer, "What must I do to be saved?" And it was, as Luthardt expressively puts it, out of

[1] "The Gospel of the Resurrection." [2] *Ibid.*, p. 215.

St. Paul's answer to this great inquiry that the Church of the Reformation was born. The reformed doctrine of the Church necessarily followed from the doctrine of justification by faith only. What mattered it to the Reformers that they were thrust out of the Church as then visibly constituted? By faith they were brought into direct relations to God, and, as Dorner[1] says, "the immediateness of the relation to God in faith excluded all human lordship over faith." Thus, the sacerdotal conception of the Church was overthrown, and there first came forth distinctly into theological thought the Biblical conception of the Church and of the relations between its visibility and its invisibility, which, as Dorner says, now "became a part of the common evangelical consciousness." The very definition of the Church by which our great Wycliffe had, as Lechler observes,[2] placed himself in deliberate opposition to the idea of the Church which prevailed in his time, now obtained its place in all the confessions of the Protestant Churches.

Now, just as it was the recovery of the Biblical doctrine of salvation which restored the Apostolic conception of the Church, so it was through a false doctrine of salvation that that conception had been lost, and an alien and antagonistic idea of the Church took possession of Christendom.

The erroneous development began, as Neander[3] says, "with a lowering of the idea of faith." This degradation of faith was prevalent in Rabbinism. St. Paul must have been familiar with the discussions on faith in the Jewish schools. The Gentile Apostle and the Jewish Rabbi, as Bishop Lightfoot points out,[4] might both maintain the supremacy of faith, but faith with St. Paul was a very different thing from faith with the Rabbi, with whom it was merely submission to an external rule of ordinances and reception of the orthodox dogmas of Judaism. This erroneous view of faith at once found its way into the Jewish Christian Church. It is this kind of faith which St. James stigmatizes as the faith of devils. And so it passed into the Gentile Church, where, as Neander notes, it spread more and more, and Christian faith came to be regarded as simply the belief and acceptance of Church dogma, and this, not on the ground that Scriptures so taught, but that the Church so received. Thus the old Jewish traditionalism reappeared, and the authority of the Church was substituted for the authority of the Truth.

In this way the whole doctrine of salvation was gradually

[1] "History of Protestant Theology."
[2] Lechler's "John Wiclif," vol. ii., p. 98.
[3] Neander's "History of Dogma," vol. i., p. 217.
[4] Lightfoot's Commentary on the Galatians, p. 162.

externalized, and the Church itself came to be regarded as primarily a visible institution. The climax was attained in the organization and theology of the Papacy. Thus Cardinal Bellarmine[1] declares the Church to be "a society of men as visible and palpable as the Roman people, the kingdom of France, or the republic of Venice." And that there may be no mistake about his meaning, he says: "We deny that to constitute a man a member of the true Church any internal virtue is requisite, but only an external profession of the faith and that participation of the sacraments which is perceptible by the senses"; while the Protestants, he adds, to constitute anyone a member of the Church, require internal virtues. This, he says, is the distinction between the Roman and Protestant views of the Church. In keeping with this statement is Bellarmine's enumeration of those who belong to the Church. He excludes heathen, excommunicated and schismatics, but all others, even impious and reprobate men, are expressly included: "Includuntur autem omnes alii etiamsi reprobi, scelerati, et impii sint."

Of course Bellarmine does not deny that the ultimate aim and purpose of the Church is to lead men to holiness, but he does deny that spiritual gifts and qualities belong to the essence of the Church. Faith in Christ becomes an accident, and is not of the essence of membership in the Catholic Church. But not only is the idea of the Church externalized, a low and unspiritual meaning is given to faith and holiness. Faith becomes a *fides implicita*, a mere assent and submission of the will to formulæ which neither the understanding grasps nor the heart embraces. Holiness itself is materialized; it is degraded into an official and ceremonial sanctity, which may exist apart from personal goodness. Such was the strange and pitiful transformation by which the living Church was petrified into a mere institution, a kingdom of this world.

The Political and Sacerdotal Influences.

Two influences hastened this development. The one was political. The imperial idea and organism passed from decadent Rome into the Catholic Church, and changed it into a new empire.

The other influence was religious. A new conception of the ministerial office prevailed. The clergy became a sacerdotal order, priestly mediators dispensing the blessings of salvation. The origin of the sacerdotal idea is variously explained. Some, like Neander, trace it to Judaism. Others, as Ritschl and Lightfoot, believe it to be chiefly due to

[1] "De Eccles. Mil.," c. 2.

Gentile prepossession and the familiarity of the newly-converted heathen with the priests and sacrifices of their former religions.

But from whatever source the conception came, it grew rapidly in a soil made ready to receive it by the externalizing processes to which the faith of the Christian Church had been subjected. As early as the middle of the third century, Cyprian of Carthage put forward, without relief or disguise, the most absolute sacerdotal assumptions, and "so uncompromising," says Bishop Lightfoot,[1] "was the tone in which he asserted them, that nothing was left to his successors but to enforce his principles and reiterate his language."

The Questions of Polity and Sacerdotalism Distinct.

The developments of the Papacy have added nothing to the sacerdotal claims and assumptions of Cyprian. The principle is the same, only it has received in the Papacy a political embodiment. The latter is objectionable only as it makes the former more formidable. The Papacy might be overthrown and sacerdotalism still remain to form new combinations and alliances. Apart from the sacerdotal principle embodied in it, the Papacy would only be a form of polity, probably a most objectionable one, but deprived of its most hurtful and formidable constituent. No doubt the sacerdotal development in the Latin Church was intimately connected with the political environment. But the two elements are altogether distinct. Instead of being Papal, we can conceive that the Latin Church might have remained Episcopal, or it might possibly have become Presbyterian.[2]

The question of sacerdotalism is distinct from the question of polity. The question of the form of the ministry is entirely distinct from the question as to the nature of the ministry. The one question touches merely the external form of the visible organization; the other enters into and affects the very nature of Christianity itself. So long as we place the essential being of the Church in what is inward and spiritual, questions of polity are kept in their true position, subordinate to the great realities of faith and righteousness. There have been those who have held to the *Jus Divinum* of Presbytery, or Episcopacy, or Congregationalism, and yet did not un-

[1] Commentary on the Philippians, p. 259.

[2] The Cyprianic theory of the episcopate necessarily leads up to the Papacy. Of itself it is essentially schismatical. The connection between the teachings and claims of Cyprian, and the subsequent developments which culminated in the Papacy, was due to the fully developed sacerdotalism of the Bishop of Carthage.

church those who accepted other forms of polity than their own.

But whenever the *esse*, the essential being, of the Church is placed in the external polity, and that polity changed into a system of priestly mediation, we pass at once from the *non-necessaria*, in which there is liberty, into the most vital and essential questions, in regard to which there can be no compromise; we stand then face to face with two opposed and irreconcilable conceptions of the Church. And these two doctrines of the Church logically involve two theologies. Every doctrine is more or less affected—the way of reconciliation and the rule of faith at once and directly, others, perhaps, more remotely. Dorner[1] maintains that in the Roman doctrine of salvation there lies ultimately an immoral idea of God, that in it a physical conception of the Divine nature is substituted for the ethical. How far-reaching, then, are the issues involved in the question before us! And these are not merely theoretical. They are most practical, and have directly to do with Christian life and conduct, and with the great practical questions of the day as to Church work at home, missions abroad, and Christian unity and co-operation.

The True Ground of the Church's Stability and Catholicity.

It has been alleged against the Protestant and Reformed doctrine of the Church that it reduces the Church to a phantom, a mere idea without substantive existence, a Platonic republic, as the cavillers against the Augsburg Confession called it.

Those who make such statements overlook two things. First, to put the external organization in its true place, subordinate to the inward and spiritual, is not to disparage or discard it. On the contrary, we maintain that there must be organization, that the unseen fellowship must manifest itself in visible ordinances and ministries. We believe that right organization is of the greatest value, and necessary for the due discharge of the functions of the Church in its service and witness in the world. But while we assert that government is necessary, we do not, as Archbishop Whitgift says,[2] thereby affirm that it is of the essence of the Church, or that it could not be the Church of Christ without some one form of government. Still less do we make any form of government a channel of grace and a mediatorial agency through which

[1] Dorner's "History of Protestant Theology," vol. i., p. 47.
[2] Whitgift's "Works," vol. i., p. 184, *et seq.* (Parker Society Edition).

alone Christ exercises His ministry and bestows His grace upon men.

Then, secondly, these objectors overlook the real seat and source of the permanence and indefectibility of Christ's Church. It is a common mistake to regard an external institution as a better guarantee of endurance than a living principle. But the real ground of the permanence of any institution is the principle embodied in it. The securities for the continuity and perpetuity of the Christian Church do not lie in antiquarian researches or doubtful precedents or the *jus Divinum* of an external order; but in the truth and love revealed in the Gospel and apprehended by humble and believing hearts. Even the Roman theologian Möhler makes the remarkable admission that "Christ maintains the Church in vigour by means of those who live in faith." "These unquestionably," he says, "are the true supporters of the visible Church."

The continuity of the Church is primarily a continuity of life; the external forms in which that life is embodied may change. As Bishop Westcott says,[1] "It is impossible to regard the Church as a body without recognising the necessity of a constant change in the organization."

If the essential being of the Church lies in some one external form, there is no room left for development or reconstruction. Everything is fixed, positive, and unalterable. The sacerdotal theory of the Church can never be the basis of a reunited Christendom. Were it possible, nothing more grievous, more disastrous to the kingdom of Christ, could ever take place. It would be the re-establishment of a reign of priestly despotism and spiritual death. But it would surely be the precursor of judgment. "God," says Bishop Westcott, "has signally overthrown every attempt to establish Church unity upon a false basis."

But if the Church is a living body, an organic unity, what is organic has endless power of adaptation, only this organic process will be in harmony with the great laws and principles of the Gospel. Litton well says:[2] "Just in proportion as Protestantism, as compared with Romanism, takes the inward view of the Church, does it place the legitimate expansion of the various elements of visible Church life upon a surer and more permanent basis."

The essential idea of the Church reaches back into the very *origines* of man's being. Man was made for fellowship, and the foundations of his social relations were laid in his relations to God, whose offspring he is. The Church is designed, in

[1] Westcott's "Gospel of the Resurrection."
[2] Litton on the Church.

God's gracious purpose of love, to become the realization of this fellowship through the processes of redemption. It is the society God Himself is creating, the community and fellowship of men who are redeemed by His Son and regenerated by His Spirit, who are possessed of His truth and obedient to His will—the fellowship of the Sons of God. This is the city which hath the foundations, eternal foundations, whose Builder and Maker is God. Of this city, this great spiritual fellowship, Jesus Christ Himself is the chief Cornerstone. He is, as has been well said, "its creative and normative personality," "in whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord."

J. P. SHERATON.

WYCLIFFE COLLEGE,
TORONTO, CANADA.

ART. III.—CHURCH TEACHING AND THE CHURCH OF ROME.

SOME of our prelates, and the whole of the modern school, are constantly urging the importance of "Church Teaching." "Ah," they say, with an audible sigh, "poor Steelborough, poor Eastport, poor Westport, poor Mr. So-and-So—sadly deficient in Church Teaching!" These lamentations have their effect and serve their purpose. Those who utter them stand as the true Church teachers, and their very utterance brings the persons to whom they relate into some measure of contempt. "Church Teaching" is a very vague expression, and generally means the particular views of those who employ it. To be understood properly it requires definition. If it exclusively relates to the teaching of the Church of England, we can test it by a reference to our formularies, interpreted, as our Church requires, by the aid of the Holy Scriptures. But if the Church be some other church, or an aggregate of churches of which the Church of England is one, then plain Churchmen must be on their guard, lest, under the sacred name of Church, rejected teaching should be introduced and propounded. That such teaching is given really requires no proof. The air of our National Church is full of it. Whatever may have been the case in the past, it is now no secret, but a settled and avowed purpose, to Catholicize (not in the simple sense in which the Church of England is Catholic) the Church of these realms. If anyone has any doubt upon this point let him read "The Catholic Religion," issued from Clewer, and carefully consider the conscientious action of those who desire corporate union with the Church of Rome.

It may be well, under these circumstances, to give a little Church Teaching about subjects too much neglected, viz., the Man of Sin and Babylon. Our Church and our greatest divines have not altogether ignored unfulfilled prophecy. The rash and foolish mistakes which some expounders of prophetical statements have made have helped to throw contempt upon the study of the subject altogether, as well as upon old, orthodox interpretations of it. Some thirty years ago the *Saturday Review* never lost an opportunity of attacking leading Reformation preachers and speakers, and especially those who held that the Babylon of the Apocalypse prefigured Rome. First the press and then polite society caught the same tone. Cardinal Newman knew that by stating his adherence to the Reformation and Evangelical religion, and his belief that Babylon was Rome, in his earlier life, he was falling in with a taste which tabooed both. Leading ecclesiastics soon set aside the traditions of their order, and gave over using expressions of which their predecessors were not ashamed. A pet cuckoo-cry was raised, and it is still popular, that Protestantism was only a negation; as if the reform of the English Church and the restitution of primitive practice and Scriptural truth could have a negative basis! The Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale College writes truly: "Protestantism had a positive as well as a negative side. It had something to assert as well as something to deny. If it discarded one interpretation of Christianity, it espoused another. Old beliefs were subverted, not as an effect of a mere passion for revolt, but through the expulsive power of deeper convictions, a purer apprehension of truth."[1]

It does not follow that because Dr. Cumming, and others before him, made some mistakes, the general drift of their interpretation was wrong. Dogmatism about dates and details was unbecoming, but an element of general truth might, and

[1] Dr. Luthardt says: "The Reformation proceeded from the anxiety of the conscience for salvation—from the heart's craving for assurance. In it was repeated the old question: What must I do to be saved? and the old answer: Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ! It should never be forgotten that such was the origin of the Reformation and of Protestantism, which finds the essence of Christianity to be the salvation of the sinner by Christ Jesus, of which we are assured by faith. It is on this foundation that Protestantism considers the mental supremacy of Christianity over the whole life to rest; for it does not seek to limit the extent of its influences to the inner life of the individual, but extends them to the entire circuit of human life in general. Not, however, by measures of external authority, but by the power of the Spirit, is Christianity to seek to conquer the world, until the opposing spirit of the world shall, at the close of history, yield to the full supremacy of the Christian spirit in the times of the future kingdom of God."

I believe did, exist. It is a very singular circumstance that when Dr. Wordsworth, the late learned Bishop of Lincoln, put forward his theories of apostolical succession, and found allusions to the Sacraments in rather an outlandish fashion in various Scriptural expressions, he was claimed as a sort of apostle by many of the modern school; but the moment he asserted, and proved—and proved in such a way that no one has seriously attempted to refute him—that Rome was Babylon, then his apostolical character was ignored, and it was said: "Poor Wordsworth! he was a little touched in the head about Rome." It might be worth the while of these persons to ask what has been the traditional teaching of their own Church upon this question, and also to inquire, Were Bishop Wordsworth's views fanciful, or were they supported by the opinions of the greatest divines, not merely of the Church of England, but of the Church of Christ at large, both before and since the Reformation?

If any man ever had a passion for traditional research, that man was Dr. Christopher Wordsworth. It would be beyond the limits of a short paper to give his unanswerable proofs that the Pope of Rome is the Man of Sin, and that Rome is the Babylon of the Apocalypse; but the point is this, that he endorsed the teaching of his own Church, and echoed and amplified the opinions of our most illustrious divines. He claims as holding in substance his views Peter of Blois and Joachim, at the end of the twelfth century; Lubertinus di Casali, Peter Olivi, and others, of the thirteenth century; Marsilius of Padua, Dante and Petrarch. He claims also Archbishop Ussher, Grossetête, Bishop of Lincoln, Hooker, Bishop Andrewes, Sanderson and Wilson, and Dean Jackson. He might also have included the translators of our Bible, the authors of our Homilies, and our Reformers generally. Nor is this all. He examines most carefully every opposite theory, and challenges, but challenges in vain, any Roman Catholic ecclesiastic to refute him. There are two Roman Catholic opinions which he specifies — that Babylon is Pagan Rome; and—a more modern notion—that Rome in the future will degenerate and become Pagan again! He states that the latter hypothesis was maintained by Dr. Manning. He adds: "Here, then, is a remarkable phenomenon. Here are two discordant schools of Romish theologians. The one school says that these Apocalyptic prophecies concern the Rome that was destroyed more than a *thousand years ago.* The other school affirms that they relate to the Rome of some *future* time. They differ widely from each other in the interpretation of these prophecies, which, as they *all agree,* concern their own city. And yet

they say that they have an infallible interpreter of Scripture resident in Rome! And they boast much of their own unity!"

It certainly does not look well, perhaps it is not quite honest, to ignore the Book of Revelation, or to give it only a spiritual significance. I am firmly persuaded that, as no part of the sacred Scriptures can be passed over with impunity, a mistaken reference about 2 Thess. ii. and an inadequate interpretation of the Revelation has done untold mischief. If the traditional exposition or assumption be wrong, let another that is better and more satisfactory be given.

Whatever authority the Preface to the Bible has, it asserted that the Pope is the Man of Sin (1611). And though the same thing was not said in our Articles, it was affirmed in the Articles of the Irish Church of 1615. "Church Teaching" appeared in the Convocation of 1606, which distinctly called the Pope "the Man of Sin." It is to be noted that the Reformers did not, as a rule, make the distinction between the Man of Sin and Antichrist which widely prevails at the present day amongst some interpreters of prophecy. The late Canon Blakeney says that "Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Hooper, Bradford, Philpot, Parker, Jewell, Grindal, Cox, Pilkington, Sandys, Becon, held that the Pope is Antichrist and Rome Babylon." And he adds: "This doctrine pervaded the public documents in the reign of Elizabeth."

It is true that in the time of Laud these opinions were modified, but Laud did not alter the English Church's formularies in this respect. His individual opinion may go for what it is worth; our concern is to maintain that those who had chiefly to do with our existing Prayer-Book, Articles, and Homilies—that is, those sacred documents to which we have given our assent—held the view already mentioned.

There are one or two circumstances, showing the sentiments of the Church, which must be specified, and which require careful consideration. There was a remarkable book, which received the sanction of Convocation, and which must be esteemed authoritative by those who seem to think that Convocation is the voice of the Church—I mean the "Acts and Monuments" of John Foxe. The late Dr. Boultbee observes that a second edition of this book was published in 1571, and "The Convocation of Canterbury, the same which finally confirmed the Thirty-nine Articles, passed a resolution that a copy of the 'Acts and Monuments' should be placed in the churches, and in the halls and houses of the Bishops, Archdeacons, and others, to be read and studied by their own families, or those who might resort thither. . . . If ever book had Church of England authorization, it was this." If that is not a Protestant book, there is not one in existence; and if the Church

of England is not in a true sense Protestant, as the late Archbishop Benson so clearly and so lately maintained, why did she ever sanction such a production? The admirers of Rome have done their very best, from the time of its first appearance down to this hour, to controvert its statements and to weaken its influence; but while they have asserted that Foxe's doctrine was false, they have "not overthrown one material fact recorded." Since Convocation has sanctioned this remarkable production, are we not the true and good Churchmen and the best Church teachers who ask that to-day it should be widely read and diligently pondered? Both directly, by plain assertion, and indirectly, by recording the opinions of other Reformers, Foxe taught that the Pope was Antichrist. One quotation on this point must suffice. After referring to the four hundred years which are known as the mediæval or dark ages, which he calls "the time of Antichrist," he says there "followed the Reformation . . . wherein Antichrist begins to be revealed and his anti-Christian doctrine to be detected, the number of his church decreasing, and the number of the true Church increasing greatly" (p. 2). As against those who think the doctrine of the Church of England can be explained, modified, or adjusted so as to make union with Rome possible, or desire and aim at corporate union, I give his words: "Nor are we other than heretics if we should now join with them." The false doctrine of the Immaculate Conception and the blasphemous dogma of the Infallibility were not then promulgated as articles of faith, so that it would be double heresy to become a Roman Catholic at the present time. The whole book is full of very valuable teaching, endorsed and authorized by our Church.

Another standard work is Jewell's "Apology." It, and the "Defence of the Apology," deal with all the leading errors of the Church of Rome, as they then existed, in a learned, most conclusive and masterly style. The "Apology" received the sanction of Convocation in 1562. So that here, again, we have unmistakably "Church Teaching." He writes: "The Council of Carthage did circumspectly provide that no Bishop should be called the highest Bishop or chief priest. And, therefore, sithence the Bishop of Rome will nowadays so be called, and challengeth unto himself an authority that is none of his; besides that he doth plainly contrary to the ancient Councils and contrary to the old Fathers, we believe that he doth give unto himself, as it is written by his own companion, Gregory, a presumptuous, a profane, a sacrilegious, and an anti-Christian name; that he is also the king of pride; that he is Lucifer, which preferreth himself before his brethren; that he hath forsaken the faith, and is the forerunner of Anti"christ.

Jewell considers the Man of Sin to be Antichrist (p. 80). He writes: "The friars of Lyons, men, as touching the manner of their life, not to be misliked, were wont boldly to affirm that the Romish Church . . . was the very same harlot of Babylon and rout of devils whereof is prophesied so plainly in the Apocalypse" (p. 81). He refers to several Roman Catholics who held that the "Bishop of Rome himself . . . is very Antichrist." "Whether," he adds, "they spake it truly or falsely, let that go; sure I am they spoke it plainly." Mr. Harding replied to Jewell, and defended the Bishop of Rome in the most outrageous way, claiming for him the titles and prerogatives that belong only to our Lord, even saying "he may be called our Lord and God." He quotes these words of Mr. Harding: "Without the obedience of the Pope there is no salvation" (p. 120). And he says Mr. Harding would defend the language of Hortiensis: "'God and the Pope have one judgment-seat, and, sin only excepted, the Pope can do in a manner all things that God can do.' Whereby, I trow, is meant that, as God is omnipotent, so in a manner is the Pope." Bishop Burnet, in his Preface to his work on the Articles, writes: "The first and, indeed, much the best writer of Queen Elizabeth's time was Bishop Jewell, who had so great a share in all that was done then, particularly in compiling the Second Book of Homilies," etc. Surely, then, if any persons wish to know the mind of the Church of England, they ought not to neglect Jewell's writings. There is a quaintness about them which is amusing; there is a calm logic which is irresistible; there is a mixture of strength and humility, of courage and sobriety, of confidence and reverence for truth, which are most charming. He well knew what Popery was, and if any members of our reformed Church propose union with Rome, it either savours of wilful ignorance, or is a sign of betrayal. The judicious Hooker, the greatest theologian our Church has ever known, but who is treated with scant courtesy by some who are esteemed learned and authoritative divines in their own special religious circle, makes short work of Romanism as such. He says that the Church of Rome "hath fawned upon kings and princes, and by spiritual cozenage hath made them sell their lawful authority for empty titles." He refers to "her gross and grievous abominations." One remarkable sentence in his first sermon on "part of St. Jude's Epistle" must be quoted: "As Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, the servant of Solomon, rose up and rebelled against his lord, and there were gathered unto him vain men and wicked, which made themselves strong against Roboam, the son of Solomon, because Roboam was but a child and tender-hearted, and could not resist

them ; so *the son of perdition and the man of sin* (being not able to brook the words of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, which forbade His disciples to be like princes of nations, 'They bear rule, and are called gracious; it shall not be so with you') hath risen up and rebelled against his Lord ; and, to strengthen his arm, he hath crept into the houses almost of all the noblest families round him, and taken their children from the cradle to be his cardinals ; he hath fawned upon kings and princes of the earth, and by spiritual cozenage hath made them sell their lawful authority and jurisdiction for titles of Catholicus Christianissimus, Defensor Fidei, and such like ; he hath proclaimed sale of pardons to inveigle the ignorant ; built seminaries to allure young men desirous of learning ; erected stews to gather the dissolute unto him. This is the rock whereupon his church is built. Hereby the man is grown huge and strong, like the cedars which are not shaken with the wind, because princes have been as children, over-tenderhearted, and could not resist." In his celebrated and convincing Sermon II., he says : "By Babylon we understand the Church of Rome."

The Articles are Protestant throughout, as against Rome, Catholic as to the Primitive Church ; rejecting the Apocrypha, works of supererogation, purgatory, sacrifices of masses, transubstantiation, traditions contrary to God's Word written, false views of justification, etc. The Homilies give no hesitating or uncertain sound. There is scarcely a distinctive doctrine of the Church of Rome that they do not, in their own quaint style, refute and denounce. The following quotation is from the homily for Whit Sunday : "If ye will compare this with the Church of Rome, not as it was at the beginning, but as it is presently, and hath been for the space of nine hundred years and odd, you shall well perceive the state thereof to be so far wide from the nature of the true Church, that nothing can be more. For neither are they *built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets*, retaining pure and sound doctrine of Christ Jesu ; neither yet do they order either the Sacraments or else the ecclesiastical keys in such sort as he did first institute and ordain them, but have so intermingled their own traditions and inventions, by chopping and changing, by adding and plucking away, that now they may seem to be converted into a new guise. Christ commended to His Church a Sacrament of His Body and Blood : they have changed it into a sacrifice for the quick and the dead. Christ did minister to His apostles, and the apostles to other men, indifferently under both kinds : they have robbed the lay people of the cup, saying that for them one kind is sufficient. Christ ordained no other element to

be used in Baptism but only water, whereunto, when the word is joined, it is made, as St. Augustine saith, a full and perfect Sacrament: they, being wiser in their own conceit than Christ, think it is not well nor orderly done, unless they use conjuration; unless they hallow the water; unless there be oil, salt, spittle, tapers, and such other dumb ceremonies, serving to no use, contrary to the plain rule of St. Paul, who willeth *all things* to be *done* in the Church *unto edification*. Christ ordained the authority of the keys to excommunicate notorious sinners and to absolve them which are truly penitent: they abuse this power at their own pleasure, as well in cursing the godly with bell, book, and candle, as also in absolving the reprobate, which are known to be unworthy of any Christian society; whereof he that lust to see examples, let him search their lives. To be short, look what our Saviour Christ pronounced of the Scribes and the Pharisees in the Gospel, the same may we boldly and with safe conscience pronounce of the Bishops of Rome, namely, that they have forsaken, and daily do forsake, the commandments of God, to erect and set up their own constitutions. Which thing being true, as all they which have any light of God's Word must needs confess, we may well conclude, according to the rule of Augustine, that the Bishops of Rome and their adherents are not the true Church of Christ, much less than to be taken as chief heads and rulers of the same. 'Whosoever,' saith he, 'do dissent from the Scriptures concerning the Head, although they be found in all places where the Church is appointed, yet are they not in the Church.' A plain place, concluding directly against the Church of Rome. Where is now the Holy Ghost, which they so stoutly do claim to themselves? Where is now the *Spirit of Truth*, that will not suffer them in any wise to err? If it be possible to be there where the true Church is not, then is it at Rome: otherwise it is but a vain brag, and nothing else." In the same homily there is a reference to the Church of Rome as "the Kingdom of Antichrist," and in the homily on "Peril of Idolatry" she is "Babylon the Great."

It is easy to ignore these statements, but is it fair, is it becoming, is it honest to do so? It is easy to speak about the Reformers as fallible men, which everyone knows and admits, and to discredit their statements by a reference to the stormy times in which they lived; but the other truth must not be ignored, that as Romanists once themselves, they knew more about Popery than some modern divines. The formularies of the Church of England were not finally settled in troublous times. Jewell wrote in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. The Convocation of 1606 was neither swayed by fanaticism nor

Puritanism. Hooker well weighed and considered what he wrote. It would be more to the purpose, if there be anything wrong in the writings of such great men, or in the Church's Articles and Homilies, to bravely try and refute them. Canon Blakeney said: "Far from being Puritanical in any degree, the Church, under the presidency of Bancroft, had begun to put forth very high notions of episcopal and kingly authority, and yet, even then, by a *synodial* act, she declared the Pope to be the man of sin. *It cannot be shown that any of the Reformers or Reformed Churches denied this truth.*" It is easy to assume that the Pope is not the man of sin, and to think it charitable and polite to abstain from the use of any such offensive title; but if it be true, real charity and love will and must proclaim it. It is easy to ignore this kind of "Church teaching," and to substitute something else for it; but, at least, those who give it must be esteemed the loyal sons of the Church and the truest guides of the people. It is easy to declare that the Church of Rome is not what she was; but is this the case? for she has not repented of her awful cruelties, nor modified her false doctrines, nor abolished the Holy Office of the Inquisition. It is easy to propose terms of union with her; but any serious attempt to effect it would ruin the Church of England, would produce national conflicts —bitter, continuous, disastrous—and would be a clear, unmistakable movement along the road of apostasy.

JOSEPH MCCORMICK.

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

PART VI.

(Concluded.)

IT was stated at the close of our last article on this subject that if the Act which authorized the second book of Edward speak true, it would be a serious retrogression to return to the use of the first book. It would, under present circumstances, be deserting a position of doctrinal perfection for the purpose of re-admitting doctrinal errors or doctrinal dangers, the exclusion of which had made perfect the second book.

This is a matter so essential to our argument that we must be permitted to bespeak for it careful and candid consideration. In approving and authorizing the second book, the Church of England has established herself on a firm doctrinal

position, and thereupon has set up her standard on high—a position from which it is impossible for her to recede without being false to the truth she has received. To allow the use of the first book, however *once* defensible, would be, under present circumstances, nothing less than a desertion of that position.[1]

At least we cannot but fear that, in the present state of the Church of England, it would become practically equivalent to

[1] While, however, we are bound jealously to guard the Reformed character of our Prayer-Book, and dare not, therefore, in our present surroundings, part with any fence of security which we may owe even to the excessive caution of our Reformers, it is well for us to be reminded that we may very well err in condemning (and even, it may be, in over-carefully shunning) all language which has been used to express doctrines which we reject. Thus we may be surrendering expressions which have been used in a sound sense by Christians of old time as well as by Reformed divines in more recent days, and virtually conceding (a very mistaken and disastrous concession) that they can only in fairness be used to signify the doctrines for which our opponents would claim them as exclusively their own.

And we might even find matter for congratulation in the divergent forms accepted by the Scottish and American Episcopal Churches, if only it be allowed that their interpretation should be governed by the doctrinal perfection of the English form. It was well said by Bishop Thirlwall concerning the Scotch and English services: "There is indeed a very considerable difference between the two offices, both in their structure and their language. But this I cannot consider as an evil in itself, still less as anything which ought to be a bar to the freest brotherly intercourse between two Churches which so closely agree with one another in doctrine and discipline" (Charge, 1856, p. 44).

And Bishop Charles Wordsworth, in his "Plain Tract on the Scotch Communion Office" (Edinburgh, 1859), says: "The existence of the three different offices in these three branches of the Reformed Church has the same effect in regard to doctrine as the existence of the three Creeds, which (though with very different degrees of fulness and precision of statement upon different Articles of the Faith) all harmonize together, all naturally tend to illustrate and confirm each other. And, in regard to practice, while the Church of England and the Church of America each keeps to the use of its own Formulary, and while we retain our own, as of 'primary authority,' but not so as to exclude the English where it may reasonably be desired, this course of action can have no proper effect to diminish the cordial unanimity or the actual communion which exists among us" (pp. 19, 20).

The words of Bishop Horsley's letter to Skinner have often been quoted: "I think the Scotch Office more conformable to the primitive models, and in my private judgment more edifying than that which we now use" (see Bulley's "Variations," p. 184). They should be read, however, in connection with the near context: "Nevertheless, I think our present office is very good, our form of consecration of the elements is sufficient."

Similar words quoted from Archbishop Sharp (see Bishop Jolly, "On the Eucharist," p. 123) should be set beside the teaching of his sermon on 1 Cor. xi. 23-25 (Works, vol. v., p. 190, *et seq.*; Oxford, 1829), and it will then plainly appear that he had no desire whatever to return to the doctrines which in the ambiguities of the first book seek a shelter. See especially pp. 197, 201.

such a desertion. Wherein consists the perfection which the Act claims as the characteristic of the second book? It is impossible, as we maintain, to doubt the answer. Its perfection consists in its strictly and unmistakeably Reformed character.[1] The work of its perfecting was the revision which manifests the scrupulous care—the perhaps even excessive carefulness—to eliminate whatever could be understood as having anything like a doubtful sound as favouring or allowing the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharistic Presence.

The *first* book was, in comparison of *former* services, an excellent liturgy. It was a great gain to have a Communion Office which the Reformed might well use without offence. And, taking into account that it was for the use of a National Church, it was a very wonderful step towards that perfecting of the Prayer-Book which our Reformers had in view. But, while it lopped off the topmost boughs of pernicious doctrines and made a very conspicuous change in a reforming direction, it is unquestionable that it still left some room for possible misunderstanding, some room for serious or dangerous error, and thus stood in need of a further revision which should make it, in view of these present dangers and present needs, "fully perfect." And this revision is just what it received in the second book.

But let it be well observed that this doctrinal perfection was accompanied, we may say by the sacrifice[2] (in some sense),

---

[1] See "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 517, 521.

[2] Even Waterland would willingly have had retained the "memorial." He says: "It is very certain that the *commemoration*, *memorial* or *annunciation* of our Lord's *Passion*, with an address to God for His *propitious* favour thereupon, has been a very ancient, eminent and solemn part of the Communion Service. There is now no direct formal application of that kind in our liturgies. There was in King Edward's Liturgy of 1549, in these words: 'We, Thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, with these Thy holy gifts, the *memorial*,' etc. . . . Why this part was struck out in the *review*, I know not, unless it was owing to some scruple (which, however, was needless) about making the memorial *before God*, which at that time might appear to give some umbrage to the Popish *sacrifice*, among such as knew not how to distinguish" ("Works," vol. iv., p. 607; Oxford, 1843. See also p. 486, and vol v., p. 295).

Probably Waterland may not have observed (as Mr. Scudamore has, "Not. Euch.," p. 647, 2nd edit.) that the ancient Ambrosian Canon seems to have had no such "direct formal application" (see Muratori, "Liturgia Romana Vetus," tom. i., cc. 131-134).

It may be very readily admitted that some of the omissions in the second book might be restored with far less doctrinal danger than others. But as regards this quotation from Waterland, it should be observed (1) that the *memorial* in his view is altogether without the "Real Objective Presence." This, in view of *our* controversies, is most important. (2) That (although he elsewhere—vol. iv., p. 509—rather labours to give to *ἀνάμνησις* a fulness of meaning beyond what it seems to us naturally to

of somewhat which we should naturally have expected our Reformers to have been very slow, and even loath, to part with. The generally conservative character of the English Reformation[1] might almost make us marvel at some of the changes introduced into the second book.[2] In view of the characteristic tendencies of our Reformers in the matter of their liturgical services, those changes are some[3] of them unaccountable upon any other principle than this, that arguments based on what may be called liturgical precedents must yield to cogent reasons having to do with securing and safeguarding doctrinal purity.

We do not wonder at all that wise, and learned, and faithful, and holy men, liturgical scholars, in after-days, when all danger of such false doctrine seemed far away, and the Reformed character of the Church of England was universally recognised, should have sometimes expressed something like a

convey) his memorial is the memorial of *ἀνάμνησις* not of a *μνημόσυνον* (*i.e.*, in the sense in which it includes a sacrificial offering). It may suffice, in evidence of this, to quote these words: "The Archetypal sacrifice itself is what no one but Christ Himself could offer, whether really or symbolically. We *represent* it, we do not offer it in the Eucharist" (vol. iv., p. 750). But other evidence may be seen in "Missarum Sacrificia," pp. 217, 218. It should also be noted that, although *μνημόσυνον* is translated "memorial," it is not, in its *technical* meaning, to be understood in a *commemorative* sense as a calling to mind of a *past* event (which is the very sense in which Waterland advocates the *memorial*, and which is also the sense in which the words of the Liturgy might more fairly be understood). The azkârâh (as Professor Abbott has observed) was a present calling to mind of the worshipper before God by the real offering on the altar of a part for the whole (see Abbott's Essays, pp. 123, 127. It should be remembered, however, that the Greek *μνημόσυνον* has also in the LXX. a wider meaning, admitting a relation to a past event, as, *e.g.*, in Josh. iv. 7). (3) That the language of the liturgies generally (as well as of many of the Fathers) may be pleaded as against the *μνημόσυνον* sense of the memorial (see "Recent Teachings concerning the Eucharistic Sacrifice," pp. 10-14). (4) That in our own days, as well as at the time of the Reformation, there are those who know not "how to distinguish," and that our present dangers seem to witness that the *scruple* of our Reformers was not so *needless* as Waterland seems to have supposed.

It is also to be observed that (to use the words of Mr. Scudamore, "Not. Euch.," p. 651) "in none of the most ancient memorials does the priest profess to make an oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ, much less of Christ Himself. They are strictly commemorative."

[1] See "Eucharistic Presence," pp. 443-446, 508-511.

[2] Canon Dixon has justly observed—speaking of the first book of Edward—"that the conservative spirit of the compilers was more manifest in the Breviary and the Offices than in the Missal" ("History of Church of England," vol. iii., p. 16).

[3] Possibly some of them may be accounted for by the influence of the Mozarabic Rite. See Mr. Burbidge's "Liturgies and Offices," pp. 175-177, 199-201, as well as his paper in *Guardian* of March 12, 1890, and Mr. Warren's letter of March 22. But see also Gasquet's "Edward VI.," pp. 185, 186.

wish for the restoration, in part, of that which the second book had cast away. We could even sympathize with a desire for somewhat to be added to our present book which is to be found in the first[1] if only we could be quite sure that there would be no danger in the change—no danger of its seeming to open a door for the inroads of superstition and the bringing back of false doctrine.

We do not marvel at all that the Episcopal Churches of Scotland and America made adventures in the direction of undoing somewhat of that which the extreme caution of our Reformers had done in the reign of Edward VI. Nor are we much surprised that the impetus given of late to the study of liturgical lore should have moved some among them to the desire for a yet further revision, and perhaps a nearer approach to ancient liturgical models. But we do not feel sure that their history does not supply a warning, if warning were needed—a lesson of danger which we should learn to avoid, a teaching which should justify the action of our Reformers, and make us thankful that they had the wisdom to bid their liturgical preferences all give precedence to a supreme regard for incorruptness of doctrine.

And our approval of the Liturgical changes made in their service for the Holy Communion must ever be limited by the proviso that it should always be well understood that the Liturgical *doctrine* should be interpreted according to the standard of the *full perfection* (doctrinally) of the English Office.

And for ourselves, we are quite sure that the present is no time for us to be thinking of change. The question of liturgical precedents is the question of that which the highest liturgical authorities will testify to be only a matter of following the lead in that which, for the most part (even though probably framed, in part, on ancient Jewish forms[2]) is

---

[1] It is obvious that there may be an agreement in expressing approval of the first book among those whose agreement can carry them no further.

Those who highly approved of the first book as a most laudable and courageous step forward in the progress of Reformation, and as a most godly form of service in comparison of that which it was meant to supersede, but who regarded it as made perfect by the second book, stood on a doctrinal standpoint entirely different from that of those who can endure the use of the second book only as a fallen representative of the first, and therefore appeal to the Act's approval of the first in order to make the first appear more perfect than the second.

[2] Dr. Probst has argued that the Clementine Liturgy was the oldest form of Liturgical service, and was used in the Church of Antioch till superseded by that of St. Basil. And Bickell has endeavoured to show that of all ancient Liturgies the Clementine is the one in which can be traced the nearest correspondence with the Jewish forms. See Dr.

merely human in origin.[1] The halo of venerable antiquity (and that antiquity sometimes rather doubtful) is the most that can be claimed for that, the rejection of which some will still lament as our loss.

But the question of preserving the purity of our Reformed faith is the question of the hour—is the question (we fear) of imminent danger, the question assuredly of tremendous responsibility. What we might think of doing, if there were no peril, is a question which must wait, at least, till the peril is gone. We have now a religious atmosphere charged with those very dangerous elements (and even in far more dangerous conditions) which made that careful revision of our Communion Service essential to the making fully perfect of our Book of Common Prayer.

Language which might be piously and safely used in a time when words were interpreted according to the limitations required by common-sense, becomes full of danger in an age when the merit of faith is measured by its capacity of believing contradictions (see "Lectures on Lord's Supper," pp. 29-31). And ambiguous expressions, which may convey only a sound sense in the surroundings of sound teaching, may need to be carefully avoided or distinctly guarded when minds are being as waves tossed to and fro, and carried about with new winds of doctrine. And especially should the introduction of such ambiguities be avoided where there is reason to fear that the change is desired in the interest of false or dangerous doctrine.

The point we have to insist upon—and we cannot too strongly insist upon it—is this: Our Communion Service is a distinctly "Reformed" Office, and we are bound to be defenders of its "Reformed" character. Can we be faithful to our charge if we allow doctrinal *distinctness* to be changed into doctrinal *indistinctness* for the sake of sheltering dangerous doctrinal error, and making our Church to be no longer numbered among the Churches of the "Reformed"?[2]

Skene's "The Lord's Supper and the Passover Ritual," pp. xi and 183-194, 209-215, 217. On the antiquity of the Jewish Passover Ritual, see pp. 129-141. Some strictures on the theories of these writers will be found in the *Guardian* of July 27, 1892.

[1] See "Papers on Eucharistic Presence," No. vii., pp. 553, 560.

[2] Let the reader be asked to compare with modern (so-called) "Catholic doctrine" the *Catholic* teaching contained in the following extract, with its faithful witness (albeit, a Laudian witness) to the true principles of the English Reformation and of our Reformed Prayer-Book: "Confirmation is by the Church of Rome, that now is corrupted with many errors and novelties in religion, held to be a Sacrament. But we, who by the grace of God are numbered among the Reformed Churches, whereof this Church of England is, both for doctrine and discipline, the most

It is impossible to ignore the fact that we have around us the felt influences of that new Church of England as we now know it, and as we know it to have been (in some sense) founded by Cardinal Newman, and built upon by those who are no friends to the faith of the "Reformed."

We can express approbation of the first book, in the sense in which our Reformers approved it, and can acknowledge that its depravers were "mistakers" in fastening on its ambiguities a sense which did not of necessity belong to them, and which they were not intended to bear. It is the first book, as explained by the second, and perfected by that explanation, which was "the very godly order," "agreeable to the Word of God and the primitive Church," in the view of our Reformers, and of the Act of Uniformity. And as so explained it is not less a very godly order in our view still. But it is just this explanation which our new Theologians would have us reject.

We are alluding, of course, not to any school of true Anglo-Catholic theology, faithful to the principles of our Reformation and the doctrine of our Articles, such as the Church of England has delighted to honour, but to a new Romanizing party, which can never fairly be identified with it.

Who are they—the leaders in the party of attack—who are now knocking at the doors, eager in their demands to have restored to us the usages disallowed in the perfecting of our Liturgy, in the revision of the second book of Edward? Are they men with views in harmony with the doctrine of our Reformers? Are they not those who would sacrifice what we know to be Protestant truth for the sake of attaining some sort of corporate union with Rome, or some sort of recognition by the Papacy?

Is their aim only liturgical improvement for liturgical reasons' sake? Have they not avowed, will they not acknowledge, that their desire is to supply what they regard as deficiencies, only or mainly for doctrine's sake?[1] Have we

---

eminent and the most pure, the most agreeable to Scripture and antiquity of all others, we hold it to be none" (MS. notes of "Preface" to Confirmation Service, inserted in Cosin's corrected copy of the Book of Common Prayer; see Parker's "Introduction," p. cclx).

[1] We venture to quote the following words, and to ask for them renewed attention:

"It is impossible to view the changes made in the Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI. apart from their doctrinal significance. The First Prayer-Book might have been used in a Communion which rejected the Real Objective Presence. But it certainly would not have borne witness, as the Second does, and still more as the *change* from the First to the Second does, that this Church of England *hath* (to use Whitgift's words) refused the Real Presence.

"And the question of restoring the use, or the permission to use the

not here the new Church of England, as founded by the new Oxford School, seeking to put its new wine into the old bottles of a Reformed Communion? And what shall we think of this attempt to put the new wine of a developed mediævalism—a

---

First Communion Service instead of the Second, cannot now be entertained apart from views of doctrinal significance. Upon merely liturgical grounds, some might regret that the changes made in Edward's days were so thorough and sweeping, who yet must be deeply thankful that those changes were made, and still stand, to testify to our Reformers' sense of the danger, and wise determination, as far as might be, to exclude the possibility of the growing up again of the doctrine they rejected. So, again, opinions may be quoted of preference for the First Book from some eminent divines (see Medd's Introduction to Walton's 'First Book of Edward VI.,' p. xvi, *sqq.*); and if we saw no danger and no possibility of the bringing in again the doctrine, for rejecting which many of our Reformers died, those opinions might be entitled to considerable liturgical weight. But if anything be wanting to justify the wisdom of our Reformers, and to make us grateful for having the *Second* Prayer-Book instead of the *First*, surely it may be found in the shelter which such expressions of opinion seem to afford for those who in our days (when the danger is realized) would desire to undo the work of the Reformers, and therefore on doctrinal grounds would bring in the First Book to crush out the very truth, to which the Second bears such important testimony.

"Moreover, when it is pleaded that the Act of Uniformity, which authorized Edward's *Second* Book, speaks with approval of the *First*, it must be observed (1) that such approval is modified by the words which speak of the Second as made *more perfect*, and (2) that such approval is clearly given to the *First* as *explained by* the Second (see the words 'As well for the more plain and manifest explanation hereof as for the more perfection of the said order of common service . . . the King's most excellent Majesty . . . hath caused the foresaid order of common service to be faithfully and godly perused, explained, and made fully perfect')—that is to say, that expressions in the First Book being capable of two senses, the Second Book takes away from it one, and stamping clearly the other sense, so approves it.

"This being so, it must be obvious that it is quite vain for those who now dislike the *Second* Book, and desire to return to the *First*, to bring forward in their support from the Act of Uniformity, or from the writings of our Reformers, expressions of approval of the *First* Book (see 'The Church and the World,' 1866, 3rd edit., pp. 323, 476; and Cooke's letter to Perry, 'Of Ceremonies,' etc., p. 113). What they want, to give any real support to their position, and what we ASK them (in no captious spirit) to produce *if they can*, is an expression (either in the Act or in the writings of our Reformers) of distinct and decided *preference* for the *First*, or *regret* for the changes made in the *Second*, and in particular an expression of adherence to that *doctrinal sense* admissible (or apparently admissible) in the *First*, which finds no place in the explanation of the *Second* Book of Edward. WE have no quarrel with our Reformers, nor with the Act of Uniformity for speaking well of the *First* Book. Even the Westminster Assembly say of the Prayer-Book that 'it occasioned many godly and learned men to rejoice much in it at that time it was set forth, because the Mass and the rest of the Latin service being removed, the public worship was celebrated in our own tongue' (Preface to Directory)."—"Papers on Eucharistic Presence," pp. 517-519.

revived unscriptural sacerdotalism teaching for doctrines the commandments of men—into the old bottles of a Liturgy revised to receive only the doctrine of the old faith[1]—the faith once for all delivered to the saints? Shall we willingly consent to have the perfection of our Liturgy destroyed—our bottles burst by this insidious design of forcing the new into the old?

Let it not be supposed for a moment that we would desire to draw too sharply the line of limitation which surrounds the teaching of the most Catholic Church in Christendom. Far be it from us to desire to make this Church of England the Church of any one narrow school of thought. We may not, indeed, remove our ancient landmarks, nor take down the fences which our forefathers have set up to defend for us the doctrines of the Reformation. But our wisdom, not less than our charity, demands of us that we should rather seek widely to stretch than tightly to strain the cord which marks the true comprehension of our Anglican Communion.

This is no question at all of severely pressing the limits of our boundaries, to restrain the freedom of thought of individual theologians. It is the question of going out of our way to make room for a party in whose view the doctrine of the English Reformation is only a heresy.

It is the question of loosing from our moorings in very uncertain weather, and hoisting up our mainsail to the wind to be carried whither we know not, only far away (as it seems) from the Church of our fathers, far away from the faith of the Reformed, far away (as we fear) from the teaching of Apostles and prophets, far away from the truth of Christ's Gospel.

If the view which has been presented in these papers of the History of our Prayer-Book be a true view, there is an urgent call to us to speak out. It is not a time for silence. It is time to speak the truth—albeit, to speak the truth in love.

Let our brethren be entreated to consider well that the question before us is one, the answer to which should be governed by a view of the present difficulties and dangers which surround us. In view of our new surroundings, in view of the oncoming force of a Church of England as founded by Cardinal Newman, shall we be willing to desert our position because of the doubtful or mistaken results of our liturgical studies? Shall we be willing to change our sides on the ground that some there have been—admirers of the first book of Edward—who were true to our Articles and faithful to the

[1] Speaking of what was then termed the *old* and the *new learning*, Cranmer said: "That which they call the old is the new, and that which they call the new is indeed the old" ("Letters," P.S., p. 450).

doctrine of the Reformed? Would *they* have been on the side of the new-founded Church of England? Would even Cosin himself have said a word in defence of this new claim? I am very confident he would have been among the first and foremost in resistance.[1]

We may be thankful that there are those whose eyes are being enlightened to see the dangers and the errors of the party in advance, and are turning back to be guided by truer and safer counsels.

And we may surely hope that, as time advances and increased light is thrown upon the subject from the by-paths of history and the study of English theology, many will be brought to see how strangely the new departure has departed from the theology of our English divines, and how urgent is the call to all true English Catholics to return to the old paths and the faith of our martyred Reformers.

Anyhow, let us beware of falling into the error of supposing that pleas for comprehension are to be listened to only on the side of the *new*-founded Church of England. Has there been no silent exodus of those who loved the old? Are there none among our faithful laity now beginning in sorrowful suspicion to look at the door—a door by which many from outside might quietly be coming in but for the dread of this inroad of the new?

At all events, if there be a danger—as we sometimes fear there may be—a danger approaching, and perhaps not very far off—the danger of making important concessions for the sake of maintaining a National Church[2]—the danger of liturgical changes for the very purpose of giving legal and legitimate standing-place to doctrines which the Church of England has rejected as errors, opening the door at the demand of those who would bring in again the blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits for the rejection of which our forefathers laid down their lives—who desire above all things to set up again, clothed and adorned, and arrayed in gorgeous apparel, a doctrine—a doctrine which is the natural parent of a worship—a worship which, if the doctrine be not true (as we are convinced it is not), must (even by the teaching of its own

[1] "See Missarum Sacrificia," p. 164.

[2] We must confess to the feeling that some word of caution (if not of alarm) may be called for in view of some recent proposals for facilitating rubrical alterations.

That the Prayer-Book, with all the details of its rubrical directions, should be regarded as stereotyped for ever is an idea which the Prayer-Book itself distinctly condemns. That certain regulations might be made more elastic is, beyond reasonable question, a thing to be desired.

But permission of *such* change should be well safeguarded against possibility of *doctrinal* shifting.

teachers) be material idolatry; in other words, a doctrine which, being false, can only be made non-idolatrous by being proved true—then we feel called upon to utter one word of most solemn warning (it is a solemn word, in the uttering of which we are persuaded we shall be discharging the true duty of the CHURCHMAN, and acting as the mouthpiece of thousands of the most faithful and attached members of our communion who are desiring to be led, not by any hasty impulse of party spirit, but by the force of the truest, deepest, most sacred convictions): WE MUST BEWARE HOW, *for the sake of maintaining its national character (or giving it a more all-embracing position)*, WE SHAPE FOR OURSELVES, OR REFOUND FOR OURSELVES (*or recognise as refounded for us by Cardinal Newman*), A NATIONAL CHURCH, THE MAINTENANCE OF WHICH WOULD BE A NATIONAL SIN.

The following words of the greatest of English divines cannot be too often quoted: "Tell us not that ye will sacrifice to the Lord our God, if we will sacrifice to Ashtaroth or Melcom; that ye will read our Scriptures, if we will listen to your traditions; that if ye may have a Mass by permission, we may have a Communion with good leave and liking; that ye will admit the things that are spoken by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus, if your Lord and Master may have his ordinances observed and his statutes kept. Solomon took it (as well he might) for an evident proof that she did not bear a motherly affection to her child which yielded to have it cut in divers parts. He cannot love the Lord Jesus with his heart which lendeth one ear to His Apostles and another to false apostles; which can brook to see a mingle-mangle of religion and superstition, ministers and massing-priests, truth and error, traditions and Scriptures. No; we have no Lord but Jesus; no doctrine but the Gospel: no teachers but His Apostles. Were it reason to require at the hand of an English subject obedience to the laws and edicts of the Spaniard? I do marvel that any man bearing the name of a servant of the servants of Jesus Christ will go about to draw us from our allegiance" (Hooker, Sermon I. on Jude 17-21; Works, vol. iii., p. 666, edit. Keble).

It is easy to say, as in answer to this, that times have changed since Hooker wrote. No change of times or circumstances can ever make it safe or right for a National Church to become the home of such a mingle-mangle as must come of the attempt to combine the doctrine of the Lord's Supper with the doctrine of the Romish Mass. In the interest of comprehension we may well lift up our voice against any endeavours to break down our fences for the purpose of comprehending the teaching of essential and vital antagonisms.

One word may be permitted in conclusion. It is not only a time for speaking the truth in love. It is surely a time for calling upon our God, showing Him the helplessness of our great need, and spreading out before Him the causes of our sorrow and our shame. It is surely a time that those who have been taught to know the Gospel of Christ (the Gospel of free justification for the ungodly) as the power of God unto salvation, should unite in importunate prayer and continual supplication, that the Spirit of the Lord may lift up a standard against the on-coming waves and waters of error, that so men may see and acknowledge the good hand of our God upon us, and in lowly adoration may learn the lesson of Divine instruction—"Not by might or by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts."

N. DIMOCK.

Notes and Queries.

THE CUNEIFORM RECORDS AND THE FALL OF BABYLON.

I HAVE to thank Mr. Cuthbert Routh for the kind terms in which he has referred to my paper on the above subject; and as he seems to wish to know my views in regard to Darius the Mede, I shall briefly state them for whatever they may be worth. I may say, then, that the opinion which I hold is that the accession of Cyrus *did* take place on the night that Belshazzar died, but that Cyrus associated with himself in the kingdom of Babylon Darius the Mede, who was probably the Cyaxares of Xenophon.

When the Medes and Persians come before us after the overthrow of the Babylonian empire, we find them standing in a very peculiar position towards each other—almost on terms of equality, and yet the Persians somewhat superior to the Medes—owing, it would seem, chiefly to the pre-eminent genius and personality of Cyrus. How did this rather anomalous state of things come about? Three different accounts have come down to us from antiquity:

The first is that of Herodotus, who represents this fusion of the Medes and Persians as having taken place subsequent to a battle between Astyages, King of the Medes, and Cyrus, in the course of which the greater part of the Median army, with their commander Harpagus, went over to Cyrus; the remainder were put to flight, and Astyages and the crown of Media passed into the hands of the victor.

The second account is that of Ctesias, followed in a fragment of Nicolaus of Damascus, which represents the fusion of the two peoples as having occurred after several severe engagements, in the last of which Cyrus with his Persians completely defeated Astyages and the Median army, sixty thousand Medes having been left dead upon the field of battle.

The third is the account of Xenophon, which represents, not Astyages, but a son of Astyages, Cyaxares, as the last King of the Medes. It

narrates how this Cyaxares, who was the brother of Mandané, the mother of Cyrus, having succeeded to the throne of Media on the death of his father Astyages, found himself threatened with war by the Babylonians and their allies, and sent a message to Cambyses, King of Persia, the father of Cyrus, requesting him to despatch a force of Persian troops to assist him in the war, and making it a special request that his nephew Cyrus should be sent in command of the contingent. His request was acceded to ; and accordingly Cyaxares and his nephew took the field with the Median and Persian forces. After some signal advantages had been gained over the enemy, Cyaxares, being of a rather indolent disposition, considered that enough had been done ; but Cyrus, fired with the thirst for conquest, persuaded his uncle to permit him to continue the campaign with his Persian forces, and any of the Medes who might choose to go with him. On this permission having been granted, nearly the whole Median army volunteered, marched off with Cyrus, and fought under his command, side by side with the Persians. Cyaxares was much annoyed and mortified when he found himself thus abandoned by almost all his army ; but a meeting between the uncle and nephew subsequently occurred, in the course of which Cyrus, by that fascinating charm of manner by which he bowed the hearts of all men to his will, restored his uncle to good humour, and it was agreed that Cyaxares should return and guard the realm of Media, whilst Cyrus pursued his career of conquest. After the fall of Babylon, Xenophon relates that Cyrus paid his uncle a visit in Media, when Cyaxares gave him his daughter in marriage, and made him heir to the kingdom of the Medes. Cyrus, on his part, we are told, informed his uncle that there was a residence prepared for him in Babylon.

It can hardly, I think, be denied that this narrative of Xenophon appears to account in a natural way for the relations of brotherhood and almost equality which we find existing between the Medes and Persians after the fall of the Babylonian Empire ; whilst, on the other hand, the account given in the narrative of Nicolaus of desperate and bloody battles between the Medes and Persians fought only a few years before, in the last of which sixty thousand of the Medes were slain, would seem very unlikely indeed to have led up to such a state of things. The narrative of Xenophon would seem far more like the truth ; and it may be added that the general account of the career of Cyrus given by Nicolaus is contradicted at the very outset by the cuneiform inscription on the Cyrus cylinder, which declares Cyrus to have been the son of a King Cambyses, whose royal pedigree is fully recounted ; whereas Nicolaus, on the contrary, makes Cyrus the son of one Atradates, of the Mardian tribe, whose poverty forced him to live by plunder. Xenophon, on the other hand, in agreement with the Cyrus cylinder, makes Cyrus the son of King Cambyses.

In concluding this note, which I fear is already too long, I would just say that it would appear not unnatural that a politic prince like Cyrus should, under the circumstances, associate with himself in the kingship of Babylon this Median King Cyaxares mentioned by Xenophon, and thus gratify the national pride of those of his subjects who were Medians. And although, in the absence of inscriptions dated in the reign of Cyaxares or Darius the Mede, with whom I would identify him, this cannot perhaps be proved, yet such a joint reign would seem not to be improbable. We know that towards the end of the reign of Cyrus his son Cambyses was associated with him in the kingdom ; and there are tablets in the British Museum, dated in the reign of Cambyses, as "King of Babylon," whilst his father, Cyrus, was at the same time "King of Countries."

ANDREW C. ROBINSON.

Short Notices.

Luther's Primary Works, together with his Shorter and Larger Catechisms. Translated into English, edited, with theological and historical essays, by HENRY WACE, D.D., Principal of King's College, London, and C. A. BUCHHEIM, Ph.D., Professor of the German Language and Literature in King's College, London. Hodder and Stoughton. Pp. 492.

EVERY student of Luther and lover of the Reformation ought to obtain this book, and to read it again and again. It places in the hands of Englishmen materials out of which to form for themselves a living and true portrait of the greatest of the uninspired servants of God. Now, for the first time, is it possible for Englishmen who do not know German to hear Luther himself. They need not henceforth ask for an interpreter. If they wish to understand his controversial spirit and method, let them read the three pamphlets on "Christian Liberty," on "The Babylonian Captivity of the Church," and that entitled "An Address to the German Nobility." If they wish to ascertain what Luther's theology was, when stated constructively, positively, and for all sorts of readers, then let them study his wonderful expositions of the Creed, the Commandments, and the Sacraments contained in the Catechisms greater and less. If, again, they desire to know what, in point of historical fact, were the beginnings of the Reformation, let them read the ninety-five theses which Luther composed and published in 1517. All these works are in this volume translated into good English, and illustrated by good notes. Dr. Wace and Dr. Buchheim have added an essay apiece, of great value, interest, and power. We cannot express our gratitude to them in terms sufficiently cordial for this timely and substantial service to the cause of sober and Biblical Protestantism. Will not the societies whose function it is to defend and promote Reformation principles spend a little money on putting the primary works of the greatest of the Reformers into the college libraries of England?

Bible Helps (*The Illustrated Bible Treasury*). Pp. 712. Nelson and Sons.

Dr. Wright, of the Bible Society, has brought out an admirable storehouse of Biblical learning, which is quite the best thing of its kind. There are three hundred and fifty illustrations, and nothing approaching to them in interest has yet been collected in a similar volume.

Among the contents are: Bible Study; Hints for Sunday-school Teachers; Our English Bible; Title of the Bible; Alphabets, Language and Text of the Old and the New Testament; Canon of the Old and the New Testament; Papers on History and Chronology, on Geography, on Science, Antiquities, and Bible Terms. The concluding section deals with the Apocrypha.

Among the contributors are Professors Bonney, Beecher, A. B. Davidson, Marcus Dods, J. D. Davies, Rendel Harris, McCurdy, Price, Ramsay, Riddle, Robertson, Sayce, George Adam Smith, and Warfield, Colonel Conder, R.E., Sir Charles Wilson, R.E., Canon Isaac Taylor, Canon Tristram, Dr. Gunther, and Dr. Wright.

Essay on Indifference in Matters of Religion. By the Abbé F. DE LAMENNAIS. Translated by LORD STANLEY OF ALDERLEY. Pp. 300. John MacQueen, Norfolk Street, Strand.

Lamennais was born in 1782, and died in 1854 in the debtors' prison at Ste. Pélagie, broken by the power of the Roman Church. He is one

of the most interesting figures in the history of French philosophy, not only for the work under review, but also for the "Paroles d'un Croyant," by which he protested against Roman authority, and by his vast synthesis, "Esquisse d'une Philosophie."

He is regarded as the founder of theological scepticism (or free inquiry) in the nineteenth century, and the progenitor of thinkers like Dean Mansel. Like Pascal, he borrows from Pyrrhonism, against the authority of our faculties. The errors of the senses, the errors of the reasoning faculties, the contradictions in human opinions—all this arsenal of scepticism is employed against human reason. After this destruction of all certitude, Lamennais attempts to re-establish what he has destroyed by reference to a new criterion—namely, universal consent. On this basis he seeks to establish the truth of (1) Deism, (2) Revelation, (3) Catholicism (*Ueberweg*).

Many of the arguments are strongly applicable to the state of religious opinion in England at the present time. Lord Stanley recommends chapter vii. in particular as an antidote to undenominational religious instruction, without an understanding as to what the Bible means.

Livy, Book XXII., Chapters i. to li. University Tutorial Series. By JOHN THOMPSON and F. G. PLAISTOWE. Pp. 128. Price 1s. 6d. W. B. Clive, Booksellers' Row, Strand.

An admirable specimen of a scholarly class edition. After the text (Weissenborn's) comes an Introduction, with a Life of Livy, Livy as a Historian, Livy's authorities for the Second Punic War, Foundation and Constitution of Carthage, History of Carthage before the Punic Wars, the First Punic War, and the Causes and Story of the Second Punic War. There is also a summary of Book XXII., and sixty pages of excellent notes.

How to Study Wild Flowers. Rev. GEORGE HENSLOW. Pp. 224. R.T.S.

Mr. Henslow is Examiner in Botany for the College of Preceptors, and has had an experience of forty years of the kind. His useful manual is based on the structural classification, and is illustrated by all the necessary diagrams. He desires to encourage accuracy in investigation, and the training of the young mind in systematic observation. Botany is a fascinating pursuit and study, and Mr. Henslow is an experienced and sympathetic guide. His studies are subject to the principle that science affords the strongest confirmation of the words: "God is not far from each one of us: for in Him we and all nature live and move and have our being"; "To all who will see, Earth is *crammed* with Heaven."

Princes Three and Seekers Seven. By MARA COLQUHOUN. Pp. 260. London: Elliot Stock.

Two pleasant sets of fairy tales. The first set follows the adventures of the hero of the familiar "White Cat" story, and of his two brothers, the Red and the Blue Prince. All the stories have a wholesome moral. Excursions into the realms of imagination are good for young people in these prosaic days.

Behind the Bow-Window. By K. M. FITZGERALD. Pp. 159. Price 1s. 6d. S.P.C.K.

This interesting and well-written story may be placed with advantage in any lending library, either in town or country.

The Basket of Flowers. Pp. 143. Price 1s. Sunday-School Union.

This little book needs no recommendation, having long ago established itself as a most popular story. Its reissue needs no apology; it is always sure of readers; and we have only to congratulate the publishers on its letterpress, illustrations, and cheapness.

The Child's Own Magazine. Pp. 144. Price 1s. 6d. Sunday-School Union.

This pretty little volume contains a serial story, a number of short stories, puzzles, and poetry, and the illustrations are numerous and charming. It is a delightful book for the little ones.

Grandmother Gwen. By the Author of "Earth's Many Voices." Pp. 109. Price 1s. S.P.C.K.

A story from the able pen of the author of "Earth's Many Voices" is always welcome; and this is a very pretty specimen, though perhaps it will be more appreciated by the inhabitants of Wales than by the majority of those of England.

A Thankful Heart. By Lady DUNBOYNE. Pp. 160. Price 1s. 6d. S.P.C.K.

This story is perhaps more suitable for girls in the schoolroom than for the parochial library; but its tone is healthy, its dialogue bright and natural, and it would make an acceptable Christmas or New Year's reward book. We regret to see that the S.P.C.K. has made no advance in the matter of illustrations this Christmas.

Dorice; or, Not all Gold that Glitters. By Mrs. SHOREY. Pp. 104. Price 1s. Stoneman.

A very good specimen of a temperance tale, not too violent in tone.

From that Lone Ark. By EDWARD N. HOARE. Pp. 376. S.P.C.K.

A stirring tale of sea-coast life, with a due admixture of villainy and virtue, character and incident, mistakes and reparation. The Ark is the sobriquet of the lonely house of the heroine's father on a headland.

A Clever Daughter. By Mrs. HENRY CLARKE, M.A. Pp. 160. Price 1s. 6d. Sunday-School Union.

A sensible story of the risks of priggishness and selfishness in our modern higher education of women, happily overcome by domestic experience and Christian principle.

A Little Lass and Lad. By SARAH TYTLER. Pp. 310. S.P.C.K.

Stories of village life are always interesting when written by those who understand it, on account of the freshness and unconventionality of their details. Miss Tytler understands rural characters, and unfolds them well, with just so much of misunderstanding and estrangement finally reconciled, by way of plot, as to give unity to the narrative.

MAGAZINES.

We have received the following (January) magazines:

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

The Month.

British-American Arbitration Treaty.

THE year 1896 opened with such a combination of events as seemed certain to involve Great Britain in serious warfare. There were political disturbances within, and grave dangers without. On all sides the outcry was raised against her, and rather increased as the months of spring passed. Every great nation seemed to take the occasion of fomenting a grievance, and she appeared to stand alone against the world. But, in the providence of God, the storm of opposing clamour slowly lessened as the progress of time and events softened the rancour, bringing the difficulties into clearer light, and so to more easy solution.

This new year of 1897 begins with an event which every lover of humanity will fain wish prophetic. On January 11 a treaty of arbitration between Great Britain and the United States was signed shortly after noon by Mr. Secretary Olney and by our Ambassador, Sir Julian Pauncefote. The essential parts of the treaty are that for five years from the date of ratification a Court of Arbitration, consisting of three members from the Judiciary of the United States and three from the Judiciary of the United Kingdom, nominated respectively by the President and Prime Minister of the contracting nations, shall have exclusive jurisdiction over differences between the two nations, no question involving national honour being submitted for arbitration. To avoid a tie-vote, King Oscar of Sweden has consented to act as final umpire either personally or by deputy.

When it is remembered that not twelve months ago the fever of war ran high in the veins of our Transatlantic kinsmen, and that certain European nations gazed with ill-suppressed glee, and even endeavoured to incite conflict by adding to our difficulties, too great thankfulness cannot be felt that aspirations for peace and expressions of goodwill begin to pass freely now from both sides. In America the feeling seems not only enthusiastic, but deep. The preservation of the pen used to sign the treaty, the inauguration of a peace carnival, the striking of gold and silver medals, the preparations for street processions and for oratory, are not, we believe, the meaningless exuberance of a fickle and excitement-loving people, but the expression of a noble sentiment which is permeating the national spirit, the effects of which will be felt for good during many years to come. And in our quieter English manner we welcome this treaty with the earnest desire that this occurrence, opening with happy auspices the Diamond Jubilee of her Majesty Queen Victoria, may be a bright precedent of still clearer understandings and more cordial contacts for mutual benefit and progress.

Elementary Teachers' Salaries.

An instructive lesson in figures has been given to the London School Board by the Strand Board of Works, which should prove of salutary value in more than one direction. Some severe things are said, as the following paragraph will show: "The London School Board has given a fictitious value to the services of the teachers in elementary schools. Ten thousand seven hundred and three teachers cost £1,210,000 per annum. Consider what this means. This number of teachers is made up of head-masters, head-mistresses, assistants, male and female, ex-pupil teachers and probationers; *i.e.*, taking into consideration all engaged in teaching, some of whom are only children, we have an average salary of £113 1s. 0½d. The report of the Committee of the Council on Education says: 'We

may mention with regard to the principal teachers in the Metropolitan district that in the past year the average salary of 355 masters in Voluntary schools was £154 15s. 5d., and that of 420 masters in Board schools was £290 os. 11d.; while 826 schoolmistresses in Board schools enjoyed an average income of £205 17s. 4d., as compared with £93 os. 7d., that of 778 teachers in Voluntary schools. The salaries of 7 masters in Voluntary schools and of 213 in Board schools amounted to £300 a year and upwards, while 3 schoolmistresses in Voluntary and 495 in Board schools had salaries of £200 and upwards.'"

The stricture that the London School Board, tested by results, is the most extravagant in the country, will appeal to different people differently. We do not wish anyone to be underpaid, but half a million of money in salaries is a rather conspicuous sum to lay as a charge of extravagance against a public body—so large, in fact, as to warrant at least the suspicion that there is something in the criticism.

The Old Catholics.

The Anglo-Continental Society has issued its forty-second report, containing a summary of the advance made by the Old Catholic movement on the Continent. The details given are full of real importance, for the movement manifests both life and growth. There are branches of the organization in France, Germany, Austria, Italy, Switzerland, Spain, Portugal, and Holland. The Old Catholics steadily continue to increase in numbers, in spite of Ultramontane predominance which manifests itself by constant unfriendliness, and frequently by formidable and open opposition. Vienna has been chosen as the locality for the International Old Catholic Congress, which will be held in the autumn of 1897.

Coming to particulars, it is gratifying to know that the French Old Catholic Congregation in Paris, over which the Archbishop of Utrecht holds jurisdiction, is making steady progress. In Germany the death of Bishop Reinkens brought to a point the important question of the future relation of his successor to the State. It remained to be seen whether the Prussian Government would continue to him the status of a Catholic Bishop, together with the grant of £2,400 a year for his support. Happily both privileges were confirmed, though the Centre Party in the German Parliament endeavoured to prevent the subsidy, in opposition to the Minister of Public Worship. The German Emperor himself sent his congratulations to Bishop Weber upon his election by no less than forty-three clergy and eighty-five lay representatives, making a total of one hundred and twenty-eight electors, as compared with the seventy-seven who elected Bishop Reinkens.

Austria has still no Old Catholic Bishop, but it is almost certain that the present diocesan administrator, Pfarrer Cech, will be chosen by the electors when the Austrian Government has given the necessary assent. In Italy the work progresses both in towns and villages. The village of S. Vito, with a population of 500, has almost entirely joined the reform movement. Count Campello still labours with signal success, but the extreme poverty of Italy prevents any rapid growth in the fund for an Italian Old Catholic bishopric. Bishop Hertzog holds a strong position in Switzerland. Bishop Cabrera finds the work in Spain growing sufficiently to warrant his holding an annual visitation. In Portugal there are five clergy, one lay reader, one licensed preacher, seven congregations, twelve schools, four schoolmasters, ten schoolmistresses, and 700 schoolchildren.

The report expresses deep regret at the deaths of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and of the Archbishop Nicephorus Kalogeras of Patras, the latter having especially helped forward the movement by most active assistance.

THE EARTHQUAKE AND THE BOG-SLIP.

The close of the old year in the British Isles was marked by the occurrence of two alarming and, happily, unusual phenomena. In the early morning of December 17 the western side of the island quivered with some tremendous vibration, which rapidly distributed itself throughout Wales and the Midlands as far as London. The disturbance was of the nature of an earthquake, and was possibly the last wave of a more serious seismic shock in Iceland, or beneath the earth's surface. The few moments of tremor were sufficient to cause widespread amazement, and even alarm. There was little real damage done, except at Hereford, where the cathedral was badly shaken, and the pinnacles of St. Nicholas' Church fell to the ground.

Again, in the dark morning hours of December 28, in the neighbourhood of Killarney, a great tract of marshy land, some 200 acres in extent, and said to be thirty feet deep in parts, called Boghaghanima, or "The Bog of the Mule," began to move rapidly down the valley, burying and sweeping away a farm and eight human beings in its course. The catastrophe seems to have been immediately caused by an unusually heavy rainfall, which swelled an underground stream, loosening the subsoil of the morass, and precipitating the whole into the river Flesk, whence it flowed into the Killarney Lakes. Arable land, crops and live stock, together with the salmon-fishing industry, have been much injured by the bog-slip. The countryside is the property of Lord Kenmare.

ST. MARTIN-IN-THE-FIELDS.

The Church of St. Martin-in-the-Fields from its history and position is prominent among City churches. The Vicar, the Rev. Prebendary Kitto, who is a candidate for the vacant proctorship in Convocation, in a ten years' retrospect which he has just issued, gives many interesting details of change and progress within that period. While the population has fallen from 12,000 to 9,000, the ratable value of the parish has increased from £450,000 to £540,000. The interior of the church itself has been much beautified, while all the records of Church work show indication of steady growth. For instance, the number of communicants has increased from 2,665 to 3,750; offertories have grown from £640 to £900 in the current year; while the numerous parochial organizations have a large and useful activity. Situated in such a notable part of London, the waves of English life, political and social, may be said to pass its doors, from the processions of emperors and princes, to the demonstration of the unemployed. Within the decade the parish has seen growing up within its bounds those magnificent galleries, libraries, halls, theatres, and hotels, so familiar to sight-seers.

BACCHYLIDES.

Egypt is still a treasure-heap for the manuscript-hunter. The fragile papyrus has yielded to the modern printed page in quite recent years works of Hyperides, Herodas and Aristotle, all of which are in the British Museum. Now a fourth Greek writer is exhumed from the dark of the ages. Bacchylides was a lyric poet, living in the first century B.C., a contemporary of Pindar, and held by ancient critics as not unworthy of a third place with Pindar and Simonides. The manuscript is beautifully written, and contains some twenty poems, many of them being absolutely complete. They are all lyric odes, celebrating the victories of the poet's patrons in the ancient games of Greece. The papyrus has been acquired by the British Museum.

SIR HENRY FOWLER'S ADMISSIONS.

Sir Henry Fowler, in a speech to his constituents, has made some important admissions with reference to Voluntary schools. He says :

"Voluntary schools, I admit, are part of our national system of education. I admit that those schools have been put to a very considerably increased cost in consequence of the raising of the standard of education. I am equally willing—and I do not think there was any responsible leader of the Opposition who did not express the same view in the House—we were equally willing that these schools should have additional relief in order to enable them to meet this additional expenditure." Sir Henry Fowler added that in his opinion all schools must be put on the same footing as regards help.

Islington Clerical Meeting.

We have never seen a larger attendance at this annual clerical conference, and papers and speeches throughout the day were generally weighty and instructive. The subject chosen was "The Mind of the Church of England on Certain Important Points as set forth in the Articles of Religion." This was divided into the following subsections: "The main purpose and general character of the Articles; the Rule of Faith; the Sacraments; the orders and discipline of the Church; the doctrines of sin and salvation.

A correspondence has passed between the Bishop of Chester and Cardinal Vaughan, in which both appear to think that the Government mean to redeem their pledges to denominational schools at the cheapest rate possible, and utter the warning that, if this is so, it may become necessary for friends of Voluntary schools to work for a political break-up in the interests of truth and justice.

More than three thousand preachers chose the subject of Peace as a leading topic in their sermons on December 20. It is a hopeful sign of the times that, while the Governments of Europe believe it necessary to be armed to the teeth, public opinion, leavened by Christianity, not infrequently expresses its serious abhorrence of any proposal to let slip the dogs of war.

The late Primate's personal estate was valued at £35,000, or little more than two years' official income.

Mr. Gladstone has entered his eighty-eighth year. He was a Member of Parliament five years before the Queen's accession.

Dr. Temple is now duly Archbishop of Canterbury. He preached at his last ordination service in St. Paul's Cathedral on December 20. He was confirmed in Bow Church on December 22, and on the following day attended a farewell service in St. Paul's, preaching a touching and appropriate sermon. After doing homage, he was enthroned on January 8 at Canterbury, in the presence of a large and representative congregation.

The Sultan, yielding to pressure from combined European representation, has at length issued a proclamation granting an amnesty to all Armenian convicts and prisoners. The *iradé* does not cover those sentenced to death for murder.

Gifts and Bequests.

An anonymous donor has presented, for the Lady Chapel of Salisbury Cathedral, two sanctuary candlesticks of black walnut, mounted in upwards of 300 ounces of pure silver.

The Misses Hume, of Lowestoft, have given, in memory of their brother, £2,300 for the building of a Missions to Seamen Church and Institute in that place.

£105 to the Curates' Augmentation Fund by the Mercers' Company.

£250 to the C.E.T.S. anonymously, "in commemoration of the first total abstinence Archbishop."

£9,000 to the Wakefield Diocesan Spiritual Aid Fund, and £9,000 to the Wakefield Diocesan Board of Education, under the will of the late Mr. Wheatley Balme.

Truro Cathedral.

Churchmen in the West are making strenuous efforts to complete the building scheme of Truro Cathedral. Up to the present time £115,507 has been expended; and according to the estimate of the architect, Mr. J. L. Pearson, R.A., a further sum of £71,000 will be necessary to complete the scheme, of which £10,000 will be needed for the central tower and spire. Lord Robartes has promised £2,000, spread over three years, and the Bishop £1,000 in five yearly instalments. Lord Mount Edgcumbe has given £1,000 for the cathedral, and £1,000 for the Clergy Sustentation Fund. It is hoped that it will soon be possible to begin building.

Blue Book on Education.

The Committee of Council on Education has now issued its annual Blue Book. Some of the figures and facts are of special value at the present time. We mention a few of the larger results. The total number of children on the books in England and Wales is 5,299,469, or slightly under one in five of the population. This is an increase of 100,728 over the previous year. A very healthy sign is manifested by the fact that the average attendance has gone up by nearly 100,000, being now 4,325,000. The number of children taught in Voluntary as compared with Board Schools is shown by the following table:

Church of England	1,850,545
Roman Catholic	235,392
British Schools	235,151
Wesleyan	129,724
	2,450,812
Board Schools	1,879,218
Excess in Voluntary Schools ...	571,594

Coming to expenditure, the total cost of maintenance for the year 1895 was £9,670,090. This shows an increase of 5·71 per cent. over the sum for 1894. The most remarkable increase is that under the head of salaries, which is £393,542 in a total of £7,389,437. On miscellaneous expenses £1,675,800 were consumed, and £604,853 on books and apparatus. The sources of revenue to meet this expenditure were as follows:

Parliamentary grant	£4,081,280
Rates	1,942,716
Voluntary contributions	826,421

It is interesting to note the cost per scholar in average attendance in the various schools at the present time:

	s.	d.
Board Schools	19	5
British Schools	18	8½
Church Schools	18	5¾
Wesleyan Schools	18	3
Roman Catholic Schools	18	1½

Many important points will be raised from the current Blue Book. But perhaps the most noteworthy features are the increasing costliness of elementary education and the wide area and effective results reached by voluntary schools with such comparatively limited resources.

UNITY AND UNIFORMITY.

MAN'S IDEAL OF UNITY IS UNIFORMITY—

"ONE FOLD."

John x. 16 (*A.V.*).

OUR LORD'S IDEAL OF UNIFORMITY IS UNITY—

"ONE FLOCK."

John x. 16 (*R.V.*).

Obituary.

DECEMBER 16, at Bovey Tracey Vicarage, the Right Reverend G. W. H. KNIGHT-BRUCE, D.D., Suffragan Bishop of Exeter Diocese. Dr. Knight-Bruce was Bishop of Bloemfontein from 1886-94, and then became Bishop of Mashonaland, resigning in the next year through ill-health. He leaves a widow and four young children.

Canon W. HENDERSON, D.D., Principal of the Montreal Diocesan Theological College since 1878, to which work he had devoted the best years of his life with much appreciation and success.

Rev. HUBERT ASHTON HOLDEN, LL.D., Litt.D., a distinguished classical scholar, whose best-known work, "Foliorum Silvula," has gone through some twelve editions.

THE LATE BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S.

The Right Reverend BASIL JONES, D.D., Lord Bishop of St. David's, died at Abergwili Palace on January 14 of heart disease, from which he had long suffered. Born in 1822, he was educated at Shrewsbury and Trinity College, Oxford, and gained the Ireland University Scholarship in 1842, and a second class in Lit. Hum. two years later. On becoming Michell Fellow of Queen's College, he began a lifelong friendship with the late Archbishop Thomson. Afterwards he accepted a Fellowship at University College, and became subsequently an examining chaplain to Dr. Thomson at York, Vicar of Haxby, of Bishopthorpe, Archdeacon of York in 1867, and Chancellor of the Diocese in 1871. Three years after, on the resignation of Bishop Thirlwall, he was recommended to the Queen by Mr. Gladstone as Bishop of St. David's. During his episcopate he has dealt with the problems of his difficult and scattered diocese with singular wisdom, moderation, shrewdness, and success. The charge of absentee clergy, once justly urged, is now no longer heard. Amid the fierce disputes concerning the School Boards, the Burials Bill, Tithes, and Disestablishment, he has maintained a temperate and wise position. He did much for Lampeter and Brecon Colleges. In his Oxford days he published much excellent classical work. The Bishop was twice married, and leaves a son and two daughters, quite young children.