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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN

OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

VOL. XIV.

NEW SERIES

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1900

PREFACE.

THE possibilities before the English Church are at the present time so great that we are apt to be impatient of any influences, especially internal, which seem to hinder their realization. The tendencies which would take away the value of Holy Scripture, the obviously necessary basis of all Christianity, by discrediting its supernatural character and guidance; the tendencies which would depreciate the wonderful awakening of the sixteenth century, and annul the teaching which the Church has been receiving from that momentous epoch; the tendencies which would seize a more modern tradition, however excellent, and exalt it into a standard of faith and practice, instead of diligently consulting the earliest times and writers; the tendencies which would deny to Church institutions the principle of growth and adaptation which governs all forms of vigorous life; the tendencies which would confine the leaven of Christianity more or less to theological teaching and charitable work, and shut out its vitalizing forces from social movements and aspirations; all these are obstacles to the fuller and more healthy influence of the faith of Christ upon our times which distress and perplex our minds. But progress in all things, if it is to be sure, is necessarily slow; and the more these matters are discussed in a temperate and dispassionate spirit, the more certain we may be of truth prevailing in the end. It may not be in our own time, and our own contributions towards the result may be small; but if we exercise ourselves in the spirit of patience, forbearance, reasonableness, sincerity, candour, and freedom from prejudice and party spirit, if instead either of rashly meddling, or of folding our hands and waiting on Providence, we each do our duty firmly and fearlessly in all that sphere which is distinctly our own, we may be confident that we are, under God, performing our part in producing that happier state of things for which we are all looking.

The last year of the nineteenth century is now drawing to

a close. It has been a time of national sorrow and struggle, brightened by hope for peace and prosperity in the future. There are hopeful symptoms also for the English Church. The long patience of the Bishops with conscientious men whom a protracted period of unrestrained liberty of development in a direction contrary to English authority has at length landed in a difficult, if not an impossible position, seems to be meeting its reward in a greater spirit of compliance. The more militant members of the section which interprets Catholicism mainly by Romanism, are confronted with a serious protest from some of the ablest and most learned of their colleagues. The Bishop of London's powerful charge was received with respectful attention. The movement for direct lay representation in the councils of the Mother Church, adopted by so many of the Colonial Daughter Churches, has made some, if indefinite, progress. The political outlook for the Church, a relatively minor matter, is free from danger. The extreme poverty of the clergy is in the way of being to some extent mitigated by special funds. The great mass of the clergy themselves, especially in the towns, undisturbed by the thunderous clouds of party controversy, are devoting themselves to their duties, not only theological and ecclesiastical, but also in the educational, moral, and social spheres, with a zeal and self-sacrifice that is beyond all praise. The country itself has shown a spirit of unanimity, generosity, and sympathy for the admirable qualities of her soldiers which has largely tended to quell for the time ecclesiastical strife.

Under these circumstances, the conductors of such a review as the CHURCHMAN, devoted as it is to the dispassionate and accurate discussion of questions theological, religious, moral, social and literary in the light of Catholic Christianity as given by Holy Scripture, the Primitive Church, and the Reformation, venture to believe that their labours and aims have not been useless in the past, and that there is increasing scope for them in the future. They invite the co-operation of all who are interested in these momentous matters from the same point of view. They ask their friends and supporters to make the scheme of the Review more widely known. And they ask also their prayers that the blessing and guidance of the Almighty may guide and prosper all their efforts for the understanding and reception of His Kingdom among men.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

THE

CHURCHMAN

OCTOBER, 1899.

ART. I.—ON THE RESUMPTION OF DIOCESAN SYNODS.

AS every so-called "crisis in the Church" matures and develops, one is repeatedly impressed with the impotency of the great bulk of the clergy to make their influence felt, or even their voice heard. The exactly opposite conditions prevailing in the Scottish National Establishment prevent any "crisis" from being either reached or declared there. Its organization, given a presbyterian basis, is unimpeachably perfect for its purpose. That is what makes that body practically unassailable by the civil power. No legislation touching the externals of its worship, the punishment of its "criminous clerks," or the constitution of its courts, is ever even mooted in the British Parliament. Aggressions which would lash the calm and serious population into frenzy if attempted there, may be deliberately perpetrated any Session in England, and regarded as a matter of course.

Why, then, is that great body of our clergy which is ever in closest touch with the popular masses, and is so largely credited individually with parochial powers, collectively so impotent that you may search history in vain for a parallel? The Lower House of each Convocation is supposed to embody their *placita;* but each is formulated on a basis derived from property in benefices, and derived from a time when the clergy voted separately their own taxes. Thus each remains antiquated. In the York Province some reforms under Archbishop Longley modified this, but insufficiently for modern requirements. But even given the large measure of reform which would make these bodies effectively representative, such reform would be inefficient without a vigorous machinery to mature, formulate, and maintain at an adequate

pressure an adequate volume of clerical opinion behind the reformed Convocations. These latter cannot represent more than exists, viz., clerical opinion in the nebulous, inert, and unconcentrated state merely. And until Bishops and clergy resume their oldest collective function, that of meeting to deliberate on all Church questions in their Diocesan Synods, in that it will remain. The analogue of this, which we have *not*, is exactly what the Scotch have in their so-called Provincial Synods. It is the (with us) missing link of vitalizing connection which should ensure the due circulation of opinion until it gathers head. Thus the English organization stands a perfect model of "how not to do it." For what have we? A series of ruri-decanal Chapters, each a small arc, as it were, or segment, of a wheel; but all detached, all in perfect severance each from other. Far in the distance lies, remote and again unconnected with these, the central body, the Convocation itself. Of course, the clergy proctors—suppose two for the archdeaconry—will have seats in some two out of the dozen or the score or more of these segmentary Chapters which the archdeaconry contains. But there is no collective body in which the clergy proctors of the diocese meet either each other or their representatives. The body in which they *should* meet is the Diocesan Synod, in which every priest and deacon, too, of the diocese has his place and voice. There they would keep touch of each other all round; and all, through the proctors, with the Lower House of Convocation; and through their Bishop with the Upper House. The Synod would supply that sustained connection, for lack of which our spiritual organization is exactly what a wheel would be without the spokes. The primary ruri-decanal fragments never coalesce. Their wisdom or unwisdom begins and ends for each in itself. It contributes nothing to the deliberations of the ultimate body. Each spends itself like a desert rivulet trickling away and lost in the sands, and never becoming an affluent to reinforce the great stream of opinion; while the consciousness of this inconsequential result reacts on the primary fragment, and also on the ultimate body. The former feel that whatever they think, say, or vote, has no determinative influence. The latter feels itself "up in the air," bereft of the solid backing which alone could give weight to its resolutions; and its own *gravamina* and *reformanda* are barely more than academic echoes. And this will surely remain, in spite of all other reforms of old machinery or tinkering of it by new, so long as this *gravamen gravaminum*, the suppression, viz., of the *vox cleri* in its oldest organ of expression, remains unredressed.

I say "its oldest," because the diocese is ever the initial unit of the whole Church. Out of it by division and sub-

division springs the parish, and by coalition the province and the exarchate. The primary idea of an organized spiritualty lies in the Bishop and clergy. The Bishop in Synod is thus the maximum of authority competent to it. When the lay voice has due weight in the selection and institution of each of these, then they become its organized representatives. The lay voice has wholly lost that due weight. It is confiscated and usurped by the intrusion of the Crown above and of patrons below. To recover that due weight, and restore a system in which the laity were consciously represented by Bishop and clergy, would require a revolution upheaving and displacing the usage of some twelve centuries. But this by the way only. The voice of the Bishop and clergy, the Church's oldest organ, remains, save in some two or three dioceses of each province, under the gag, by a mutual consent of Bishop and clergy to shirk their oldest duty. The resumption of this is the one Church reform which is absolutely within the competency of those whose functions it concerns. It would pave the way to, and keep an open door for, all others. No consent of Crown, Parliament, or Privy Council, is needed to effect it. Whereas there is not an item in the programme of the Church Reform League which is not liable to be thwarted by one or more of these embodiments of the secular state. That, I suppose, is the reason why that League and its leaders give this initial point of all Church reform a back place. Surely common-sense would suggest, "Do *first* what you can do for yourselves. See how far the inherent powers, *which you neglect*, will carry you; and then, and not before, you will have earned a title to be heard in your appeal for help from without." Instead of this, the *pièce de résistance* of the reformists is to formulate some co-operative organization of the laity. That may well come in its own place and time, when the clergy have recognized and resumed their own duties *first*. What the clergy who support the League are now doing is really to shirk their own oldest function, and to seek to devolve on the laity that duty, or a part of it, which is really theirs—that, viz., of forming a deliberative organ for the benefit of the whole Church. They are, from the worldly standpoint, "putting in the shot before the powder," a blunder sure to entail grievous consequences; from the spiritual, they are evading the primary function of that "office and work of a priest in the Church of God" to which they stand solemnly pledged, and to which they professed to have been called by the Holy Ghost.

Place the office of Bishop above presbyter as high as you will, you cannot place it higher than that of Apostle above presbyter; and we see from Acts xv. and xvi. 4 that the

relations of these last were based upon joint deliberation, and were embodied in a decree running in their joint names, and claiming the guidance of the Holy Ghost. What the Bishops practically now claim is the monarchical episcopate of the Middle Ages, excluding the clergy of the other orders from their share and voice in diocesan administration. That monarchical episcopate is the outcome of all the absolutisms which have darkened history—the Cæsarism of ancient Rome and the Papacy of mediæval, the Byzantinism of the East, the Norman tyranny and the Tudor prerogative among ourselves. All these have contributed to stilting up our Anglican Bishops into that "prelacy" which provoked the earliest reaction of the Puritans and issued in the Presbyterian secession. If that first wave of the deluge of separatists had been stayed, who can tell how much of the torrent which succeeded might have been spared? The fact was that our Reformation took over the three orders of ministry as it found them, and did nothing to readjust their relations *inter se*. The difficulties of the Elizabethan situation were enormous; but the result shows that an opportunity was missed. The Bishops *would* not convoke their Synods and throw themselves upon the support of their clergy. If they had done so, the turbulent minority would have given, no doubt, some trouble at the moment; but the freedom of open debate in every diocese would soon have shown their insignificance, and the weight of reason and moderation would have been on the side of order and authority. As it was, the Bishops preferred a policy of *sic volo sic jubeo*, became themselves the puppets of prerogative, and administered the Church through the Court of High Commission. Thence followed by consequence the overthrow of Crown and Altar together. Then the Restoration and the dregs of the Stuart dynasty led on to the Revolution of 1689; and in less than a generation from this latter date the Convocations ceased to sit for nearly a century and a half! It is doubtful whether it would have been possible to thus suppress the spiritualty, if Diocesan Synods had formed a norm of Church administration everywhere. To that suppression is mainly to be ascribed the last grand schism of the Wesleyans. But I suggest that that suppression itself was a corollary of the disuse of the Diocesan Synod; and that, if the revival of Convocational sessions had been followed at once, as it should have been, by the resumption of those Synods, we should have been spared the worst entanglements of the last half-century, and have seen the Convocations themselves reformed long ago.

Can anyone imagine Timothy or Titus discharging the duties entrusted to them by St. Paul, by holding a "Visitation" of the clergy of Asia or Crete, in which each of them

a solitary spokesman, addressed a silent assembly of presbyters —a chorus, as it were, of *personæ mutæ?* Will anyone produce a single instance which seems to favour the idea of a Bishop-choregus of silence?—the attitude best described by the words, from the "Rejected Addresses,"

> "I am a blessed Glendoveer;
> 'Tis mine to speak, and yours to hear."

Look through the Apostolic, sub-Apostolic, post-Apostolic, and later ages, until we reach the dislocation of all institutions which followed the break-up of the Western Empire; the attestation is everywhere the same. Our monarchical episcopate dates from this latter period of convulsion and confusion. At such periods only the stronger elements survive. The weaker ones are absorbed into them, or else perish and drift away in wreckage. That period yielded the prototype of the "blessed Glendoveer" in lawn sleeves, as we know him. He prevails to this day, in spite of all the evidence of the New Testament being dead against him; and that in a Church which yet professes before all things to ground itself on the teaching and examples of the New Testament and the purest ages. I beg to repeat on this behalf the challenge[1] of Bishop Jewel to the Romanists, the terms of which are too well known for me to need to repeat them here. Take the well-known declaration of St. Cyprian, that he had made it his rule "to do nothing *sine consilio vestro* [sc., *presbyterorum*] *et sine consensu plebis.*" I have seen the words quoted again and again recently in favour of some formulation of the lay voice in Church Councils, but never once as proving the status of the presbyterate, as forming the standing council of the Bishop. Take, again, what is a virtual echo of Cyprian's words, from the Fourth Council of Carthage: "*Irrita erit sententia episcopi nisi clericorum præsentia confirmetur*" (Can. xxii.). Or go back to St. Paul's words to Timothy (1 Tim. iii. 13): "They that have served a good diaconate win for themselves a higher grade [*i.e.*, the presbyterate] and great boldness [παῤῥησίαν] in the faith," etc. I draw attention to the Greek word: it means "freedom of speech." If accorded on matters of "the faith," how is it possible to exclude it from matters of discipline and ritual? Yet our Bishops *act as if* they believed that it rests, by some Divine right, solely with them to decide whether the clergy are to be consulted at all, and if so, when. They cannot really believe this. The men who reject the Papacy as an unjustifiable absolutism cannot, I say, really believe that a secondary

[1] The proofs on which I rest will be found given in a pamphlet, "Excommunication of the Clergy," etc., published by Messrs. Parker and Co., Oxford and London, 1883.

absolutism has been accorded to *them*, so as to extinguish the παῤῥησίαν aforesaid, and treat St. Paul's words as an open question. If they search the Scriptures, they will find that the Divine right lies on the other side. Those pastoral Epistles, from one of which this is quoted, abound with evidence that free discussion was the rule as between Timothy and his subordinate clergy. What else the purport of the numerous cautions against unwise logomachy? Yet in spite of this, our modern prelates treat the clergy, by the hundred and by the thousand, as men whose "mouths must be stopped," called to listen in silence to the utterances of superior wisdom. It is unhappily impossible to vindicate the nearly effaced rights of the presbytery without seeming to fling stones at the higher order. Of course, they share the blame of suppressing the Synod with the clergy who acquiesce in the suppression; but I am inclined to ascribe the greater sin to the clergy, who contentedly ignore the primary function of their sacred office. It is for them to demand their rightful share in Church government, of which share the Synod is the oldest embodiment. They are asking for no favour, starting no novelty, uttering no party "shibboleth." The plea is for a restoration of the oldest Catholic landmark of their order, and the restitution of rights more ancient than the New Testament itself in its collected form, which hang fixed on firm nails of precedent through all the ages down to the close, or nearly so, of the Middle Ages. The plea is for resuming a dropped branch of the Reformation itself. In the report of successive Royal Commissions under Henry VIII. and Edward VI., known as the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, sections 19 to 23 are devoted to directions for holding Diocesan Synods. That report sleeps deep in the dust of three centuries, and with it lie buried the constitutional rights of the spiritualty. But there is no one document which exhibits the animus of our Reformers so completely in regard to all points of administration. It was meant to be the governing code of the whole period since, subject, of course, to amendment all along. It was intended as a barrier against the encroachments of prerogative; therefore Tudor prerogative shelved and shunted it off the line of progress. It would have been as effective against Parliamentary absolutism now as against royal absolutism then. And it is owing to the suppression of all the guarantees which, had it become law, it would have maintained, that we are what we are—a Church without a code of her own, and hardly knowing where to pick the law which regulates her from the mass of antiquated canons and intrusive statutes. It contained elements, the loss of which we feel to this day in a lowered vitality and a reduced activity

of the whole spiritual estate; but no single item of that total loss is more deplorable than that of the continuous provision for the Diocesan Synod as a working institution. For lack of this, we have lost view of a primary principle which should govern all the relations of the clergy to nation, Crown, or Parliament, viz., that *their own consent is a pre-requisite to all Church legislation which is to bind them.* No prerogative of crosier or mitre rests on such clear and absolute grounds, alike of Divine appointment and natural equity, as that of the clerical body in every diocese to have a voice and a vote on all that concerns the duties of their office. This is a right before and above all canons, and out of this all canons rise and on this depend for their validity. I gravely doubt whether a Bishop, who suppresses that right, but more especially who refuses that concession when demanded by his clergy, has any claim on their canonical obedience. So far as in him lies that Bishop is maintaining the subversion and prostration of that which it is his duty to uphold; he is treating the imprescriptible rights of the presbyterate precisely as the Roman Curia has for centuries treated the rights of the episcopate. I hope this is plain speaking; and I claim the right to use it as part of that παῤῥησία which we inherit from the teaching of St. Paul. Among his most solemn valedictory words to the Ephesian presbyters at Miletus (Acts xx. 28) was the reminder that "the Holy Ghost had made them overseers" (ἐπισκόπους, which the Revised Version rightly renders "bishops"). And if "the gifts and the call of God are ἀμεταμέλητα (Rom. xi. 29), the same call of the Holy Ghost and the same qualifying gifts are ours at this day as then were theirs. When the same Apostle set Timothy over these same presbyters, he was set to superintend and guide their use of those gifts, not to thwart, or extinguish, or suspend their exercise. This last would be a "quenching of the Spirit" in His own chosen vessels. The power conferred on Timothy could not be greater than the Apostle's own, which he himself declares as "given to edification and not to destruction" (2 Cor. xiii. 10). The early Church harmonized these powers by the machinery of a Synod, with the Bishop (in the later individual sense) as its president. And this was so completely the accepted norm, that in a vacancy of that presidency the Synod administered the diocese until it was filled. The primary unit of all Church government being thus the diocese, and its primary governing organ being the Synod, any scheme of Church government which fails to include the free voice of the clergy in such Synod is inconsistent with every principle and precedent which the New Testament, followed by the sub-Apostolic and all the purer ages, has bequeathed to us. It was no novel rule of

action which Cyprian laid down, and which the contemporary Canon of Carthage (as cited above) embodied, but the genuine voice of the Church from the beginning. Why is that voice silenced now?

Is not Church history, and that of our Church in particular, full of testimony to the weight of the presbyteral voice on all questions affecting and directing Church life? There is no such monumental name since the Reformation as that of Richard Hooker, whose vast repertory of argument is neither antiquated nor exhausted. In the eighteenth century the most influential leaders of religious thought were William Law, author of the "Serious Call," and John Wesley. At its close, the Evangelical school of thought was led by Venn, Romaine, Cecil, Simeon, and their associates, of whom not one rose to the mitre. The chiefs of the Oxford Movement, Froude, Keble, Newman, Pusey, and their later exponents—Liddon and Dean Church—were all similarly below the line of high preferment. Go back before the Reformation, and the pioneer name of Wicliff stands out self-luminous. What a mass of useful influence made useless, let run to waste, or stagnating in holes and corners, throughout the order to which they all belonged, do these names suggest! What a reserve of forces never mobilized, and what fountains of counsel choked up by stony silence! The most deplorable fact is that, because they never meet, therefore no voice of warning and exhortation from among their own ranks can reach the clergy collectively; and the more they need rousing to the due sense of their primary duty, left in the abeyance of neglect for centuries (and more so since the Reformation even than before), the more impossible it becomes to rouse them. Each man lives with his head hid in the parochial hole, and drawn out once a year to croak for an afternoon in the ruri-decanal puddle. The governing organ is a loquacious oligarchy of Bishops, each heading (*exceptis excipiendis*) a democracy of dummies, whom he summons triennially to sit silent at his feet. This is what the πολλὴ παῤῥησία of the Apostolic presbytery has drifted into.

Here is a vital function suppressed, a primary organ congested—why waste remedies on the surface or the extremities? Restore its action, and that will, as the frame recovers tone, restore the rest. By the resumption of synodical action the Bishops themselves, in the first place, would be the greatest gainers. They would substitute a volumed weight of voice for an isolated utterance; they would substitute the maximum of authority competent to a diocese for a showy autocracy which veils an inherent weakness; they would wield the pastoral staff of Polycarp, of Irenæus, of Cyprian and Cornelius,

instead of holding out to their clergy the iron hand of the House of Commons in the velvet glove of the House of Lords.

How long will they prefer to go on engrossing the functions of organic unity? Do they not know that the laws of vertebration are against the assumption? Why sink back into a structure of the cephalopod or the jelly-fish type, when the Church has given us a nobler organism—the central column in the Bishop, with the lateral processes in the attached clergy, all sustaining and enfolding the pulmonary and circulatory structures on which life depends—the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and the ceaseless beat of the untiring heart of love, while the Head above is Christ Himself? To this the faithful laity attach themselves as the members and extremities, in a frame "fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth." For it is a mistake to suppose that the Synod involves the exclusion of the lay voice; indeed, its most complete norm, as shown in the pamphlet referred to in the note above, expressly provides for their inclusion, *deinde introducantur laici*, etc. I suppose, if any of the great early Bishops named could revisit the Church Militant, and measure this its Anglican branch by his own experience in the flesh, he would be astonished at finding Bishops everywhere, but their Synods hardly anywhere; the heads lively enough, but the rest a mere heap of *disjectæ membra Synaxis*, the great majority torpid, the rest quivering in convulsions. He might admonish us thus: "My brethren, all Church history since my time on earth shows no such spectacle as you exhibit, that of some twenty thousand presbyters deemed individually so worthy of trust as you, and yet collectively so impotent and helpless—for why? You have let go your oldest right and duty. You are a presbytery first—*τὸ πρεσβυτέριον* of the blessed Paul—and parish priests afterwards. The Synod is your normal state—no mere confluence of units before distinct, but the original expression of that unity of the body which is its essence. Solidarity, not dispersion, is the ideal of your office. The accident of local distribution has, in your conception of it, destroyed the essential idea. You act as if the second part of your commission had swallowed up the first; as if the 'preaching the Word and ministering . . . in the congregation' appointed to you were everything, and 'the office and work of priest in the Church of God,' beyond this, were nil." And in this your Bishops, our much-mistaken successors, uphold and encourage you, thereby weakening their own authority, which in their Synods should find its amplest expression."

By his isolation the Bishop, who should be the keystone of an arch, not a monolith erected on a pavement, weakens the

whole Church fabric which he should support. But there is a deeper source of weakness even than this in our modern episcopate. The Bishop is, in the eye of the world, the tool of the civil power. We all know of the Apostolic succession and Bishop Stubbs' genuine pedigree; but there comes in the bend-sinister of the ballot-box origin of our modern prelate. He is chosen and placed by the Prime Minister, who fluctuates with the popular majority, which depends on "the swing of the pendulum" at over six hundred polling centres. That is the grim fact which, in this sham-loving generation, nobody cares to enounce. I use my πολλῇ παῤῥησίᾳ to call attention to it. There is in the choice and posting of the prelate a conspicuous absence of every spiritual element whatever; nay, an ostentatious mockery of contempt waits, as we know, on every attempt to give the spiritual voice even a checking power *ex post facto*. This is the stupendous fact, in this day of "freedom of conscience" elsewhere all round, which gives the Pope and his satellites in England the weight of influence which they wield. The one thing which, under these circumstances, would strengthen episcopal authority at its weakest point would be for every Bishop to throw himself fully on all those Apostolic elements of spiritual life which the Synod includes, and gather them into his pastoral staff; to take his clergy frankly and fairly into partnership in the diocesan administration, and invite their united counsels for the good of the Church. This would go a long way to convert him, from a stepfather imposed by fiat of the civil power, into a spiritual Father in God; and would breathe into a diocese, where the Synod with full παῤῥησίᾳ of all members met yearly or half-yearly, the vigour of the renewed youth of the Church, the restored model of the Apostolic age.

Yet, further, if the comparatively few men now alleged as "troubling Israel" had to meet with equal frequency the full court of opinion amongst their brethren, they would *toties quoties* be virtually on trial before their peers for any eccentricities of preaching or practice laid to their charge. With such an institution flourishing in its vigour in every diocese, it would be next door to impossible that our present chapter of troubles could ever have arisen. Idle novelties would have been nipped in the bud by the wholesome frost of the sober-minded majority of moderation; or, so far as they have reason—and who shall say that, with our antiquated standards of rubric and canon, they are *all* mere unreason?—they would be winnowed, sifted, and recognized as wholesome. As it is, innovators have, at any rate, a *primâ-facie* case, against which episcopal autocracy shows a weak side. The secession of the more impatient and impulsive of our brethren is followed

by the growth of party spirit among those that remain. Men hoist the flag of faction and exchange shots in the columns of a newspaper, who might, within the Church's council-chamber, heal their differences in the balm of brotherhood. The individual of decided but one-sided views might derive from the voice of brethren in Synod that element of balance and temper of which he is now unjustly and mischievously deprived. For lack of this, men think their own thoughts apart, start on solitary or centrifugal orbits, and conceive antipathies and alienations, until, in proportion to their power of original thought, they become either party leaders or isolated and perhaps recalcitrant units.

Men who dislike being recalled to a forgotten standard of primary duty are always fertile in "practical difficulties." Strange indeed it would be if, where you have to dig out entire masses of men from the frozen ruts of centuries of prejudice and oblivion, there were not practical difficulties in the way. But some nine hundred clergy could meet under Bishop Borromeo of Milan for eleven or more years successively in the seventeenth century. How can such a thing, with our improved locomotion, raise any difficulty worth naming in England at this end of the nineteenth? Besides, the thing is done in Scotland before our eyes. There analogous institutions have prevailed for two centuries at least. Of course, if a diocese becomes so unwieldy, or in parts so congested, as to make gatherings difficult, that is a reason at once for dividing it, but none at all for depriving its presbytery of their rights. The same sort of argument, which would be scouted with contempt, if applied to the suppression of any civil franchise, is by some thought good enough for denying the clergy their primary right, older by centuries than the earliest germ of the rights of Englishmen as such.

HENRY HAYMAN, D.D.

ART. II.—JAMES BONNELL.

THE Bishop of Salisbury in his book on the Holy Communion (*note*, p. 184) refers to an inhabitant of the city of Dublin at the close of the seventeenth century as "that excellent Irish Churchman." The individual thus spoken of was James Bonnell, Accountant-General of Ireland from 1684 to 1699, a name we suspect that few will recognise at the present day. James Bonnell, however, merits the high eulogium he has received at the hands of Dr. Wordsworth. We propose in this paper to give some account of his life and

the times he lived in, and revive the memory of one who in his day was remarkable for his piety and universal benevolence. Fortunately, a sketch of Bonnell's life was furnished a few years after his death by his friend William Hamilton, Archdeacon of Armagh. A third edition appeared in 1707, and the book was republished in later times.[1] The original edition bore the imprimatur of no less than three of the Irish Bishops who united in their expression of admiration and regard for the character of their deceased friend.

James Bonnell, like so many other deeply religious men who found their home in these countries in the seventeenth century, was a Protestant of foreign extraction. His ancestors lived in the Low Countries, from whence they fled at the outbreak of the Duke of Alva's dragonnades. Probably the name was originally Bonneille, as we find a David Bonneille in Norwich, "the son of an alien and merchant." A Thomas Bonnell fled from Holland at the close of the sixteenth century, and settled at Norwich, and became Mayor of the city. His life was published by Curl, the famous London bookseller satirized by Pope. His grandson, Samuel Bonnell, was a successful merchant doing business in Italy. He lived at Genoa where his son James was born in 1653. Samuel Bonnell amassed a considerable fortune, which was all expended on behalf of the Royalist cause.

When the Stuart dynasty was restored, Samuel Bonnell returned to England, and in recognition of his services received the lucrative post of Accountant-General in Ireland, with right of succession for his son.[2]

To this office James Bonnell succeeded on the death of his father and while still a minor. For many years the duties were discharged by deputies. Bonnell's early education was carefully looked after by his mother, who was a daughter of Thomas Sayer, also of Norwich. Having learned the rudiments in Dublin, he was sent in the first instance to the Grammar School of Trim, then under the care of Dr. Tenison, afterwards Bishop of Meath. Tenison took note of the strong religious tendencies of the boy, and afterwards spoke of "the sweetness of his humour" and "the good-nature of his disposition." His constant companion in these early school-days was an old-fashioned handbook of personal religion known as "The Practice of Piety," which he read every morning. While at Trim School he received his first Communion. When fourteen years of age young Bonnell was sent to a private

[1] An edition was published by Joseph Masters, Aldersgate Street in 1852.

[2] "Liber Munerum Hibernicorum," part ii., p. 137.

"philosophical" school at Nettlebed, Oxfordshire, kept by a Mr. Cole, who had formerly been Principal of St. Mary's Hall, Oxford. The purpose of his friends in sending him there was that he might escape the temptations incident to a large public school. Unfortunately this object was defeated, and Mr. Cole's school was found to be a nursery of vice. In later years Bonnell would say, "I cannot with comfort reflect upon the time spent in that place; in it were all the dangers and vices of the University without the advantages." By God's goodness he was preserved from falling into the evil practices he saw around him, and kept his innocency. Mr. Cole himself was not a bad man, but he failed to maintain discipline in his school. A few years later Bonnell was entered on the books of St. Catherine's College, Cambridge, where he had as tutor the famous Dr. Calamy, the strong Puritan divine, who afterwards took a prominent part in assisting the Restoration. At Cambridge Bonnell persued a strictly religious life, observing all the fasts and holy-days of the Church, and preparing himself with great diligence for his Communions. On holy-days, he tells us, "if the weather were fair and calm, I would usually spend them in the fields, if otherwise in some empty chamber in the college; in the absence of my chamber-fellow in my own chamber, or in my study if he were there; but not so as to give him or any else the least suspicion of this practice all the time I was there." His secular studies were also pursued with great zeal, and he became a well-read scholar, especially versed in Hebrew and Greek and the French language. Later in life he commenced a translation of the works of Synesius. Having completed his University education, Bonnell became tutor in the family of Mr. Ralph Freeman, of Aspenden Hall, Hertfordshire. In the year 1678 he travelled with his pupil into Holland, and stayed for nearly a year at Nimeguen, after which time he returned to England. In 1684 he visited France, and at Lyons nursed his former pupil in a dangerous attack of small-pox. His influence over Mr. Freeman was entirely for good, and kept him, as he confesses "from running into many mischiefs he should hardly otherwise have avoided."

In his early years Bonnell had a delicate constitution, and many of the reflections created by his state of health are given by his biographer. His intense devotion led him to the prayer that the Divine grace "might be in his heart and tongue, in his looks and in his eyes, and shine bright in all his actions." All these years he was "a constant communicant; his self-examinations for the Sacrament were strict and severe." His biographer gives many samples of the

"Sacramental Meditations" he was in the habit of composing on these occasions.

The time at length arrived when it was necessary that Bonnell should take up the duties of his high office in Dublin, which had hitherto been discharged by deputy. Accordingly, at the close of 1684 he arrived in that city, and became *de facto* as well as *de jure* Accountant-General of Ireland. We may observe that on two occasions subsequently he had serious thoughts of resigning his official position and taking Orders in the Church. An offer was made by his friend and former pupil to buy an advowson for him, a step which he resolutely opposed as being entirely against his principles. His thoughts on the sacred ministry show how profoundly he recognised the responsibilities of the solemn office, and with what a mind he would have entered on them. He made two efforts to resign his public position and take Orders, and he tells us how they were both frustrated by circumstances over which he had no control—one of them the outbreak of the Revolution in 1688, and the other the state of his health. As his biographer points out, it was no worldly consideration that suggested the change, for the temporal advantages of his office were far greater than those he could have expected in a long time from any ecclesiastical preferment, and his station was besides "of sufficient dignity and credit."

Let us now try and get a picture of Dublin and its society when Bonnell took up his residence there in 1684. The city was a small one for its population and importance as the metropolis of Ireland. It extended but a little way round the castle, and was hemmed in on all sides by walls. Trinity College was still *juxta Dublin*, and the city was entered at some distance through Dames Gate. The principal churches lay clustered near each other. They were the cathedral of Christ Church and the churches of SS. Andrew, Nicholas, Michael, John the Evangelist, and Werburgh. The Custom House, where the Bonnells' office was situated, lay on the river-side close to Essex Bridge (then a new structure), and immediately below the castle. Here was the harbour of Dublin of those days. His private residence was in Smock Alley, now Essex Street West, a thoroughfare which led to Fishamble Street, and was then fashionable. This street a little later became the Drury Lane of Dublin, and here the chief theatre was situated. As far back as 1649 it was known as Cadogan's Alley, Captain William Cadogan, ancestor of the present Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, then living there. The principal business street was Skinners' Row, a narrow and gloomy passage which ran east and west to the south of the cathedral. It was so called from the extensive trade in hides

formerly carried on between Dublin and Bristol. Here stood the Tholsel, or Market House, a quadrangular building of hewn stone, containing the municipal courts, a "gilded" room, and the Exchange. Two statues, 8 feet high, stood in niches in front of the Tholsel representing Charles I. and II. The streets, which were "uneven, very dangerous, and dirty," were paved for the most part with rough cobble-stones from Wicklow. The city was lighted by lanterns and candles hung out from the citizens' windows, five inhabitants on each side of every street being required to hang out lanterns with candles "in such suitable places as the Lord Mayor and Sheriffs should direct."[1] The city was infested with idle and vagrant beggars, "liveing nusances," as the old chronicles called them. Begging was a profession, and all authorized beggars were required to wear badges; beggars appearing in the streets without them were subject to imprisonment or deportation. It is interesting to know that the Recorder of the city immediately before Bonnell came to reside in it was Sir Elisha Leighton, elder brother of the saintly Robert Leighton, Archbishop of Glasgow. The Master of the Free School of Dublin (the school in which Ussher and the great Duke of Marlborough were educated) was at the time the Rev. Edward Wetenhall, D.D., who had resigned a canonry in Exeter to take up the school.[2] He was the author of a Greek and also a Latin Grammar, which were in much vogue both in English and Irish schools. Wetenhall, who was a great friend of Bonnell, afterwards became Bishop of Cork, and then Bishop of Kilmore. He was buried in Westminster Abbey. As Bishop of Kilmore he preached Bonnell's funeral sermon in St. John's Church before a large congregation. He prefaces the publication with the advertisement that it was drawn up and preached in much haste, "my dear friend's death being a great surprise to me, who was then but just come up from my home into the city, and very full of business."

Among the inhabitants of Dublin in Bonnell's time were large numbers of French Protestant refugees, who found a hospitable home in the city and became the most industrious and prosperous of the citizens. After a short residence they were admitted to the franchise. The burgess rolls of the day are full of such names as Blondeau, Latour, Bernard, Chaignau, Tabary, Guillaume, Chevalier, Rosseau, Martineau, etc. Among these Bonnell would naturally be an acceptable visitor and benefactor, being himself the descendant of refugee Pro-

[1] Gilbert's "Calendars of the City of Dublin." V., pp. 452-457.

[2] Bishop Reeves' Preface to Rev. W. G. Carroll's "Succession of Clergy in St. Bride's Parish, Dublin."

testants. In 1687 we find the benevolence of Dublin further illustrated by public subscriptions on behalf of Christians "held in slavery with the Turkes in Sally" (*i.e.*, Sallee, Morocco), a movement in which we may be sure Bonnell had his part.

There are intimations in Bonnell's "Remains" that there was another and a darker side to the picture. Dublin was not free from those vices which belong to all cities.. Bonnell took his part in counteracting the evil, and helped to establish and support various organizations for the moral and spiritual improvement of the community. Many of these institutions sprang up in Dublin about the year 1693. His biographer says: "They gave him great comfort and joy. He not only approved of the pious design, but did very much encourage and promote it. He pleaded their cause, writ letters in their defence, and was one of their most diligent and prudent directors. . . . He was likewise a zealous promoter of the societies for reformation of manners who apply themselves to the suppression of profaneness and vice; he was always present at their meetings, laid their design truly to heart, and thought much of them; he contributed liberally towards their necessary charge, and constantly prayed for their success."[1] Again we are told: "He was continually dispersing good books among young people, his clerks, and servants, and poor families; which he seconded with such constant instructions upon all fitting occasions, delivered with such kindness and concern as could not fail of making great impressions upon many of them."[2]

Among the literary men of Dublin in Bonnell's day were William Molyneux, the friend and correspondent of Locke, Secretary of the Philosophical Society of Dublin and author of many philosophical and scientific writings, and George Ashe, Provost of Trinity College. Ashe was tutor to Jonathan Swift, and reputed to be the clergyman who went through the form of marriage between Swift and Stella in the grounds of St. Patrick's Deanery; Dr. Foy, Fellow of Trinity College, and Rector of St. Bride's, who when only fifteen years of age gained a scholarship (a feat in these modern times repeated at Oxford by John Keble); Dr. King, Dean of St. Patrick's, and afterwards Archbishop of Dublin, who wrote the Latin inscription on Bonnell's monument in St. John's Church; and Dudley Loftus, the learned Hebrew and Syriac scholar, who held the high office of Vicar-General and Judge of the Prerogative Court were also contemporaries. These and others like them formed a brilliant literary coterie in Dublin at the close of the seven-

[1] "Life and Character," p. 191. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 213.

teenth century. "Many of the physicians of Dublin," says his biographer, "were likewise his intimate friends." Archdeacon Hamilton thus enlarges on his intellectual attainments: "He was master of the accomplishing as well as necessary parts of learning; had thoroughly digested the Greek and Roman authors, understood the French language perfectly well, and had made good progress in Hebrew. In philosophy and oratory he exceeded most of his contemporaries in the University, and applyed himself with good success to mathematics and music. In the course of his studies he read several of the Fathers . . . particularly Synesius. . . . He had a delicacy of thought and expression that is very rarely to be met with. . . . He had a nice taste both in men and books, and was very conversant in our best English divines. But he particularly admired Hooker, whom he used to commend as an author who writ with a primitive spirit, but modern judgment and correctness. . . . He was particularly fond of two authors, Kempis and Salles [St. Frances de Sales], and has left behind him a correct translation of the 'Introduction to a Devout Life' written by the latter."[1]

Bonnell is described by his biographer as "tall, well-shaped, and fair. His aspect was comely, and showed great sweetness mixed with life and sprightliness. There was a venerable gravity in his look, a natural modesty and sincere openness. But in the House of God his countenance had something in it that looked heavenly and seraphical. . . . His natural and acquired seriousness was tempered with a very engaging cheerfulness in conversation."[2]

The even tenor of Bonnell's life was sadly interrupted by the Revolution of 1688, which threw Dublin and the whole of Ireland into the utmost consternation. A second massacre was feared. Multitudes fled out of the country to England. Bonnell notes in his diary, under December 9: "Last Thursday the letter threatening a massacre of all the English on this day came to town, and people not receiving such satisfaction from the Lord Deputy as they expected, began to think of England, and multitudes flocked away. I went myself to Rings-end, thinking if there were any alarm I was nearer to take shipping." Eventually he made up his mind that it was his duty to stay in Ireland. It was a testimony to his high character and the esteem in which he was held, that, though a strong Protestant, he was not removed from his office when other high officials were dismissed by the Government of James II. A contemporary in his employment writes of him that he "was continually at the Custom House, because they

[1] "Life and Character," p. 80. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 79.

could not be without his knowledge in the revenue." He adds that Bonnell spent most of his official income at this time in relieving the poor of the city, especially the distressed Protestant refugees.[1] The municipal government of the city had been entirely in the hands of the Protestant citizens. The King now required that the Roman Catholics should be admitted to the franchise without taking the oath of supremacy. The relation between the city and the Government became very strained. Sharp communications went on between Alderman Castleton, the Lord Mayor, and the Earl of Clarendon, Lord Lieutenant. A short time later the Earl of Tyrconnell endeavoured to abolish the charters of the city and destroy all civic privileges. He taxed the citizens in 6,000 pairs of shoes and 5,000 yards of gray cloth monthly.[2] The Papists threatened to burn Dublin if King James's army was defeated. Trinity College was turned into a garrison, and the Fellows and students expelled. The streets were chained up, and breastworks made at the entrance into each against the army of William III., in case it should attempt a landing.[3] As a measure of precaution, the plate of St. John's Church was buried, and not dug up again till 1690.

Archbishop King, in his "State of Irish Protestants under James," gives a graphic picture of the reign of terror. By order of Colonel Luttrell no Protestants were allowed to "walk or go in the streets from ten o'clock at night till five in the morning, and no greater number than five should meet and converse at any time."[4] The Archbishop's book throws a side-light on the condition of the Irish Church at the time (1690). It shows, among other things, that Irish Churchmen were not then averse to the use of the term "altar" for the Holy Table, and also were in the habit of saying daily prayers in their churches. Thus we read "the humble petition of Alexander Allen of Wexford, clergyman—That your petitioner being minister of the parish church of St. Iberius in the town of Wexford hath therein for several years past daily celebrated Divine service; complains of the rabble at the instigation of the Mayor breaking into his church and destroying all the pews and altar of the said church." Again, the minister of Trim, Mr. Prowd, complains of how the soldiers on Christmas

---

[1] Mason, in his "History of St. Patrick's Cathedral," tells us that several members of the French Protestant congregation who had been allowed to worship in the Lady Chapel had been seized along with their minister to be sent back to France. The cruel sentence failed to be executed in consequence of the victory at the Boyne.

[2] State Papers for 1690, p. 532.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 279.

[4] "State of Irish Protestants," etc., pp. 123, 124.

night did "break and plunder our altar on which we had that day celebrated the Holy Communion."[1]

During all these excitements Bonnell continued bravely at his post. We do not find that he took any part in the political agitations of the day, but he joined with the rest of the citizens in expressing his joy at the results of the Revolution which placed William III. on the throne. The change was great indeed. All the parish churches had been closed by order of James II., and the Protestants denied the exercise of their religion in public. Several of the churches had been converted into prisons, and the clergy imprisoned. Bonnell saw in it a judgment for previous negligence as to Divine worship and their "irreverent, careless, undevout behaviour." The turn in the affairs of the kingdom created universal joy. Bonnell exclaims: "How did we see the Protestants on the great day of our Revolution, Thursday the third of July (a day ever to be remembered by us with all thankfulness; O had it been begun with visiting our churches, and presenting ourselves there to God our deliverer), congratulate and embrace one another as they met like persons alive from the dead! Like brothers and sisters meeting after a long absence, and going about from house to house to give each other joy of God's great mercy, inquiring of one another how they past the late days of distress and terror." He entirely condemned the acts of retaliation contemplated by the Protestants on their Roman Catholic neighbours. He writes: "Instead of breaking open our church doors this day with the first dawn of it, to praise Thy stupendous mercy to us, we ran together into herds, we met in crowds to arm ourselves as there were no way but this to keep the enemy from returning back upon us. When it was Thou alone, O Lord, who without any arms of ours hadst driven them from us."[2]

Bonnell's residence lay in St. John's parish. The church is no longer standing, and on its site has been built the Fishamble Street Mission Hall. It shared the same fate with St. Michael's, another of the ancient churches of Dublin, whose site is now occupied by the Synod House of the Church of Ireland. The church tower alone remains, and forms the nucleus of the new buildings. The original church of St. John's parish was erected in 1168, and the founder's name is on record—Giolla Michell. It was rebuilt in the sixteenth century by Arland Ussher, the father of Archbishop Ussher, several members of whose family lived in the parish. It was rebuilt again in 1682, when we learn "a consecration dinner"

[1] "State of Irish Protestants," etc., pp. 115, 116.
[2] "Life and Character," etc., pp. 60-65.

was given, at which the Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Francis Marsh, was present. It was a small and mean building with a low roof: the walls were only twenty feet high. There were forty-two square pews on the ground-floor, each pew being occupied by several families. Here Bonnell worshipped, taking always a secluded seat. When the church was to be rebuilt, a petition of the ministers, churchwardens and parishioners was addressed to the Lord Lieutenant in Council to forbid the erection of butchers' and other stalls against the walls of the new church. The petition contains the almost incredible statement that "the very altar" of the old church had been constantly polluted with the refuse of the butchers' stalls, "to the great offence of the communicants."[1] Among the articles of furniture provided for the new church was a desk for "Bishop Jewell's Book" (the "Apologia Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ"), ordered to be placed by royal edict in all the churches, where it took a place almost on a level with the Bible.

Literally within a stone's-throw of St. John's Church stood the Cathedral of Christ Church. Here most probably Bonnell was often to be seen. His high official position would lead him to be present on state occasions. The cathedral is properly the Chapel Royal, and contains the viceregal pew called the "State." We have a contemporary account of how the Irish Court went to prayers in Bonnell's time. "When they go to church [*i.e.*, the Lord Lieutenant and Court] the streets from the Castle gate to the church door, as also the great aisle of the church to the foot of the stairs by which they ascend to the place where they sit, are lined with soldiers. They are preceded by the Pursuivants of the Council-Chamber, two Maces, and on State days by the King and Pursuivant at Arms, then Chaplains and Gentlemen of the Household, with Pages and Footmen, bare-headed. When they alight from their coach, in which commonly the Lord Chancellor and one of the Prime Nobility sit with them, the Sword of State is delivered to some Lord to carry before them. And in like manner they return back to the Castle, where the several courses at dinner are ushered in by kettle drums and trumpets. In these cavalcades the coach in which they ride is attended by a small squadron of horse, after which follow a long train of coaches that belong to the several Lords and Gentlemen who attend them." The writer follows them into the cathedral. "They sang an anthem with vocal and instrumental music, there being two pair of organs in Christ Church, of which one is a very noble one. When the minister ascended the pulpit, I

[1] Hughes' "St. John's Parish," pp. 25-30.

heard him with great attention and delight."[1] A contemporary local writer also tells us how the city magnates went to church on these occasions. The Lord Mayor "is waited upon by the Sheriffs, Masters, Wardens, and members of each company of the city in their formalities. In which manner attended, his Lordship waits on the State to church and from church in Castle-street until they pass by, and then follows the train of the State towards Christ Church, where the chief governor usually repairs, as far as near the end of Skinners'-row, and so turn off into the church, through a lane kept open to that purpose into the South door."[2]

John Dunton, quoted above, was an eccentric London bookseller who visited Dublin at the close of the seventeenth century in pursuit of his business. He established book auctions in several of the principal coffee-houses of the city, and in three or four public sales disposed of as much as £1,500 worth of stock. His lists show us what kind of books were in demand: Pool's "Annotations," Clark's Bible, Hammond "On the New Testament," "Book of Martyrs," Dupin's "Ecclesiastical History," Josephus, Locke "On the Human Mind," Seneca's "Morals," "Cook upon Littleton," Johnson's Works, Shakespeare's Works, Beaumont and Fletcher's Plays, Judge Hale's Works, and those of Boyle, Archbishop Ussher, Tillotson, Taylor, Patrick, Sprat, Barlow, Stillingfleet, Burrow, Sherlock, South, Charnock, Baxter, and the poets Cowley, Dryden, and Congreve. Dunton has curious things to tell us of the opposition he endured at the hands of a rival Scotch salesman of literary wares.

The Church of Ireland in Bonnell's time suffered severely from the abuse of pluralities, a fertile cause of defection from the Protestant Church and of large accessions to the Roman Catholic faith. The scattered flocks of the Established Church were utterly neglected by their absentee Rectors and Vicars. Take the case of two, at least, of Bonnell's clergymen. The Rev. Thomas Bladen, D.D., who was Rector of St. John's Church from 1660 to 1695, held in addition the following preferments: The deanery of Ardfert (county Kerry), the vicarage of Diamer and Gully in the Diocese of Meath, and also the rectory of Kilskyre and Killalon in the same Diocese. He lived in the rectory, 14, Fishamble Street, Dublin.[3] His successor, Dr. Scroggs, Fellow of Trinity College and Professor of Hebrew, apparently did not live long enough to enjoy the same wealth of ecclesiastical preferment. His record is a

---

[1] Dunton's "Conversation in Ireland," 1699, pp. 554, 555.
[2] "Calendar of Ancient (Dublin) Records." V., p. xxiii.
[3] Hughes' "History of St. John's Parish," pp. 56, 57.

good one. He put a stop to the abuse of providing drink and tobacco at the cost of the parish for vestry meetings, and he laid the foundation of the first parish schools opened in Dublin for the education of the children of the poor. He thus led the way for what was subsequently the rule all over Ireland, namely, the institution of schools in connection with the parish churches. Dr. Scroggs was succeeded in St. John's by Dr. Harrison (1696-1720), an ecclesiastic who in addition held the following preferments: The deanery of Clonmacnoise, a canonry in Kildare Cathedral, and the rectories of Ballraine and Killashee in the Diocese of Kildare. How could a Church flourish under the incubus of such abuses?

The "Life" of James Bonnell shows, among other things with regard to the Church in his time, how deep-seated was the repugnance to kneeling at the Lord's Table. It was a controversy that had never ceased to rage since Ussher's time. "The kneeling posture," says the Bishop of Salisbury, "was at one time a great matter of controversy and of deep feeling, as is shown by the declaration on kneeling still appended to the office." And in a note the Bishop refers to Bonnell's "Life," and adds: "The controversy as to sitting or kneeling was apparently still going on in the Church of Ireland when the 'Life' was published in 1743."[1] We are told by his biographer that this "unhappy controversy . . . was a great trouble to Bonnell. His great humility did then in a particular manner prompt him to fall low on his knees." Bonnell argued out this question for himself. He made a distinction between the soul that sat at the heavenly banquet and the body that knelt. "Were Christ indeed on earth, the Table He sat at we should expect (if we were favoured) to sit at too; . . . but now *He* sits not at this outward Table which is before us; why then should *we?* . . . 'Tis true on our Table the Holy Elements are impregnated with the materials of life; like the first framing of a living creature or an embryo before it is quickened. But they are quickened with spiritual life only upon the faith of each receiver which God hath appointed to be the recurring instrument or means of this Divine quickening. Then they become to us the deeds of glory and the assured conveyances of spiritual nourishment and immortal happiness. And as such they come to us from a higher Table, and while we are permitted to sit at that Table, well may we be content, and well does it become us to kneel outwardly in the church. While we sit with the Church Triumphant, well may we be content to kneel with the Church Militant."[2] We have glimpses of the same controversy in the

[1] The Holy Communion, pp. 145, 274, 275.
[2] "Life and Character," etc., pp. 165-167.

writings of John Dunton. He says: "I resolve to live and die in the communion of the Church of England, as believing that kneeling at the Holy Sacrament is the most becoming posture of all such as would humbly and devoutly commemorate the death of the Blessed Jesus. Our great Redeemer Himself kneeled down and prayed (Luke xxii. 41), and that for certain is the best pattern we can follow. If our blessed Lord so humbled Himself, the greatest men must not think much to come down so low—

"'Kneeling ne'er spoil'd silk stocking' (*Herbert*).

If it hurt the finery, it will make him the better Christian. Kneeling is a fit posture for all acts of devotion. The Eucharist is the highest act of worship, or, rather, it contains in it many other acts—prayer, praise, thanksgiving, and adoration."[1]

It is pleasant to think that at a time when there is not much evidence that religion flourished in Dublin, there lived in the city so devout a spirit as James Bonnell. His influence was altogether on the side of what made for good in the family, in the Church, and in the world. Reading his reflections and prayers, we are reminded of Thomas à Kempis, of Rutherford, and of a later Irish Churchman, Alexander Knox. Bonnell's devotion to the Sacrament was very intense. Beginning with a bi-monthly Communion, he found his spiritual life demanded more, and he was not contented without communicating weekly as well as on all holy-days. He also practised meditation with great regularity and exactness. His preparations for his Communions were earnest and devout. "It troubled him that he was often forced to be late at his office on Saturdays, lest his going to the Sacrament next day might have an ill effect upon his servants and tempt them to presume too far and approach the Lord's Table without sufficient preparation. . . . During the whole administration, so intense were his thoughts, so earnest were his prayers, that those who were near hardly ever beheld him without tears, which he concealed as much as he could by keeping close in the most private corner of the seat."[2] His devotions took the form of a devout thanksgiving to God for "giving him the sacrifice of His dear Son in the Blessed Sacrament." There is evidence from his biography that daily prayers were said twice in the Dublin churches in Bonnell's time; it was his own habit, we learn, to attend the public service of the Church "twice every day." "When once prayers began, he took no notice of any about him, and was always troubled at those

[1] "Conversation in Ireland," p. 530.
[2] "Life and Character," etc., pp. 164, 165.

unseasonable salutes wherein too many allow themselves in time of Divine service." He loved the fasts and feasts of the Church, "giving them devotions proper to them as much as his engagements in the world would allow—humiliation and repentance if days of sorrow, praises if days of joy." "Happy soul!" we find him exclaiming, "to whom each new week is welcome and known not, by the almanack or the outward face of the year, but by the grace it proposes to thy meditation and practice in its collect, while thou dost join with the whole Church in making this theme thy study and thy care; when each month is known to thee, not by the old heathen name it bears, but the blessed Saints it commemorates, welcoming with joy their holy festivals. . . . May my soul enter into your secrets and dwell with you in this sacred exercise! May I ever rejoice in this orderly revolution of time, ever be with you the children of the kingdom, the favourites of Heaven, the delights of my soul and heirs of eternity in all the happy periods of this revolution!"[1] He also prized the book of Common Prayer and set it up above all extemporary effusions. "Even his private prayers were a well-digested form." We get more than one insight into the nature of his private devotions. While undressing it was his habit to repeat the fourth Psalm. He also had forms of prayers: "Kneeling down before stepping into bed;" "at lying down;" "waking in the night;" "waking in the morning;" "when first getting out of bed, kneeling;" "while washing." The following is this last form of prayer: "Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquities and cleanse me from my sin. O wash me with Thy precious blood, O most gracious Lord Jesus, who hast loved us and washed us from our sins. Except Thou wash me I have no part in Thee. Thou hast made me sensible that I stand in need of Thy amazing condescension to be washt from the stains which I daily contract, that Thou mayest engage me to practise daily the same condescension to my Christian brethren." His habit was also to repeat on his knees the *Miserere* every Friday at noon.

It is well known that religious conversation is one of the most difficult of Christian attainments—to introduce the subject without appearing to force it. Bonnell had a great gift in this direction. He could speak without giving offence or appearing to take liberties. "He had a peculiar art," says his biographer, "of engaging company upon such subjects, and managed his part of such discourse with that modesty and prudence that there appeared nothing of artifice or design, nothing that aimed at magnifying himself or raising his own

[1] "Life and Character," etc., p. 184.

character. When he spoke of religion it was with a natural easiness, with calmness and humility, and he never soured such conversation with uncharitable reflections upon others who either differed from him in opinion or fell short of him in practice."[1] He watched the character of his own conversation strictly. There is a smack of Baconian sententiousness in the following observation: "If I converse with politicians and men of business, it makes me worldly; if with men of learning and wit, it makes me vain; if with fair persons, I am in danger of being sensual; if with great ones, of being proud."[2] Another difficult attainment is that of administering reproof, and here also Bonnell shone. When he reproved, "He did it not in a haughty imperious way, but with the prudent endearments and tenderness, as well as sincerity, of a friend; in such a manner as by his reproofs to oblige them and fix them faster to his friendship." He was a good causist, and we learn that the clergy "advised with him in their difficulties and doubts, particularly where any man's conscience was concerned, and always paid a great regard to his judgment."[3] He bewailed the differences between Christian men, and used to say that most differences "were chiefly in words." He "compared the quarrels of parties among Christians to engagements that happen in armies when they fall foul on their friends, thinking that they are enemies."[4] A charitable man himself, he thus urged generosity upon others: "Observe thy good humours, take thyself in thy fits of charity. Art thou disposed at any time to give largely? Do it out of hand lest the grace of God withdraw and thou growest cool in thy good purposes. No man ever repented of his charity, though it might seem to have been in excess."[5] He was the special friend of orphans and "poor housekeepers."

As Bonnell was going out of the world of Dublin life, another and a very different person was entering it. No greater contrast could be drawn than between the gentle, sweet-tempered, and spiritually-minded Accountant-General, and the cynical, materialistic-minded and misanthropic Jonathan Swift, shortly afterwards to be Dean of St. Patrick's. He had taken Orders, and was Vicar of Laracor, about twenty miles from the city. That Swift did not like Bonnell goes without saying, and he made fun of his "Exemplary Life and Character," when published. Some years ago Swift's copy of this book was disposed of by a second-hand bookseller in Dublin, and on the fly-leaf were found inscribed in the Dean's handwriting these lines:

---

[1] "Life and Character," p. 192. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 199, 200.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 234, 235. [4] *Ibid.*, p. 233. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 201.

Thus James Bonnell lived, plainly doth appear,
A Book so Thick, a copper plate so neat,
To prove his money, like his life, well spent;
They likewise here do Fix *his* monument,
Who as a mark upon his sacred dust
Obliged the Public with his pretty bust.
What's wanting to make the book worth minding,
Is easily Got—A pretty Binding.
Then surely none can doubt the book will sell,
James Bonnell lived and dyed so well.[1]

Bonnell married late in life Jane, daughter of Sir Albert Conyngham, Lieutenant-General of the Ordinance, who fought on the side of William at the Boyne.

The inscription on Bonnell's monument was from the pen of the learned Dr. King, Archbishop of Dublin, and was as follows:

P.M.S. Jacobi Bonnelij Armigeri, Cujus exuviæ unà cum patris et duorum filiorum Alberti et Samuelis juxta sitæ sunt. Regibus Carolo II^do^ Jacobo II^do^ et Guiliemo III^io^ erat Rationibus Generalibus in Hibernià temporibus licet incertis dominis fidus, ab omni factione immunis, nemini suspectus, omnibus charus. Natus est Novembris 14° 1653 patre Samuele qui propter suppetias Regiæ familiæ exulanti largiter exhibitas, officio Computatoris Generalis fisci Hibernici An° Dom. 1661 una cum filio remuneratus est. Avo Daniele Proavo Thomâ qui sub Duce Albano Religionis ergo Flandriâ patria suâ exul, Norvicum in Anglia profugit, ubi mox civis et demum Prætor. Pietate avitâ et pene congenitâ imo primævâ et Apostolica eruditione, prudentiâ, probitate comitate, et morum simplicitate conspicius. Mansuetudine, patientiâ et superomnia charitate insignis. Urbem hanc exemplo et præceptis meliorem, morte mæstam reliquit. Obijt Aprilis 28, 1699. Monumentum hoc ingentis doloris publici præsertim sui, exiguum pro meritis posuit Conjux mæstissima Jana e Coninghamorum gente.

The monument has long since disappeared.

A humble, sweet-tempered and sincere Christian, full of the enthusiasm of personal religion, a light shining in a dark place, a striking example of the power of the Divine Spirit to mould and influence human lives in the most unlikely atmospheres, James Bonnell stands alone, as far as we know, in the society of Dublin at the close of the seventeenth century, as a man who combined the intensely devotional spirit of Thomas à Kempis with the loyalty of a true Churchman. His name is one that deserves the feeble recognition and renewed attention we have endeavoured to give it in this paper.

J. A. Carr.

[1] See *Notes and Queries*, second series, vol. v., p. 207.

ART. III.—POPE LEO XIII. ON THE STUDY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.

THE Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII. on the Study of Holy Scripture, issued in 1893, to the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Communion, is a document fraught with important consequences to the claims of the Christian religion. Its chief purpose is, no doubt, to confirm the faith of the educated and thoughtful lay members of the Roman Church, whose minds may have been disturbed by the Rationalists and "the peremptory pronouncements of a certain newly-invented free science," in reference to the Divine Scriptures. These faithful souls were under the impression that their religion would be held and maintained independently of any book. "We believe and know," writes one of their prominent exponents, "that our holy religion, not being founded upon Biblical records, has nothing to fear from Biblical criticism."[1] They appealed accordingly, and very properly, to their infallible head for an authoritative declaration upon this important question, forgetting, however, that the matter had already been definitely decided at the Council of Trent. They have received their answer in the Encyclical Letter, and a quiet snubbing in addition in being reminded that "the Church has never required, nor does she now require, any stimulation from without" for "the protection and glory of God's Holy Word." They are told in the plainest language that "the God of all Providence . . . has bestowed upon man a splendid gift and safeguard, making known to him, by supernatural means, the hidden mysteries of His Divinity, His wisdom and His mercy," in a Divine revelation "contained both in unwritten tradition, and in written books, which are therefore called sacred and canonical because, being written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, they have God for their Author." They are reminded that Holy Scripture is "the source" of innumerable benefits—"profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice, that the man of God may be perfect; furnished to every good work." Their attention is drawn to the fact that the Founder of the Church "appealed to the Scriptures"—"this grand source of Catholic revelation"—to prove "His Divine mission" and character. "From them He cites instructions for His disciples and confirmation of His doctrine. . . . At the close of His life His utterances are from Holy Scripture, and it is the Scripture that He expounds to His disciples after His resurrection, until He ascends to the glory of His Father. Faithful to His pre-

[1] *Contemporary Review*, April, 1893: "The Pope and the Bible."

cepts, the Apostles . . . used with the greatest effect the sacred writings, in order to persuade the nations everywhere of the wisdom of Christianity, to conquer the obstinacy of the Jews, and to suppress the outbreak of heresy."

In the face of these declarations the members of the Roman Church must see that their faith is dependent on the truths contained in the Divine books, and that their religion is founded upon the supernatural revelation expressed in the canonical Scriptures, as God's "own oracles and words—a Letter written by our Heavenly Father, and transmitted by the sacred writers to the human race in its pilgrimage so far from its heavenly country."[1]

Whether the answer of the Papacy will prove satisfactory or not to those who have appealed to it remains to be seen; but to those outside the pale of the Roman fold—the inheritors of the principles of the Reformation—this Encyclical Letter, as far as its general aim is concerned, affords considerable gratification. Hitherto the latter have been under the impression that the value and authority of Holy Scripture were held of very secondary importance in the Roman Church, and that consequently no encouragement was given to its study and exposition. Probably such an impression resulted from the teaching of Roman Catholic theologians, held in great repute, who say that Holy Scripture was not calculated to teach the Gospel;[2] that "the Scripture is a nose of wax, a dead letter which kills, truly a shell without the nut, a leaden weight, a forest to serve as a refuge for brigands, a school for heretics;"[3] that "the excellence of the unwritten Word surpasses by far that of the Scriptures which the Apostles have left to us written on parchment. The Scripture does not contain clearly all the mysteries of religion, because it was not given for that purpose, nor to prescribe an absolute system of faith";[4] that "we shall endeavour to demonstrate that the Scriptures without the traditions are neither absolutely necessary nor are they sufficient."[5] But these writers, it may be urged, were individuals for whose utterances the Church ought not to be held responsible; nothing is authoritative unless it has the *imprimatur* of the Holy See, or of those delegated to grant such a privilege. This explanation, on the face of it, seems fair and reasonable, but it is scarcely sufficient to show that the impression under discussion is mistaken and erroneous. Not only is evidence wanting of any reproof, or repudiation of the

[1] Encyclical Letter, p. 4.
[2] Tournley, "Prælect. Theol. de Eccl. Christi," tom. i., p. 281.
[3] Lindanus, "Panoplia," book i., c. 22; book v., c. 4; book i., c. 6.
[4] Coster, "Enchiridion," c. 1.
[5] Bellarmine, "De Verbo Dei," lib. iv., c. 4.

teachers referred to, but the Holy See itself in the past has, on more than one occasion, given proofs of entire sympathy with them. The fourth rule of the Congregation of the Index of Prohibited Books, approved by Pope Pius IV., forbids the use of translations of the Scriptures, even when made by Catholic writers, without a faculty in writing granted by the Bishop or Inquisitor. "Whosoever," it says, "shall presume to read these Bibles, or have them in possession without such faculty, shall not be capable of receiving absolution of their sins unless they have first given up the Bibles to the Ordinary. . . . Moreover, regulars may not read or purchase the same without license had from their superiors." In 1713 A.D. Pope Clement XI. condemned by the Bull *Unigenitus* numerous propositions taken from the "Moral Reflections of Paschasius Quesnel upon the Books of the New Testament, in French," Paris, 1669; and "Christian Thoughts on the Texts of the Gospels," etc., by the same writer; Paris, 1693-94. Among these propositions were the following:

(*a*) "It is useful and necessary, at every time, in every place, and for every kind of persons, to study and know the spirit, piety, and mysteries of Sacred Scripture.

(*b*) "The reading of Sacred Scripture is for all.

(*c*) "The Lord's Day ought to be sanctified by Christians with the readings of piety, and, above all, of the Holy Scriptures. It is damnable to wish to restrain a Christian from such reading.

(*d*) "To snatch the New Testament out of the hands of Christians, or to keep it closed to them, by taking from them that method of understanding it, is to shut the mouth of Christ against them.

(*e*) "To interdict to Christians the reading of Sacred Scriptures, especially of the Gospel, is to interdict the use of light to the sons of light, and to cause them to suffer a certain kind of excommunication."

These propositions the Bull condemned as "false, captious, ill-sounding, offensive to pious ears, scandalous, pernicious, rash, injurious to the Church and her practice, and contumelious not only to the Church, but also to the secular powers; seditious, impious, blasphemous, suspected of heresy and savouring of heresy itself, and also abetting heretics and heresies, and also schism, erroneous, near akin to heresy, several times condemned, and finally heretical." After thus exhausting the dictionary for epithets, it proceeds to threaten ecclesiastical censures against anyone who should presume to "teach, defend, publish them conjointly or separately, or treat of them publicly or privately, even by way of disputing."

Pope Leo XII. also, in an Encyclical Letter to the Latin

Bishops, dated May 3, 1824, writes: "You are aware, venerable brethren, that a certain society, called the Bible Society, strolls with effrontery throughout the world; which society, contemning the traditions of the Holy Fathers, and contrary to the well-known decree of the Council of Trent, labours with all its might, and by every means, to translate—or, rather, to pervert—the Holy Scriptures into the vulgar language of every nation; from which proceeding it is greatly to be feared that what is ascertained to have happened as to some passages may also occur with regard to others; to wit, that by a perverse interpretation the Gospel of Christ be turned into a human Gospel, or, what is still worse, the Gospel of the Devil. . . . In conformity with our Apostolic duty, we exhort you to turn away your flock, by all means, from these poisonous pastures. Reprove, beseech, be instant in season and out of season, in all patience and doctrine, that the faithful entrusted to you (adhering strictly to the rules of the Congregation of the Index) be persuaded, that if the sacred Scriptures be everywhere indiscriminately published, more evil than advantage will arise thence."

With such testimony before them—and much more might be adduced—non-Romanists have good grounds for their opinion of the low value hitherto set upon the study and use of Holy Scripture by the hierarchy of the Roman Church. The Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII. comes, therefore, as an agreeable surprise. Without endorsing all that it contains, they are disposed at the outset to look upon it as a sign of important changes in the views of the Roman Curia in reference to the right place of God's Word in His Church. The high commendation bestowed upon the sacred books—a commendation supported by such patristic quotations as "an inexhaustible treasury of heavenly doctrine"; "an overflowing fountain of salvation"; "fertile pastures and beautiful gardens," etc.—the devout expressions of "gratitude to God for the communication to man of the words of His wisdom"; and the fatherly admonition "to approach the Sacred Writings with reverence and piety," are in themselves a revelation of better influences at work in the counsels of the Vatican.

Gratifying as the Letter may be to those of every denomination who retain their belief in the inspiration of the Bible, it contains, however, statements which ought not to pass unnoticed or unchallenged. Before referring to these in detail, it is necessary for the sake of clearness to distinguish the words "Church" and "Catholics," so frequently used in the document. The former word is manifestly used in the sense of the definition given by Silvester Mazzolini, called Prierias, Master of the Papal Palace under Pope Leo X., in his

reply to the theses of Luther on Indulgences, viz.: (1) The Universal Church was in its essence the assembly of all Christians; (2) virtually it was the Roman Church; (3) and the Roman Church was virtually the Pope.[1] Few will deny in these days this conclusion of Prierias, and therefore the "Church" in the Encyclical must be taken as a synonym for the Pope, or the particular communion of which he is the head. "Catholics" are referred to, of course, as individual, private members of the Roman obedience, for whose labours *per se* the "Church" can neither take credit nor blame.

Now, the Bible of which the Pope writes contains the Apocryphal books, and these, as well as the others, are said "to have been written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and have God for their Author." It is also stated that "this belief has been perpetually held and professed by the Church."[2] Such an assertion as this, in the face of the well-known history of the formation of the Canon of Holy Scripture, is astounding. St. Jerome himself, the author of the Vulgate, which is pronounced as the "authentic version," wrote: "As the Church reads the books of Judith, and Tobit, and Maccabees, but does not receive them among the canonical Scriptures, so also it reads Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus for the edification of the people, not for the authoritative confirmation of doctrine."[3]

Pope Gregory the Great apologized for quoting a passage from 1 Maccabees on the ground that the book was "put forth for the edification of the Church, though it was not canonical."[4] From those early days down to the Council of Trent a continuous succession of the most learned theologians in the Western Church maintained the distinction between the canonical books and those for ecclesiastical use. The list of these distinguished men closes with the names of Cardinal Ximenes, Sixtus Senensis, and Cardinal Cajetan.[5] It is therefore a fact beyond all question that, until the middle of the sixteenth century, the authoritative contents of the Bible were not matters of faith in the Latin Church. The Trentine Fathers, in a session comprising only about fifty-three representatives, among whom there was not one scholar distinguished for historical learning or special study of the subject, decreed, for the first time in Christian history, that the Apocryphal books were of "equal veneration" with the rest, and "as sacred and canonical." From this date only did

---

[1] Bishop Creighton's "History of the Papacy," vol. v., p. 70.
[2] Encyclical Letter, p. 3.
[3] "Pref. ad Libros Sol."
[4] In Tob. xix. 13.
[5] *Vide* Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," vol. i., p. 259.

the contents of the Bible become an absolute article of faith in the Roman Church.[1] Leaving out of consideration altogether the opinions of the great Fathers of the Eastern Church, it may be fairly asked, With what propriety can Pope Leo XIII. say that the belief in the inspiration of the Bible—as, of course, formulated at Trent—has "been perpetually held and professed by the Church"? Students of history will be glad to know when this profession of faith was made by the "Church" prior to the sixteenth century.

Exception may be justly taken also on historical grounds to the credit claimed in this Letter on behalf of the "Church" for her solicitous care of the Bible, her continuous encouragement of its study, and her desire to feed the flock from its saving words. It is enough to take one's breath away to read such assertions as the following: "By admirable laws and regulations, she [the Church] has always shown herself solicitous that the celestial treasure of the Sacred Books . . . should not lie neglected." "She has strictly commanded that her children shall be fed with the saving words of the Gospel at least on Sundays and solemn feasts. Moreover, it is owing to the wisdom and exertions of the Church that there has always been continued from century to century that cultivation of Holy Scripture which has been so remarkable and has borne such ample fruit."[2]

All this is a new revelation to readers of ecclesiastical history. The records of nearly sixteen centuries of the Christian era are blank with regard to any particular "solicitous care of the Bible" shown by the Roman Church. From her claim to be regarded as "the Mother of all Churches," it might have been taken, as a matter of course, that she would have been the first to take measures for the formation of the Canon of Holy Scripture, and thus show how jealously she guarded such a Divine treasure. But she cannot claim this credit. The first attempt to form a Canon of the Bible for Christian use was made at a small gathering of clergy from parts of Lydia and Phrygia, held at Laodicea about 363 A.D.[3] This example was followed at the Council of Carthage, 397 A.D., and to the decree passed on that occasion was appended the following note: "Let the transpontine [Roman] Church be consulted about the formation of that Canon." This action of the North African Bishops seems to have had little effect at Rome. The desired confirmation does not appear to have been obtained, neither were any steps taken to give to the

[1] Westcott, "The Bible in the Church," p. 256.
[2] Encyclical Letter, pp. 8, 9.
[3] Westcott's "Bible in the Church," p. 170.

Church in Italy what these two provincial Synods thought most necessary. So important was the question felt to be by the North African Christians that another Council at Carthage, in 419 A.D., discussed the subject again, and renewed the decree of its predecessor. Again a note was added: "Let this also be notified to our brother and fellow-priest Boniface, Bishop of Rome, or to other Bishops of those parts, for the purpose of confirming that Canon."[1] Rome apparently remained indifferent to these conciliar reminders. No "stimulation from without" could move her to follow the example of the Synods of Laodicea and Carthage, and she did nothing to *define* the contents of the Holy Book until the Council of Trent.

What has the Roman Church done, it may be asked, to preserve the versions of the Bible from textual corruption? Until the time of Pope Sixtus V., at the end of the sixteenth century, she did absolutely nothing to vindicate the statement of the Encyclical Letter, that "she has ever held fast and exercised profitably that guardianship conferred upon her by Almighty God *for the protection* and glory of His Holy Word."[2] From the days of St. Jerome three different Bibles circulated in the West, of which no one had paramount authority.[3] Jerome's improved version finally succeeded in displacing its competitors on its own merits, without any direct ecclesiastical authority; but the long contest with its rivals necessarily led to great corruptions of the text. Mixed texts were formed according to the taste or judgment of scribes, and the confusion was further increased by the changes which were sometimes introduced by those who had some knowledge of Greek.[4] Individual scholars, like Cassiodorus, were sensible of the growing corruption, and did what they could to check it; but private labour in those days was of little avail. Charlemagne eventually took the matter up, and entrusted the task of revising the Latin text to Alcuin. Into this revision errors gradually crept, and later attempts at correction were made by Lanfranc of Canterbury, and others. Individual schoolmen, especially in France, began in the thirteenth century to draw up the *Correctoria Biblica*. If there was a time in the history of the Papacy when the Curia could reasonably be expected to do something to amend the Vulgate text, it was in the days of Pope Leo X., when the Renaissance was in its full vigour. That Pontiff attracted to

[1] Westcott's "Bible in the Church," p. 189.
[2] Encyclical Letter, p. 12.
[3] Westcott's "Bible in the Church," p. 190.
[4] Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," vol. iii., p. 1703.

Rome from all quarters men distinguished in art, poetry, philosophy, and scholarship, so that it might be the capital of the world in everything pertaining to culture as well as religion. Pagan literature received the smiles of his patronage. A Greek printing-press was introduced, and valuable libraries established. Scholars produced editions of Plato, Pindar, Theocritus, Tacitus, Annotations on Homer and Sophocles, and were rewarded with lavish bounty from the Vatican treasury; but not one of these, or any one of the scores of learned professors maintained at the Gymnasium, was encouraged to do anything for the correction of the Vulgate. This indifference to the claims of the guardianship of the Bible is all the more amazing from the fact that pious and learned men elsewhere, especially in Germany—as John of Goch, John of Wesel, Gregory of Heimburg—had long drawn the attention of the Church to the paramount importance of Scriptural study and emendation.[1]

The warning voice of the Reformation, its appeal to the Bible as the only rule of faith, failed to impress upon the Papacy the urgent duty of providing a standard version of the Sacred Book. It is true that individuals here and there made attempts to produce improved editions of the Sacred Text, but these private and independent efforts made confusion more confounded. Perhaps no better illustration can be given of the almost hopeless character of this task than the attempt made by Isidorus Clarius, Bishop of Foligno in Umbria. He printed a revision of the Vulgate in 1542, which contained more than *eight thousand* corrections. In his Preface he says that "he did not correct all, because, if he would have corrected every passage in his version scrupulously and exactly by the Text, he might have given offence to Catholick ears."[2] This honest confession of his did offend "Catholick ears," for his version was forthwith placed upon the Index. Eventually the prohibition was withdrawn on condition of excluding the Preface and Prolegomena.

The first attempt on the part of "the Head of the Church" to give to his people an authoritative version of the Vulgate was that of Sixtus V., in 1590. Though the credit of such an effort is rightly due to him, he cannot be said to have "exercised profitably the guardianship . . . for the protection and glory of God's Holy Word." His corrections were arbitrary, and in many respects in defiance of those who had been employed to report upon the text. Bellarmine complained that the Church had never incurred a greater danger

[1] Ullman's "Reformers before the Reformation."
[2] Du Pin, "Eccles. Hist.," vol. iii., p. 699.

on account of these alterations.[1] When Clement VIII. succeeded to the Papal chair two years later, the Vulgate again underwent a revision in which more than *two thousand* corrections were made. To this edition a Preface was added from the pen of Bellarmine, acknowledging that there were wrong readings left unchanged in it to avoid giving popular offence, and aiming to save the honour of Pope Sixtus by an excuse which had no foundation in fact.[2] Such are "the celebrated editions of the Vulgate" which Pope Leo XIII. now "recalls (to recollection) with pleasure"; witnesses of "the solicitude of the Apostolic office . . . not to suffer any attempt to defile or corrupt" "this grand source of Catholic revelation."[3]

The present Pontiff may be credited with the laudable desire to make the Bible "abundantly accessible to the flock of Jesus Christ," but this has not been the characteristic of the Apostolic office since the days of Pope Gregory IX. That Pope declared: "The not knowing the Scriptures by the testimony of Truth itself is the occasion of errors, and therefore, it is expedient for all men to read or hear them."[4] For many centuries past the fact is patent that the free circulation of the Scriptures in the vernacular has been disallowed, or so restricted as practically to make them inaccessible to "the flock." Proofs have already been given in this article in support of this statement. No better illustration of its truth could be furnished than a paper in the *Contemporary Review*, May, 1888, entitled "The Power behind the Pope." The writer described the noble attempt of a devout French Roman Catholic, M. Henri Lasserre, to publish an edition of the Gospels for the benefit of his countrymen, to whom, he says, "the Gospel, the most illustrious book in the world, is become an unknown book." Lasserre's enterprise, completed in 1886, received the *imprimatur* of the Archbishop of Paris, and the approval and benediction of Pope Leo XIII. Its success was wonderful, twenty-five editions in the space of twelve months, thus showing the eagerness of the people for Scriptural knowledge. Then, after a year's circulation, the Sacred Congregation placed this book upon the Index, and the same Pope who, twelve months before, sent "from the bottom of his heart his Apostolic benediction" to its author, prohibited it to be

---

[1] Bellarmine to Clement VIII.: "Novit beatitudo vestra cui se totamque ecclesiam discrimini commiserit Sixtus V. dum *juxta propriæ doctrinæ sensus* sacrorum bibliorum emendationem aggressus est; nec satis scio an gravius unquam periculum occurrerit" (Van Ess., p. 290).

[2] Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," vol. iii., p. 1707.

[3] Encyclical Letter, pp. 4 and 11.

[4] Epist. ad Germ. Archiep. Constant. apud M. Paris.

published, read or retained under pain of anathema. How strange this decree, bearing date December 20, 1887, appears side by side with the professions of the Encyclical Letter, November 18, 1893. Who can reconcile their glaring and astounding contradictions?

Here, in Great Britain, where the Bible is so well known, it is both impracticable and impolitic to exercise the restrictions placed upon the vernacular use of the Sacred Book in Continental Roman Catholic countries, and so with us Romanists benefit in some degree from their environment. Their Scriptural fare, however, in the public services of the Church is of a very meagre kind indeed. "The saving words of the Gospel," with which they are commanded to be fed on Sundays and solemn feast-days, are read at High Mass, first in Latin and then in English, but the minister is under *no obligation* to give an exposition of the same. He *may* do so, if he pleases. At Low Mass the Gospel and Epistle are said in Latin only, and such is the practice, which is said to prevail at all Masses, in purely Roman Catholic countries. Bible readings, such as obtain in the Anglican Church, are privileges utterly unknown to lay worshippers, either in this country or elsewhere. It may therefore be said without offence that under the Roman system the laity have the least possible encouragement to feed in those "fertile pastures and beautiful gardens in which the flock of the Lord is marvellously refreshed and delighted."[1]

And are the Roman clergy themselves much better off? They have "the sacred psalmody," it is true, in Latin in the daily office, and in the same language the Breviary lessons to be read on special occasions; but what aids have been afforded them from the seat of authority for the pursuit of Biblical studies? The reference in the Encyclical Letter to the "chairs of Oriental literature in the Roman College, etc.,"[2] would lead the world to suppose that some aids to a better knowledge of Holy Scripture have issued from those learned professorships. But what are the facts? In spite of the revival of Greek learning, "the happy invention of the art of printing," the introduction of a Greek press at Rome under Leo X., and the long "established chairs of Oriental literature," it was not until 1858, when Cardinal Mai published his edition of the Vatican MS., that any Greek Testament was ever printed in Rome. As to the Hebrew Bible, no edition of it has been published there yet. Equally lax has the Vatican press been in providing commentaries. Those that exist have been printed elsewhere, and they are for the most part antiquated,

[1] Encyclical Letter, p. 7. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 11.

costly, and fragmentary. "Apart from the large, costly, and now partly antiquated works of Cornelius à Lapide and Calmet, severally 200 and 150 years old, there are at this moment no full commentaries on the entire Bible accessible to the Roman clergy, and very few indeed on separate portions except Maldonatus and Estius, the great majority of such as do exist being German, while little is done in France, almost nothing in Italy, and quite nothing in Spain and Portugal, for Biblical study."[1]

The careful reader of the Encyclical may reasonably ask, Is there anything in its pages which shows that there is a desire on the part of the Pope to popularize the Bible? Is there a suggestion anywhere in it in favour of the removal of the restrictions which make the Sacred Writings comparatively unknown to the laity? An emphatic No is the only answer that can be given. Its words are addressed to the hierarchy, and are primarily intended for the clerical caste. Its directions for the study of Holy Scripture are manifestly given with a view to the preparation of candidates for the ministry, and they bear all the characteristics of a syllabus new and tentative. Even for this select and limited class the approach to Biblical study is guarded and fenced about by conditions of such a kind as to be practically prohibitive. "Care must be taken, then," says the Letter, "that beginners approach the study of the Bible well prepared and furnished. . . . The best preparation will be a conscientious application to philosophy and theology under the guidance of St. Thomas of Aquin, and a thorough training therein."[2] The "Angelic Doctor," therefore, is the approved key of access to the sacred pages of the Divine Word. But what this involves can only be understood by those conversant with the scholasticism of the Middle Ages. Some idea of the hopelessness of the task of "a thorough training" in such a system may be suggested from the bare fact that the Bible itself is a mere primer compared with the ponderous "Summa Theologiæ" of St. Thomas. Imagine "a beginner," desirous of slaking his thirst for Divine knowledge in "the ever-flowing fountain of salvation," conscientiously applying himself for a thorough training in the Thomist philosophy and theology! Turning to the prologue of the "Summa," as the first step in the process, he reads: "Seeing that the teacher of Catholic truth should instruct not only those advanced in knowledge, but that it is part of his duty to teach beginners (according to the words of the Apostle to the Corinthians, "even as unto babes in Christ, I have fed you with milk and

[1] Littledale, "Plain Reasons," etc., p. 90.
[2] Encyclical Letter, p. 21.

not with strong meat), it is our purpose in this book to treat of those things which pertain to the Christian religion, in a manner adapted to the instruction of beginners. For we have considered that novices in this learning have been very much hindered in [the study of] works written by others; partly, indeed, on account of the multiplication of useless questions, articles and arguments, and partly [for other reasons]. To avoid these and other difficulties, we shall endeavour, relying on Divine assistance, to treat of those things which belong to sacred learning, so far as the subject will admit, with brevity and clearness."

All this is exceedingly good and promising, and the ingenuous student expects to find before him a task *brief, clear,* and *childish in its simplicity.* With this idea he takes a glance at the body of the treatise. His eyes open wide at the sight of this "brief" compendium of theology covering no fewer than 1,150 *folio pages,* each containing 2,000 words! He is amazed at the "milk" provided by this wise Catholic teacher for the special sustenance of theological "babes," when he is told that he must first digest *forty-three* propositions concerning the nature of God, each of which embraced several distinct articles separately discussed and concluded in the *eighty-three folios* devoted to this branch of the subject; then *fifteen* similar propositions regarding the nature of *angels,* embracing articles such as these:

Whether an angel can be in more than one place at one and the same time?

Whether more angels than one can be in one and the same place at the same time?

Whether angels have local motion?

And whether, if they have, they pass through intermediate space?

Then he is told to master ten propositions regarding *the Creation,* consisting of an elaborate attempt to bring into harmony the six days' work with mediæval notions of astronomy. These are to be followed by *forty-five* propositions respecting the nature of *man* before and after the Fall, the mode by which it was preserved immortal by eating of the tree of life, the place where man was created before he was placed in paradise, etc. Then, having digested all these subtle propositions, stated "briefly and clearly" in 216 of the aforesaid folio pages, he, poor novice! is informed for his consolation and encouragement that he had now mastered *not quite one-fifth part* of this "first book" for beginners in theological study, and that these propositions, and more than five times as many, were to be regarded by him as the settled

doctrine of the Catholic Church![1] If such be the needful preparation for the study of the Bible, who can wonder if the Holy Scriptures remain for the future a sealed book to the majority of the Roman clergy, as it did in the days of the Schoolmen? Ample records exist to show how the system of St. Thomas Aquinas practically closed the sacred pages. The state of theological training and its results at Oxford University in the fifteenth century is described by one of its distinguished *alumni* at that time: "In the Universities they have ordained that no man shall look on the Scripture until he be noselled in heathen learning eight or nine years, and armed with false principles with which he is clean shut out of the understanding of the Scriptures. . . . And then when they be admitted to study divinity, because the Scripture is locked up with such false expositions and with false principles of natural philosophy that they cannot enter in, they go about the outside and dispute all their lives about words and vain opinions, pertaining as much unto the healing of a man's heel as health of his soul."[2] To the same effect speaks Folly in the satire of Erasmus: "These Schoolmen possess such learning and subtlety that I fancy that even the Apostles themselves would need another spirit if they had to engage with this new race of divines about questions. . . . With the greatest complacency divines go on spending night and day over their foolish studies, so that they never have any leisure left for the perusal of the Gospels, or the Epistles of St. Paul."[3] The same writer, in the preface to his *Novum Testamentum*, speaks of his work as opening again "the wells of Abraham, which the Scribes and Pharisees, those wicked and spiteful Philistines, had stopped and filled up with the earth of their false expositions."

To this deplorable condition of Biblical knowledge Pope Leo XIII. would lead his flock by placing them "under the guidance of St. Thomas of Aquin." An outsider of the Roman communion may be pardoned for thinking that the labour of writing the Encyclical Letter is not worth the candle, if its main scope and purpose be to make scholasticism the door of access to the sacred oracles. All the eloquent sentences in praise of the Inspired Volume, all the illustrations of its marvellous use, all the admonitions to its reverent study, can only be regarded as well-sounding phrases when contrasted with the manifest intention of fencing round the "inexhaustible treasury of heavenly doctrine" with an almost impassable

---

[1] Seebohm's "Oxford Reformers," p. 108.
[2] Tindale's "Practice of Prelates," p. 291 (Parker Society).
[3] "Praise of Folly."

Thomist bog. The conclusion is inevitable that, in the Roman Church of to-day, Holy Scripture does not occupy the commanding position it once held for more than twelve hundred years. The teaching of the Fathers of the first six centuries, though referred to with high commendation in the Pope's Letter, is more honoured in the breach than in the observance.

An excuse is suggested for such a practice by the assertion of the Encyclical that "it must be recognised that the Sacred Writings are wrapt in a certain religious obscurity, and that no one can enter into their interior without a guide."[1] Patristic testimony, on the other hand, is flatly contradictory to this statement. The Fathers say most distinctly that in the things pertaining to salvation the Scriptures need no interpreter. The witness of St. Chrysostom is sufficient: "The Apostles and prophets have made all the things they published manifest and clear, and they have expressed them to us, just like ordinary secular teachers, so that each person by himself, from his own private reading, can learn the things which are said."[2]

The suggested difficulties of Holy Scripture, the expressed necessity of special guidance, the commendation of a difficult and obsolete system of preparatory studies practicable only for a select class, leave, after a careful perusal of the Papal Letter, the conviction that there is not, after all, any new departure to be found in the Vatican counsels on the subject matter of the Manifesto, and that the Holy Book will remain as jealously guarded and restricted from lay use as it has been for some centuries past.

D. MORRIS.

ART. IV.—WORTHY RECEIVERS.

THE beautiful city of Corinth lay smiling between its azure seas. It was a large and important commercial town, spread at the feet of a gigantic rock, like the Rock of Dumbarton, 2,000 feet high, which formed its citadel. The ancient city, which was one of great beauty and splendour, had been destroyed in a former generation by the Roman general Mummius. For nearly a century it lay desolate; but a new Corinth had risen from the ashes of the old. Julius Cæsar, recognising the importance of the isthmus as a military and mercantile position, sent to it a colony of Italians, who were

[1] P. 16. [2] Hom. III. de Laz.

chiefly freedmen. The new establishment rapidly increased by the mere force of its position. Within a few years it grew, as Singapore has grown in our days—from nothing to an enormous city. The Greek merchants, who had fled on the Roman conquest to the island of Delos and the neighbouring coasts, returned to the home of their fathers. The Jews settled themselves in a place most convenient for the business of commerce and for communication with Jerusalem. The beautiful temples were restored. The city was again shining with marble and gold.

It was the first day of the week. The Christians who had been converted by St. Paul had, of course, no church in which to assemble. It was not for many generations afterwards, when the age of persecutions had ceased, that places of worship could be built. Nor was there a day of rest. The Jews, indeed, observed their Sabbath the day before; but for Gentile Christians there was no such day of rest until the edict of Constantine in the fourth century. But they held gatherings for common worship in each other's houses. There would be among them a few more prosperous middle-class men who would have rooms large enough to admit a sufficient number. Towards some such room, then, they were now making their way along the various streets. With their meeting for worship they combined the Greek national custom of a social meal in common. In that warm and delightful climate the Greeks were not in the habit of having more than one set meal in the day. The others were just short snatches for the satisfaction of hunger and the support of nature. The one chief meal they often ate in common, the members of several families together. This custom the Christians naturally retained, making their Christianity the basis of their union for eating together. This day you would see them carrying baskets of food towards their well-to-do brother's house. Those who were better off would have large baskets carried by slaves. Some would be so poor that they would have little or nothing to contribute.

The result was very different from what might have been expected by St. Paul after his prolonged stay in Corinth. It appears that the wealthier people brought much more than they wanted, in order to make a display and cause the poor people to feel their inferior position. It became a kind of picnic. There seems to have been a sort of eager, scrambling spirit about it all.[1] Some of them wanted to be first. Some of them wanted to have the best things. Some wanted to get most of the food and wine. Many of them ate too much.

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 20, etc.

Some actually became intoxicated. In the midst of it all they celebrated the Christian mysteries, the memorial of the death of Christ. Can anything be imagined more unlike the Lord's Supper? Can you possibly picture to yourselves anything more unlike our service of Holy Communion? Is there any any member of any congregation throughout the length and breadth of the Church of England, who could possibly be guilty of such blasphemous irreverence?

What was the natural consequence? Such persons, as St. Paul said, stood self-condemned. They ate and drank their own condemnation, not remembering that this assembly was in reality the Lord's Body—His Church. St. Paul says nothing about damnation. The word he uses means condemnation, judgment, decision—nothing more. He is not thinking in the least about the place of punishment or the Last Day—simple condemnation. Such people condemned their own conduct. Nothing could be simpler or plainer. St. Paul was thinking of nothing of the kind. What he meant was that if these riotous, disorderly communicants once thought about it, they could not help seeing that such conduct was indecent and scandalous. And then there were other results. What follows now if people eat too much, or drink to excess, even once? They are ill the next day. What follows if they form the habit of indulging in superfluous food, and in frequent intoxication? They are visited by all kinds of diseases of the digestion. They become a mass of diseases. Physicians will tell you that most of the diseases of society come from the pleasures of the table. So it is now with gluttons and drunkards, and so it was then. Many of them became weak and sickly, says St. Paul. It was the just and natural order of God's providence. It would require a miracle to prevent gluttons and drunkards from becoming weak and sickly. Perhaps God punished them besides; but that would be enough.

One consequence more there was. For this cause, says St. Paul, many sleep. That is his word for the absence of religious life. How could there be any spiritual vitality in people who behaved in such a scandalous and abominable manner, turning the very Supper of the Lord, as St. Paul pathetically calls it, that sacred, solemn, holy, touching festival, into a noisy and unseemly picnic? Of course they slept; of course there was no religious life in them at all.

"When ye come together into one place, THIS is not to eat the Lord's Supper! For in eating, every one taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry, and another is drunken! What? have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the Church of God, and shame them that have

not? What shall I say to you? Shall I praise you in this? I praise you not. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup For he that eateth and drinketh in this unworthy manner, eateth and drinketh his own condemnation, not seeing that he is in the midst of the Lord's Body, the assembly of His Church. For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep. For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. But when we are judged we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world. Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat wait for one another. And if any man hunger, let him eat at home; that ye come not together with condemnation."

There you have it all. That is the whole account of the matter. There is nothing behind. Take care, in any application of these words, that you do not merely take them by themselves, snipping off what was before and behind, without making any reference to the scrambling, unseemly, impious picnic of the Corinthians.

Now there is a serious contrast between the days of the early Church and our own—not in this matter, to which I shall again presently refer, but in the point of attendance at Holy Communion. Communion has fallen very much into neglect amongst modern Christians. In the early days, the Lord's Supper was the principal part of public worship every Sunday. Every Christian partook of it regularly. If he failed for three Sundays together to participate in the common pledge of union with Christ and with the brethren, then he was *ipso facto* excommunicated. With us it is just the reverse. It is only a very small minority in our modern congregations who remain to partake when the Holy Communion is celebrated and administered. The rest troop out of church at the close of morning prayer as if they had done their duty, and anything farther was no concern of theirs. Of course, some have communicated at the early service. But that accounts for a very few among the vast number of professing Christians. The present Archbishop of Canterbury, in his last Charge in St. Paul's as Bishop of London, to the clergy of his diocese, told them that in the previous year on Easter Day, the day of all others when the Prayer-Book insists on every baptized grown-up Christian coming anew to pledge his faith and loyalty to his Lord by receiving the emblems of salvation, as far as calculations could be made out, out of three and a half millions of people in the diocese, only 110,000 partook of the Lord's Supper in the churches of the Church of England. And yet, as I say, Easter Day is the one typical day of all

others when Christians are urged to avail themselves of that privilege.

Perhaps it is partly the fault of those who arranged, or still arrange, our services. Possibly the morning service is too long: possibly the attention and devotion of most people is exhausted before the point arrives for Communion.

Perhaps some persons shrink back from some vague notion that, if they are known to partake of Communion, they will be put on a moral pedestal where it will be difficult for them to remain, forgetting that there is nothing required of Communion people—as they are sometimes absurdly and disloyally called—which is not required from every professing Christian who wishes to be considered a living member of Christ; and that the only difference between these so-called Communion people and those who are not, is that the one set have found out for themselves the most direct means of grace and Divine help, and the others, alas! have not.

Perhaps, also, many persons have a lingering feeling of alarm at the very solemn denunciations in the Prayer-Book, adopted from the language of St. Paul to the Corinthians, addressed to outrageous offenders against public morality and decency if they should dare to present themselves, and so place themselves in the category of the disorderly communicants at Corinth. That adaptation of those words has been greatly misunderstood. It is with the last of these obstacles that I wish to deal in this paper.

Now, at the time when our present Communion Office was compiled from the old liturgies, the state of ungodliness and evil living brought on by the Dark Ages was exceedingly gross and exceedingly prevalent. And yet, remember, that all professing Christians were supposed to be communicants. The practice of the unreformed Church had made Communion extremely difficult. As a matter of fact, men for the most part communicated only once a year—at Easter. These difficulties were removed by the Reformation; and, for fear of sacrilege, our forefathers mentioned the reasons for abstaining from Communion in very plain terms, terms which astonish us by their nature. We should not have supposed that anybody coming under these few disgraceful heads would have thought of coming near the feast. These terms can apply to few, if any, of those who form our regular Christian congregations in these days. We are all aware that in our times, unfortunately, church-goers are only a minority of the population. Our regular Christian congregations rather need encouraging and stirring up to warmth, earnestness, zeal, and reality. Think of the list of people who were the only ones whom our forefathers wished to prevent from participation:

"Therefore if any of you be a blasphemer of God, an hinderer or slanderer of His Word, an adulterer, or be in malice, or envy, or *in any other grievous crime*, repent you of your sins, or else come not to that Holy Table."

I do not think that anyone in our modern congregations is likely to be a habitual blasphemer of God, a deliberate hinderer or slanderer of His Word, an adulterer, or living in black, malignant malice or envy, or in any other grievous crime. Sins you have. Sins we all have. The heart knoweth its own bitterness; and those sins of yours you bring to God for pardon at that glorious service when we specially plead the passion, death, and sacrifice of Christ.

It is against these notorious offenders whom the Prayer-Book wishes to keep away—the blasphemers of God, the hinderers or slanderers of His Word, the adulterers, the malicious, those whose hearts are full of bitter envy, or who are guilty of any other grievous crime—that our forefathers adopted the serious language of St. Paul to the Corinthians; not against the trembling sinner who comes to sue for pardon and relief. It is in reference to these notorious offenders, and the imminent danger of their presence, that they inserted these words:

"So is the danger great if we receive the same unworthily. For then we are guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ our Saviour; we eat and drink our own condemnation, not considering the Lord's Body; we kindle God's wrath against us; we provoke Him to plague us with divers diseases and sundry kinds of death."

If any of us wish to behave as the Corinthians did, or if we come under the few, distinct, black and terrible heads of impossible receivers in the Prayer-Book, then we should be right in applying these words of St. Paul in some sort to ourselves. But not till then. The unworthy receivers St. Paul was thinking of were the impious gluttons and drunkards. The unworthy receivers the Prayer-Book was thinking of were the blasphemers, the slanderers of Scripture, the adulterers, and the like. But do not allow those words to be misunderstood. Do not tell the poor conscience-stricken sinner who longs to taste and see how gracious the Lord is that some mysterious visitation of disease is the punishment of all unworthiness alike. In that sense none of us are worthy. Christ our Lord has told us that disease does not come in that way, but as it came to the Corinthians, as it would have come to the notorious evil-livers at the time of the Reformation, by way of natural consequence of their evil-living. Do not allow the hesitating sinner to be told that, if he comes to the spiritual banquet of Christ's dying love, our Heavenly Father

is waiting to pounce upon him like a lion if he is not in a perfect condition, because Christ and St. Paul have told us that God is longing and yearning to receive us, and that we can never have any righteousness or worthiness of our own. In Christ's name do not let us misinterpret St. Paul's words to those riotous Corinthians, or our Prayer-Book's application of them to blasphemers and adulterers. The Communion was meant for sinners seeking pardon and grace, not for righteous persons who need no repentance.

Think of our Saviour. How it must distress Him to see such a fallacy prevailing amongst us, the very contrary of what He was always teaching! "Come unto Me, *all* ye that are weary and heavy laden," He said; not those who think they have made themselves perfect. When He allowed the poor harlot to wash His feet with her tears, and wipe them with the hairs of her head, He was not threatening to punish her with diseases because she was not worthy. When He was sitting in that upper room that evening in Jerusalem, that evening before He went out into the Garden of Gethsemane, and gave His disciples the bread and the wine which He had blessed, and said, "This is My Body, this is My Blood," and knew all the time that on that very evening they would all basely desert Him and flee, and some of them would even deny Him—do you think that at that moment He was wishing to punish them with diseases because they were not worthy? Read the seventeenth chapter of the Gospel of St. John, and you will see what He was thinking of. "Holy Father," He was saying, "keep through Thine own Name those whom Thou hast given Me." "Let not your heart be troubled." "Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you." "Ye are My friends." "I go to prepare a place for you." Yet they were not worthy receivers in the Pharisaic and mistaken sense of the word. That very night, a few short hours after they had received the bread from His holy hands, and had drunk from the cup after His holy lips had touched it, they all forsook Him and fled.

And besides that, what was Christ always saying about diseases and death? Why, He was always trying to teach His disciples that diseases were not the arbitrary punishment of sin. The man that was blind was not blind because of his own sin or the sin of his parents. The men on whom the Tower of Siloam fell were not sinners above other people, nor even the Galileans whom Pilate slew near the altar when the sacrifices were being performed. "Whom the Lord loveth He chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom He receiveth." The tares are left with the wheat till the harvest. As a plain matter of fact, Christ teaches us that diseases and sundry

kinds of death do not come except very rarely as the direct punishment of unworthiness, but as the natural consequence of evil-doing, and usually in the natural course of God's providence.

No! the warning in the Prayer-Book which is most generally applicable to modern congregations is not that against the blasphemers, the slanderers of the Bible, the adulterers, and the like, who are not found in the small number of those who in these days attend church, but that equally solemn denunciation against those of the congregation who disregard the Eucharistic Feast:

"This He Himself hath commanded; which if ye shall neglect to do, consider with yourselves how great injury ye do unto God, and how sore punishment hangeth over your heads for the same; when ye wilfully abstain from the Lord's Table, and separate from your brethren, who come to feed on the banquet of that most heavenly food."

The Prayer-Book description of the Eucharist is that Christ "hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of His love, and for a continual remembrance of His death, *to our great and endless comfort.*"

The requirements of the Prayer-Book are exceedingly broad, exceedingly simple, and applicable alike to all those who wish to be considered sincere Christians, however feeble and imperfect may be their endeavours:

"Ye that do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins, and are in love and charity with your neighbours, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in His holy ways; draw near with faith, and *take this holy Sacrament to your comfort.*"

The Prayer-Book strikes a deep penitent note of personal insufficiency throughout the whole service. What could be more humble and self-distrustful, what less suggestive of achieved worthiness and perfection, than the words of the General Confession? "We acknowledge and bewail our manifold sins and wickedness, which we from time to time most grievously have committed . . . the remembrance of them is grievous unto us, the burden of them is intolerable." What are the words of comfort which follow? "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden"; "God gave His only-begotten Son, that whoso believeth should not perish"; "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners"; "If any man sin we have an Advocate with the Father."

And, again, what could be less self-reliant or more utterly dependent on God than the prayer of humble access? "We do not presume to come to this Thy Table trusting in our own righteousness, but in Thy manifold and great mercies. We

are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under Thy table."

And even though we have received the pledges of God's love, the note of personal emptiness and self-depreciation is still the same: "Although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto Thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech Thee to accept this our bounden duty and service; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences."

Holy Communion is not a mystic rite for the initiated few; it is the great and constant means of grace for all needy and sin-stricken believers. Our Lord once for all described the attitude of our Heavenly Father towards even the most sinful of His sons, when they turn again to Him, in the inestimably precious parable of the Prodigal Son. "He arose and came to his Father. But when he was yet a great way off—when he was yet a great way off—his father saw him, and had compassion, and *ran*, and fell on his neck, and kissed him. And the son said unto him, 'Father, I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son.' But before he could get out all the words he had prepared, the father was calling aloud to his servants, 'Bring forth the best robe and put it on him! Kill the fatted calf, and let us have such a feast and banquet as we never had before; let us eat and be merry! for this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found!'"

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

ERRATUM.—Page 639, "Massiglio, the author of the '*Defensa Paris*,'" should read "Massiglio, the author of the 'Defensor Pacis.'"

SWITZERLAND ONCE MORE.

August 19, 1899.

ONCE more I hear these mountain streams
Down-rushing from their icy throne,
The snow-drift thundering from the height,
The waterfall's enchanted moan;
Into the secret of the hills
I mark the glaciers wind their way,
Or pause to watch some fold of cloud
Flushed with the rose of dying day.

O splendours of this Alpine land,
Rejoicing tired heart and brain,
How oft have I, mid hours of toil,
Longed for your soothing peace again!
Far rambles over open fields,
The long bright walks among the pines,
The morning plunge in some blue lake,
The evening stroll beside the vines!

How sweet to feel, at day's cool prime,
The shy lights slowly gathering force,
Till all the spears of distant crags
Seem dipt in Morn's immortal source!
To wander on mid darkling glades,
And taste the savour of the Dawn,
Ere, one by one, from alp and dale
The shadows of the Night are drawn.

Far-famed, yon solitary peaks,
Like steadfast beacons raised to guard
These pastures dreaming many a mile
Beneath their stern unbending ward,
Rise diademed with peerless snows
That gaze for ever in God's face,
Rock-ribbed, ice-walled, and heaped about
With stones of ruin at their base.

Again I tread these scented paths
With silent lips and thoughtful mien,
While tinklings from the vagrant herds
Cross and recross the cloven ravine;
Here gather sweet forget-me-nots,
There press thro' spaces hung with dew,
Here pluck the gentian from his bed
And marvel at his lustrous hue.

With many a merry scuffle, white
With foam of onset, ever flash
The torrents, brawling as they go,
And down the wave-worn gullies dash:
Like steeds unbroken to the rein
At every check they madly rear,
Yet all day long within the clefts
Make ceaseless music in the ear.

Perchance my steps may lead me forth
To where, retired amid the glen,
Some gray moraine its length uprears
Beyond the scattered haunts of men;

Where icy balms of heaven are born
  Mid silent caverns, blue and deep,
Poised o'er the shining battlements
  That clasp the mountains' cloudy feet.

At times, when manhood's pulses stir
  With quickened zeal and vital glow,
I yearn to touch those crystal tracks
  Lying unseen in upper snow.
Ah! fair to scan, long leagues beneath,
  Each valley hushed in mystic trance,
The glory of the awakening hills,
  The calm too great for utterance.

And when at last Night casts her veil
  Of awful beauty o'er the world,
How phantom-strange the ridges gleam!
  The cloud-wreaths on their summits curled
How solemn in their sleep! Each spire
  Bathed in the moonlight coldly shines,
In hoary grandeur glimmering faint
  Far o'er the shadow-stricken pines.

E. H. BLAKENEY.

Review.

Ecclesiastes: An Introduction to the Book; an Exegetical Analysis; and a Translation with Notes. By THOMAS TYLER, M.A. D. Nutt. Price 6s. A new edition.

THE large majority of commentaries, either on the Sacred Scriptures or the secular classics, are mere compilations, written to serve a passing need. Not so this most able and conscientious edition of Kohêleth. Mr. Tyler has evidently spared no pains to render his commentary valuable to the serious student; every page of it bears the impress of careful thought. Difficulties are not evaded, but met and faced; and there is an impression of original work about this book which is most refreshing.

Mr. Tyler published the first edition of his "Ecclesiastes" in 1874, and though the framework has not been disturbed, he has thoroughly revised and amended his work for this second edition. Briefly, the chief —and really notable—contribution which Mr. Tyler brings to the interpretation of Ecclesiastes is the consideration of the peculiar relations of Ecclesiastes to the post-Aristotelian philosophy. Admitting to the full the editor's ingenuity, I have been unable to accept his assertion of the direct influences either of Stoicism or Epicureanism upon the Hebrew writer. Mr. Tyler's "proofs" seem ineffectual; and I am glad to see that this view is supported by the writer of the article "Ecclesiastes" in

Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible," vol. i., p. 639. (Compare Wenley, "Aspects of Pessimism," p. 38.) Mr. Tyler sees direct influences where only resemblances occur.

In § 5 of the Introduction, arguing on the assumption (it is nothing more) that Zeno and Epicurus have directly influenced Kohêleth, Tyler builds up his theory as to the date of the book, which seems to me to be put considerably too late; and to that opinion Dr. C. H. H. Wright apparently assents. Tyler is probably correct in saying that Kohêleth had studied the Book of Job thoroughly; but the remarks in § 9 on Psalm lxiii. and Ecclesiastes are surely fanciful. It may be true also that Ecclesiastes is not without traces of a Messianic hope; but can we really find such in ch. v. 6?

On p. 61 the editor argues ingeniously, perhaps convincingly, that Kohêleth = Philosophy, *i.e.*, a collective personification, an assembly of philosophers; while Solomon (who certainly did *not* write the book, as every scholar now admits) is introduced to us as the mouthpiece of speculative philosophy, in order to give the book a concrete unity (§ 13).

Notably acute is Tyler's explanation of the epilogue (on p. 82); and his remarks on the influence of the LXX. are important (compare § 18). The really weak spot in an admirable (though by no means always convincing) work is the English translation, which strikes me as often uncouth, and wanting in dignity and felicity of phrase. E. H. B.

Short Notices.

Instructions on the Revelation of St. John the Divine. By the Rev. Cresswell Strange, M.A. Longmans and Co. Price 6s. Pp. 330.

ONE well versed in Biblical literature wrote that "more nonsense has been written upon the Book of Revelation than upon any other book of Holy Scripture." The opinion was severe, perhaps too severe, for holy thoughts and aspirations sometimes breathe and do good work in the world, even through very imperfect reasoning. However, it is a pleasure to welcome a book on the Apocalypse which is eminently sensible, and also full of useful practical teaching. In this respect Mr. Strange reminds us of the late Dean Vaughan's volume on the same subject. Here are a series of fifty-two Instructions, each of which has been preached as a sermon, in which the author clearly deals with the problems, and emphasizes the plain lessons of Revelation. He does this with two beliefs constantly before his mind: first (with Professor Milligan), that the book is an extended account of our Lord's discourse on the four last things; and, second, that its teaching is rather for all time than bound up in specific historic events. Throughout, Milligan, Schaff, Lee, and Fausset are consulted. The result is a really valuable collection of homiletic dissertations.

Wanderings West and East. By the Rev. E. Bartrum, D.D. Partridge and Co. Price 2s. 6d. Pp. 221.

Everybody travels nowadays. The number of those who go round the world and then write a book of travels increases every year. Dr. Bartrum was called by domestic duty to Canada and British Columbia, and thence made his way across the Pacific to Hong Kong, Japan, Ceylon, Egypt, and so to his country rectory in England. His mind is receptive, but dis-

criminating. He does not bore us with masses of information and conjecture; but he makes some excellent notes in simple and sprightly language on many interesting subjects. His hints on Canada and British Columbia will be useful to intending colonists; while his descriptions of Japanese life, of the Chinese character, and his notes on trees, plants, and natural features of the countries he traversed, are exceptionally concise and good.

High Aims at School. By the Rev. R. A. BYRDE, M.A., with Preface by Dr. JAMES of Rugby. Elliot Stock. Pp. 134.

Boys are not easy to preach to, but when once attracted are perhaps the most remunerative listeners. These sermons are just what sermons to boys should be—earnest, simple, practical, formative. Such subjects as "Home Duties," "Patience," "Purity of Heart," "Evil Influence," are well chosen, and discussed with admirable reality and force.

Scientific Temperance Addresses. By E. CRAWSHAW. C.E.T.S. Price 1s. 6d. Pp. 98.

The effects of alcohol on the human body as a study in physiology are now well known to temperance lecturers. In the clearness of arrangement and illustration, this book compares favourably with others of the same character. It is also considerably fuller and more up-to-date than any we have previously seen. Herein it appears to possess a distinct advantage.

Footsteps to Peace. By W. WELBY PRYER. George Stoneman: London. Price 8d. Pp. 63.

The Spirit of Power. By the Rev. W. TALBOT HINDLEY. *Home Words* Office. Price 6d. Pp. 42.

Two little devotional manuals on the same lines as the teaching of the Keswick School. Those who accuse this school of mysticism should read such statements as these, which are throughout in close touch with the everyday things of life.

Charles Grant. By HENRY MORRIS. S.P.C.K. Pp. 63.

Charles Grant was a close friend of William Wilberforce and Henry Thornton, and in the closing years of the eighteenth and first years of the nineteenth centuries he was associated with all the important religious enterprises in this country. No connected account of his life has been published before, and this book gives interesting glimpses of religious life and thought, with particulars of many good people who worked for God both in the India and the England of that day.

Sophia Cooke. By E. A. WALKER. Elliot Stock. Pp. 91.

Sophia Cooke laboured for forty-two years as a missionary in Singapore under the Society for Promoting Female Education in India and the East. Her devoted life was crowned by great success among the girls of her boarding-school, and is a touching proof of Christ's power to inspire service that is self-sacrificing and enduring.

Unseal the Book. By Mrs. ASHLEY CARUS-WILSON. R.T.S. Pp. 160.

To say that Mrs. Carus-Wilson was Miss Mary L. G. Petrie, B.A., before her marriage will be sufficient to recommend this book to Bible students. It consists mainly of papers published in several magazines, which are here collected and systematized. It deals with the right rendering, studying, storing, and practising of Holy Scripture. We commend the book heartily to Christian teachers.

Our Christian Year. By a TEACHER. Elliot Stock. Pp. 346.
Sunday Readings. By BEATRICE WAUGH. S.P.C.K. Pp. 192.

Both these books follow the Church's seasons, the former being intended for the elder scholars in Sunday-schools, and the latter for the

sick in hospitals. While there is, perhaps, nothing very striking about either, yet they are well suited for the purposes for which they were written; and many who have little time or training, and who yet are glad to teach in a Sunday-school or minister to the sick, will find here much excellent matter ready for their use.

My Tour in Palestine and Syria. By F. H. DEVERELL. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode.

The care and attention that have been bestowed upon this book are remarkable. Paper, type, and binding are excellent, and the illustrations, done from photographs, are charming from their clearness. The letter-press is a kind of diary recording the author's impressions on the spots he visited. Much interesting information may be gleaned from them, but we see no necessity for a violent tirade against the Government for not declaring war on behalf of Armenia.

Statutes and Songs. By the Rev. F. B. MEYER. London: James Nisbet and Co.

These are sermons, or, rather, sermon-notes, and give a good representation of Mr. Meyer's general style. We particularly like the second, "The night is far spent," on Rom. xiii. 11-14, but all are good.

Old Testament History for Schools. Part III. By the Rev. T. H. STOKOE, D.D. The Clarendon Press.

The importance of system and method in religious teaching in secondary schools is gradually becoming recognised. Manuals such as Dr. Stokoe's should be widely used. They contain almost every requirement for school use, and are practical, plain, and up-to-date. This, the third volume, deals with the period from the Disruption to the return from the Captivity, and is as good as its predecessors.

A Lost Art. By S. C. PENNEFATHER. London: *Home Words* Publishing Office.

These are a series of stories of the East End which have come under the observation of workers in the Mildmay Mission. They are deeply interesting, with an undercurrent of quiet pathos that should convince even the most careless reader of the needs of our outcast brethren, and the duties we owe to them. We wish a wide circulation for this little book.

The Month.

THE second trial of Captain Dreyfus ended at Rennes on Saturday, September 9, with a second verdict of guilty by five votes to two, instead of unanimously as in 1894. Extenuating circumstances were found, however, and the sentence was ten years' detention in a fortress. It is an amazing verdict, about which everything that can be said has already been given vent to, both for and against. The *cause célèbre* of the century is finished; but France has received a blow from which she may, perhaps, never recover. Nemesis follows in the wake of guilty nations as of guilty individuals. All through the civilized world outside France the verdict of the court-martial has created a feeling of shame and horror. We will not add more, save to express our sense, not only of the baseness of the crime, but also of our admiration for the patriot minority in France, who through all these bitter months have succoured

the cause of right and justice through evil report and good. Picquart and his noble confrères have won for themselves a name that will never die in the memories of men and women. Honour to them!

The news from the Transvaal is serious enough; but it is now pretty clear that England is all but unanimous on the questions involved in this awkward affair. We fancy that President Kruger might be glad to yield so far as he himself is concerned; but the majority of young Boers are thirsting for a brush with Britain, confident of success for their own arms. The memory of Majuba Hill has not faded out of the Boer mind; but, then, neither has it faded from the mind of England. And England will not tolerate being trifled with any longer on a matter that touches her honour, as well as the principles of justice and of right.

The ecclesiastical situation remains unchanged, though Dr. Sanday's pamphlet on the Archbishops' decision is causing some sensation. It is devoutly to be hoped that no ill-timed acts on the part of Churchmen, whether High or Low, will be allowed to interfere with the peace, won on constitutional lines, which we all so emphatically desire. But even peace can be purchased too dearly, if at the sacrifice of principles.

Lord Halifax's address to the E.C.U. has not approved itself to the conscience of loyal Churchmen. The following comment in a well-known London paper is worth reproducing, because it appears to us to voice the settled opinion of constitutionally-minded Churchmen throughout the land: "His lordship discusses at some length the grounds upon which the Archbishops gave their decision regarding lights and incense. This he has a perfect right to do; but we question whether he is equally justified in the advice which he extends to the Union on the manner in which the new admonitions are to be received. It appears to be not obscurely hinted that a positive disregard of the Bishops' authority in these matters would not arouse the president's implacable resentment. The point he insists on, however, is that, if obedience be rendered, it shall be made plain by clergy and laity that this 'compliance is yielded grudgingly and of necessity,' and that 'submission is made without prejudice to whatever future action may be thought wise and right.' It is perhaps superfluous to recall to Lord Halifax's mind the form for the Ordering of Priests in the English Prayer-Book, in which the candidate for holy orders takes a solemn vow very hard to reconcile with this 'grudging' obedience recommended by Lord Halifax. Let us quote a passage. The Bishop asks the candidates in the course of that office, 'Will you reverently obey your Ordinary and other chief ministers unto whom is committed the charge and government over you: following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions, and submitting yourselves to their judgments?' To which the answer to be returned is, 'I will so do, the Lord being my helper.' There is nothing here about grudging and perfunctory obedience. The clergy have sworn, one and all, to obey 'with a glad mind.' But the president counsels more practical expressions of disobedience than a mere display of the sulks. He suggests that incense should still be used in the processions before the Communion service, but discontinued before the opening 'Our Father.' This course, he seems to think, would get behind the letter of the Archbishops' decision, and serve as a vigorous and unmistakable protest. We hope the English Church Union is not becoming infected with the morale of a certain section of that Roman Church to which it approximates so closely in doctrine and ritual. . . . English people as a rule do not like this sort of sharp practice; and we cannot think that Lord Halifax, in proposing

it, has consulted either his own dignity or the interest of the Church party to which he is so devotedly attached. A vigorous policy founded upon his suggestions would, we believe, lead to a tenfold increase of anarchy and confusion in the Established Church."

"It is a noteworthy sign of a growing sense among Irish Churchmen of the corporate character of a diocese that the first stone has been laid in Belfast of a cathedral intended to serve as the Mother Church of the united dioceses of Down, Connor, and Dromore. It is true that each of these dioceses has its own cathedral, but since their union in a single see there has existed the need of a central church as the seat of the Bishop's authority. That Belfast should have been chosen is a happy augury for the future of the Church of Ireland in that important centre of population, amongst whom the Bishop, let us hope, finds it more congenial to erect a new cathedral than to upset a parish church. Congregationalism is rampant in the city. The clergy live apart from an ecclesiastical centre, and their standard of Church life closely conforms to that of the Protestant sects by which they are surrounded. The cathedral, presenting a higher type of worship, and standing as the symbol of corporate unity, cannot fail to influence and elevate the tone of Belfast Churchmanship. For financial reasons, it will be built at a modest cost, and, for reasons which we fail to appreciate, the style chosen is the Byzantine of Southern France, and the plan that of the basilica in its general outline."—*Church Times.*

Nearly 150 workhouses have been booked for short missions by the Church Army Prison and Workhouse Mission Staff, and the society expects to have close upon 300 booked by the autumn. The reports received week by week from the chaplains and masters of the workhouses where these missions have already been conducted are very encouraging.

The Church of St. Michael Bassishaw, in Basinghall Street, is to come down, and the Common Council have bought the site for £36,000. This is at the rate of £7 a square foot.

"Professor Campbell reports that spectroscopic observations at the Lick Observatory have shown that the polar star is, in fact, a triple system—a binary with a revolution of about four days, moving round a third more distant star."—*Athenæum.*

The Bishop of Peterborough, Dr. Carr Glyn, whose ministry at St. Mary Abbott's, Kensington, is held in pleasant remembrance, is making his episcopal supervision a reality by visiting every parish in his diocese. The formidable nature of the task will be realized when it is stated that the diocese contains about 600 benefices, and that the acreage is 1,236,708. Some of Dr. Carr Glyn's predecessors have fallen far short of his ideal in this respect, for there are many parishes which he has already visited in which a Bishop has not set foot for half a century.

The annual income of the See of Winchester is £6,500, and Bishop Davidson has courageously avowed that this sum does not permit of him entertaining the clergy and churchwardens at luncheon, in view of the demands made upon him in connection with the needs of the diocese. In these days of agricultural depression, the calls on the purse of a Bishop are many and urgent; and when he has met them, his income, large though it appears on paper, has dwindled down to very modest proportions. Luncheons are capital things in their way, but there are other forms of truer hospitality.

The suggestion that York Minster should be restored does not seem to have been very enthusiastically taken up. Of the £50,000 which is needful, not £13,000 up to the present date has been subscribed. The fact that restoration is sometimes a distant relation to vandalism may account for these disappointing figures.

In a deeply-interesting account of Spurgeon's sermons, Mr. Arthur Mee says, in the *Puritan* for September: "Something like 100,000,000 have been sold at a penny, and quite double that number have been circulated in newspapers and other ways. The number of Mr. Spurgeon's sermons sold since 1855 exceeds the number of Bibles circulated since the beginning of the century." When it is borne in mind that the British and Foreign Bible Society print five tons of Bibles every day, it will be understood what this means.

The British Association held its annual meeting at Dover this year. Sir Michael Foster presided, and delivered his opening address on the evening of September 13. There was a very large attendance of members.

The shilling edition of Mr. Walsh's "Secret History of the Oxford Movement" will be ready immediately. New matter has been added, and it will be more complete and contain more information than any previous edition. One hundred thousand copies are being printed.

Clergymen interested in the proper management of our hospitals and infirmaries are invited to attend a conference to be held under the auspices of the Hospital Reform Association, at St. Martin's Town Hall on the 10th and 11th prox., to discuss: (1) "The Inquiry System," October 10, 4 p.m.; (2) "Payments by Patients," 8 p.m.; (3) "Provident Dispensaries," October 11, 4 p.m.

The Archdeacon of London, the Ven. William M. Sinclair, D.D., has been appointed chaplain to Mr. Alfred H. Bevan, Sheriff-elect.

The appointment of Chaplain-General of the Army will shortly be placed at Lord Lansdowne's disposal by the retirement, under the age clause, of Dr. Edghill.

An alteration has already been made in the Church Congress programme. On Tuesday, October 10, the preacher at Westminster Abbey will be the Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, instead of the Archbishop of Armagh. On the following Friday there will be a thanksgiving service in St. Paul's Cathedral, the Bishop of London being the preacher. Sermons by special preachers will be given in St. Paul's Cathedral and Westminster Abbey on October 8 and 15.

The Dean of Ripon, as Chairman of the Christian Conference Committee, announces that united meetings will be held on Monday, October 9, in St. Martin's Town Hall, Charing Cross, in connection with the Church Congress. The circular states that the Church Congress, having at present no power to admit any but those "in communion with the Church of England" to speak at its meetings, the committee of the Christian Conference have resolved on holding united meetings, as was done successfully at Bradford in 1898. They have chosen subjects either identical with those to be discussed at the congress, or germane to them, and hope that their discussions may not be without some influence on those of the congress.