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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

JANUARY, 1900.

ART. I.—THE ARCHBISHOPS OF CANTERBURY SINCE THE RESTORATION.

I. JUXON (SEVENTY-FIFTH ARCHBISHOP).

A GREAT measure of success was given to the design of Dean Hook when he undertook to write the lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury from the beginning. He carried his work uninterruptedly down from Augustine to the Reformation period. Then, after breathing-time, he began again, calling his fresh work "New Series," and continued it to the next great crisis in the history of the Church of England. With the death of Laud came the temporary overthrow of the Church, Independency being established in its place. But in less than three years after the death of Cromwell the monarchy was restored amid such an outburst of national enthusiasm as rarely occurs in any country, and with it was restored the ancient Church of the nation.

Nine of the Bishops who had been driven out of their sees still survived, and were forthwith restored. These were: Juxon, of London; Pierce, of Bath and Wells; Skinner, of Oxford; Warner, of Rochester; Roberts, of Bangor; Wren, of Ely; Duppa, of Salisbury; Frewen, of Lichfield and Coventry; King, of Chichester. Canterbury, which had remained vacant since Laud's martyrdom, was filled by Juxon, and Gilbert Sheldon succeeded him as Bishop of London. Brave old Hook added Juxon's life to his series, but it was too evident that his power was gone. It is a performance very much poorer than any of the preceding lives, and almost immediately after its publication the good Dean died, full of years.

Juxon has up to the present time had eighteen successors, men of widely differing character and attainments. Some

have been able and learned, more have been commonplace and of little mark. But the period during which they have lived has been big with stirring events in the history of religion. It is a period of transcendent interest to ourselves of to-day, because the destinies of our nation have been ceaselessly shaping themselves, and our kinsfolk have been colonizing every quarter of the world.

After the royal line was again seated on the throne, John Milton, who had been one of the foremost leaders of the rebellion, and who was now old, poor, and blind, continued to put forth his political doctrines in some of his prose writings. In doing so he seemed to many, as he did to Johnson a century later, to be making himself ridiculous, dreaming unpractical theories, spinning cobwebs which time would sweep away. But the sturdy old Puritan knew that it was not so, that he held doctrines and principles which would yet bear fruit. Green, in his "History of the English People," says that England emerged Puritan from the Great Rebellion and has remained Puritan ever since. The statement is profoundly true, though it has to be qualified and guarded. In politics the doctrine of absolute monarchy was cast out, and the responsibility of the Government to the nation was affirmed. The Church had suffered heavily by being bound to the Tudor and Stuart theory of kingly right, and even yet found itself more or less in antagonism to the voice of the popular will. The political struggles of the days of the later Stuarts, ending with the expulsion of James II., was the triumph of the Puritan principle.

In religion, also, it has prevailed unto this day, even when it has taken the external form of High Church doctrine. The battle fought by men like Bunyan and Baxter against the prevalent laxity of their time was really the same battle as Newman fought when he was holding undergraduates spellbound from the pulpit of St. Mary's, and using all his endeavours to promote personal religion within the walls of Oriel. The responsibility of the individual soul, the tremendous issues of life, and the realities of eternity, flash out alike in Baxter's "Saint's Rest," in Law's "Serious Call," in the sermons of Whitefield, of Spurgeon, and of Liddon.

What was merely outward in Puritanism, the hatred of innocent festivity (too frequently identified with the riotous living of the vicious), and of the beautiful in public worship, has largely passed away, as experience has taught men deeper wisdom and wider sympathies. And where these things are still viewed with suspicion it is because there lingers in the public mind the fear that they may be identified with doctrines and principles which the nation has rejected for ever.

When the ancient Church of England again became the Church of the Nation, Juxon was seventy-eight years of age. It will be well to summarize the facts of his previous life. He was born, probably at Chichester, in 1582, educated at Merchant Taylors' and St. John's College, Oxford, was intended for a lawyer and entered at Gray's Inn, but was ordained and was presented by his college to St. Giles's, Oxford, in 1609. His character as a preacher rose high, and in 1615 he was preferred to the living of Somerton, Oxon, and in 1621 he was made head of his College. In 1626 he became Dean of Worcester, through the influence of Laud; and it is to the credit of them both that Laud trusted him to the end, though Juxon was by no means so fervid as Laud in matters of ritual. Several times he appears as the composer of differences by his counsels of moderation. In 1663 he succeeded Laud in the Bishopric of London, and again it is to be noted that, though he was Laud's nominee, because of his simple piety, he incurred none of the hatred which gathered round Laud. He seems to have been always loved. He bravely and wisely exhorted Charles I. not to agree to the execution of Strafford. When the war broke out, and London remained in the hands of the Puritans, he was suffered to live unmolested at Fulham. His memory remains enshrined in the pathetic record of the last hours of Charles I.; he administered the Holy Communion to him on that solemn morning, walked with him from St. James's to Whitehall, received his last injunctions on the scaffold, and saw him die. It is little wonder that it was thought fitting that he should fill the vacant throne of Canterbury. But he was enfeebled by age and infirmity, and his primacy was little more than nominal. When he and Charles II. met again, at the time of the Restoration, Juxon was shocked at the King's libertinism, and they did not at all take to each other. During his primacy the resettlement of the Church took place, but Juxon's part in the arrangements was little more than nominal.

The great event of his primacy, the Savoy Conference, for that reason will be best treated in the succeeding biography. The Archbishop was too feeble to attend, and the presiding spirit of the Conference was his successor, Sheldon, at that time Bishop of London. No wonder that Juxon's thoughts and affections went back to his old See of London, and such energy as still remained to him was exerted in carrying on the restoration of St. Paul's Cathedral, which he had begun in the early days of his episcopate, and which was all to be destroyed by the Great Fire within three years. He also rebuilt the Great Hall at Lambeth Palace, which is now used as the Library, and he exerted himself for the augmentation

of the poor benefices of his see. He died in June, 1663, at the age of eighty-one, and was buried, by his own desire, in the chapel of St. John's College, Oxford.

II. Sheldon.

Gilbert Sheldon was born at Stanton, near Ashbourne, Derbyshire, June 19, 1598. The house of his birth is still carefully preserved, and a wooden tablet marks the chamber. His father, though descended from an old county family, was then a menial servant to Gilbert, Earl of Shrewsbury, who became the babe's godfather, and after whom he was named. At fifteen he matriculated at Trinity College, Oxford, graduated B.A. in 1617, and M.A. 1620. Two years later he was elected Fellow of All Souls, and was ordained. Lord Coventry, Keeper of the Great Seal, appointed him his chaplain, gave him a prebend at Gloucester, and recommended him for his general ability and knowledge of politics to Charles I. The King gave him the vicarage of Hackney, and he also received the livings of Oddington, Ickford, and Newington (Oxon). In 1634 he took his D.D., and next year was elected Warden of All Souls.

Though belonging to Laud's party in the Church, he was by no means an obedient follower. There is a long and very interesting account in Wood's "Athenæ" of his (unsuccessful) resistance to the Archbishop's nomination of Jeremy Taylor to a Fellowship of All Souls. The King intended to make him Dean of Westminster, but the outbreak of the Civil War stopped this. In the negotiations between King and Parliament he incurred much odium for his uncompromising adherence to the cause of his master; and in 1647 he was ejected from All Souls, and imprisoned for about six months in Oxford, being liberated only on condition that he would neither come within five miles of Oxford nor go to the King in the Isle of Wight. He retired to Snelstone, in Derbyshire, close to his birthplace, where he gave himself to fishing in the river Dove. Izaak Walton says that his skill as a fisherman was "above all others'," and that the poor who dwelt near him reaped the benefit of that skill. Here he remained until the Restoration, constantly subsidising the exiled Charles from his own purse and from collections which he made from his royalist neighbours. A strong indication of his royalist zeal is found in the fact that after the Restoration, when petitions poured in from clergy who had been deprived,[1] most of them referred to Dr. Sheldon for testimony to character and loyalty.

[1] In the Calendar of State Papers there are 143 in August, 1660.

In March, 1660, when the Restoration was seen to be imminent, the Wardenship of All Souls again became vacant, and Sheldon was reinstated. In May Charles II. returned. Sheldon met him at Canterbury, and was from the first high in favour. Juxon was translated from London to Canterbury, and Sheldon succeeded him in London,[1] and was also made chaplain of the Savoy. From that day he was virtually Primate, Juxon being worn out with old age and infirmity. He crowned the King, and married him to Catherine of Braganza.

The ecclesiastical history of this period is not a record to be read with unmixed satisfaction. There can hardly be a more unprofitable speculation at any time than that on what might have been, compared with what is. Whether the steps taken for the peaceful settlement were all wise is a question which every student of the proceedings will judge for himself. This much is certain, that persecution was not confined to one side. Men had not learned the principles of toleration, as events showed.

Much of the trouble that followed must be set down to the character of the King. His vicious life had drawn forth strong remonstrance from Sheldon during the exile, and was a terrible grief now to all pious men. But his falseness also soon made itself felt.

When the Restoration was decided upon there was content, if not actual joy, even with the Independents. When Monk summoned the remains of the Long Parliament to assemble once more, the greater part of them were men who had been opponents of the late King. But their experience had wrought a change; the military despotism of Cromwell had horrified many whose sympathies had been altogether with Hampden, and their congratulations to the coming King were honest and sincere. And whilst their religious foundations were precious to them as ever, much of the old bitterness was gone; they were ready to welcome, as things indifferent and harmless, much that in the days of heart-burning had exasperated them. On the other side, the old Church party, trained in the school of Laud, were warmly attached to the Episcopal form of government and to the Liturgy which had been cast out. The Presbyterians in their hour of victory had persecuted, sometimes with downright brutality.[2] There was little tenderness for them now, even though they saw their error, nor was there in the minds of the nation at large. It is evident from manifold signs that a bitter resentment filled the popular

[1] He was consecrated in Henry VIIth's. Chapel, October 28.
[2] See Perry's "History," pp. 481-483.

mind against the fervid, but narrow, sectarianism which had supplanted the calm and beautiful services of the Prayer-Book. And to all this must fairly be added the hatred of the worldly and profane, who detested the Puritans for the protest they had made against the open irreligion which had found favour among the courtiers and the rich, and had been imitated as usual by their poorer fellow-citizens.

In sending to Charles II. whilst he was waiting in Holland an assurance of their loyalty and of the sincerity of their welcome, the Puritans took the opportunity of stating their views about the religious settlement. Some were reasonable, others not so. They knew that public opinion was strong against them, and the men they sent to represent them, such as Calamy, Reynolds, Manton, were men of learning, piety, moderation; but there was an element of narrowness, too. Charles received them graciously, and it was this perhaps which emboldened them to go further in their demands than was wise or fair. Thus they pleaded that as the Book of Common Prayer had been so long discontinued that many people had never heard it, the King might abstain from using it in the Royal Chapel, and that its use might at furthest be permitted, but not enjoined. The King replied that he thought it the best Liturgy in the world, and did not mean to have his own liberty interfered with; but that for the rest, the point was open to consideration, and for his own part he was not inclined to rigorous measures against other congregations. They requested the disuse of the surplice. Charles replied that he had always been used to it, and considered it a comely garment, but that he would hold it an open question whether it should be enforced universally.

After the Restoration the Puritans again professed their loyalty, and dwelt strongly on their points of agreement. But the bitter exasperation of the High Church party was so evident as they thought of the old intolerance, that moderate Churchmen wrote to the bishops counselling forbearance, and even Sheldon, preaching before the King, took the same line. "Let us," he said, "consider and bemoan one another for what we have mutually done and suffered from each other." It was with the profession of moderation that the King bade the Presbyterians put their proposals in writing, and they did so, stipulating, first, that the document should be taken "without prejudice," as lawyers say, not committing their clients, the great body of Dissenters; and, secondly, that the Church clergy, on their side, should deliver a like statement, stating what concessions they were ready to make. This stipulation unfortunately was not observed, but the Presbyterians put in their paper. They were satisfied, they said, of the lawfulness

of a form of prayer, provided it were consonant with the Word of God. They held that it should not be too tedious on the one hand, nor composed of too short prayers or responses on the other; that it should be as far as possible like the reformed liturgies of the Continent; and that the minister should be allowed a certain license, "that he might make use of his gifts of prayer and exhortation." They held that the Common Prayer-Book was "in some things justly offensive," and needed revision "at the hands of godly, learned, and moderate divines of both persuasions." Ceremonies they were willing to leave to authority, but still requested that kneeling at the Lord's Supper and observance of such holy days as were only of human institution might be made optional; bowing at the name of Jesus and towards altars, and the use of the surplice and the cross in baptism, to be abolished.

The King laid this document before the Bishops, whose reply certainly savoured little of conciliation. The Prayer-Book, they said, was "altogether unexceptionable," and could not be too strictly enjoined, especially considering that ministers already exercised the right of praying extempore before and after the sermon. But they were content that the Liturgy should be reviewed if His Majesty saw fit. As for the ceremonies, they were unwilling to part with any of them; the satisfaction of some private persons should not be allowed to overrule the peace of the Church, and any concessions would only encourage discontent.

This was not promising, and there were some who, like Clarendon, saw that the peace of both Church and State was menaced by the hardness thus displayed. It was evident, too, that the temper of Parliament was rising, and the consciousness of this led the King to issue a Royal Declaration (October, 1660), in which he promised that the whole question should be laid before Convocation and Parliament, and meanwhile no proceedings should be taken against the objectors. The Presbyterians were delighted, and some of the leaders accepted Church preferments. Reynolds was consecrated Bishop of Norwich, and Manton, though he refused the deanery of Rochester, accepted the rectory of St. Paul's, Covent Garden.

A message from the Crown, March 25, 1661, appointed a conference to be held between twelve Bishops on one side and the same number of Presbyterians on the other, with nine coadjutors on each side. It was to meet at the house of the Bishop of London, in the Savoy, and to report within four months. For some unknown reason the first meeting did not take place till April 15. Juxon, as we have said, was too infirm to attend, and Sheldon presided at the meeting. His

name seldom occurs in the discussions, but he was from the first the ruling spirit. At the first meeting he stated that, as the Nonconformists had sought for revision, and not the Bishops, it was incumbent on the former to state what they wanted, and that nothing could be done till they had delivered their exceptions in writing, as well as the additions which they desired. They demurred to this course, which was not, according to their views, a conference at all; but in the end they consented, and commissioned Baxter to draw up the paper.

Burnet charges Sheldon, not altogether unfairly, with having herein set a trap for Baxter. He saw that a big heap of demands would disgust the nation and make the objectors unpopular. If they had been equally sharp-witted, and confined their demands within the limits of a true policy and a tolerant spirit, much might have been conceded. As it was, Baxter was insatiable and narrow. Instead of filling up gaps, he drew up a new form altogether, showing no respect either for primitive models or established customs. This, having with some difficulty obtained the consent of his fellow-religionists, he presented with the request that it should be left open to the clergy to use which of the two they chose. Unhappily there was something of menace in his language. He bade the Bishops "exercise a little charity," not make men offenders by passing laws which their conscience would not allow them to keep, and told them that if they rejected his proposals he should appeal to all the Protestant Churches to judge them. The documents are given in Cardwell, and show that both sides were in angry mood. Certainly the language of Baxter is that of indignation rather than of brotherly conference.

But another factor comes in at this point. The Convention Parliament had been dissolved, and a new House of Commons met in May, 1661. It is known as "the Cavalier Parliament," heart and soul devoted to the King (see Green's "Larger History," iv., pp. 356, 357). The Presbyterians had sunk to a handful of fifty members. All idea of concession to them was treated with scorn, and before the conference could even report, a Bill of Uniformity was introduced, enjoining the use of the old Book pure and simple. Ten days before the allotted four months expired the Nonconformists in despair begged for a personal conference. Two days were spent in discussing whether they should have it, then it was conceded. Three members met on each side, and those the most eager and uncompromising. Cosin, the learned Bishop of Durham, proposed that they should write down what they thought absolutely sinful and what they judged inexpedient. But it

was all too late now. Frivolous objections and unreasonable demands on one side prevented concessions which should have been made on the other, and peace and brotherly love were driven away.

The Commons read their Bill of Uniformity the third time on July 9 and sent it up to the Lords. There wiser and calmer counsels prevailed. It was pointed out that the King had announced his intention of referring the Prayer-Book to Convocation, and on this ground the Bill was dropped. Convocation had already met (May 8); Sheldon had opened it under commission from the aged Primate.[1]

The first Session was largely occupied with providing the service for Adult Baptism, rendered necessary in consequence of a generation having grown up many of whom had never been baptized. Then the revised Prayer Book was taken in hand (November and December, 1661). The House accepted the Book just as Convocation had passed it, though the proposed alterations were discussed first. An official copy was ordered to be prepared under the supervision of Dr. Sancroft.

Such was the final revision of the Book of Common Prayer, until we come to the new Lectionary of 1872. The details of the revision of the Savoy Conference must be read elsewhere. On the whole, it was unfavourable to the Puritan party (see Perry's "Student's Church History," p. 500). Then the Parliament passed the Act of Uniformity, which enforced the use of the Book in all public worship, required an unfeigned consent and assent to all which was contained in it, and required every minister who had not been episcopally ordained to be so at once. St. Bartholomew's Day, August 24, 1662, was the last day of grace to those who failed on these points. From 1,500 to 2,000 Presbyterian ministers chose the alternative of deprivation. They preached their farewell sermons on the previous Sunday. Many of them were both learned and pious, and the loss of such men could not be without evil. But the young squires who passed the Act could not forget how their fathers had been used for their loyalty, and how, to use Mr. Green's words, "the solemn petitions of the Book of Common Prayer, the words which had rung like sweet chimes

[1] Baxter complains of a piece of sharp practice of Sheldon against him. A curious anomaly (which exists still) in the Diocese of London directed that each archdeaconry should elect two proctors, and that out of this body the Bishop should select two to serve. The City chose Baxter and Calamy; Sheldon passed them both over, and so, as Baxter said, "the City had no representative." He also complains that those ministers who had not received episcopal ordination were not allowed to vote in the elections. Burnet says that Sheldon and Morley, Bishop of Winchester, overbore everything in the management of the elections.

in their ears from their first childhood, had been banned from every village church as accursed things. It had been only by stealth and at home that the cross could be signed on the brow of the babe brought to be christened. Hardly by stealth had it been possible to bury their dead with the words of pathetic hope which have so often brought comfort to the ears of mourners." And further, there was the conviction in the heart of the nation that episcopacy was of the very essence of ecclesiastical order and discipline. There can be no question that the country at large approved of the result. The City of London welcomed Sheldon on his first Visitation as Primate with bands of music and volleys of cannon.

We cannot but admit that the course thus taken, necessary though it may have been, isolated the Church of England. The severance from Rome on one side remains as it has done from the days of Elizabeth, and the insistence on Episcopal Ordination severs us from the Protestant Communions on the Continent. But the longing for the reunion of Christendom was perhaps never stronger than it is at this moment.

On June 4, 1663, Juxon died, and Sheldon was nominated by the King as his successor. Evelyn gives an interesting account of the Confirmation on August 31, "the mace-bearers in procession, eight Bishops, the Lord Mayor and sheriffs, the Dean of Arches, divers advocates in scarlet." The Archbishop was "in a private room looking into the chapel [it is the present vestry], and the Bishops sat in chairs round a table placed before the altar." When the ceremony was completed, he goes on to say, "This done, we all went to dinner in the great hall, to a mighty feast."

When Sheldon's life is viewed as a whole, it would be unjust to deny to him the character of a good and pious man. Burnet speaks of him disparagingly, but Burnet was a strenuous Whig, and Sheldon was a strenuous "Church and King" man. Here are Burnet's words: "Sheldon was esteemed a learned man before the war; but he was now engaged so deep in politics that scarce any prints of what he had been remained. He was a very dexterous man in business, had a great quickness of apprehension, and a very true judgment. He was a generous and charitable man. He had a great pleasantness of conversation—perhaps too great. He had an art that was peculiar to him of treating all who came to him in a most obliging manner; but few depended much on his professions of friendship. He seemed not to have a deep sense of religion, if any at all, and spoke of it most commonly as of an engine of government, and a matter of policy. By this means the King came to look on him as a wise and honest clergyman" ("History of his own Times," i., 247). It would be easy to

draw from contemporary records proof of the untruthfulness of this portrait. Sheldon hated unreality and canting professions, and sometimes spoke against them with sharpness (see Burrows' "Worthies of All Souls," p. 251). But Charles I. had a very high reverence for his religious principles, and it was he who brought back Chillingworth from Romanism, into which he had lapsed. He had a most difficult task in reconstructing the Church after the troubles, and was no doubt a man of strong convictions. But his influence with the King went down because he not only rebuked him for his scandalous life, but (according to Burnet himself) refused him the Sacrament. At the time of the Great Plague of 1665 he remained in London the whole time, was unceasing in his labours to relieve distress, and begged money from all the Bishops of his province for the same object. In 1667 he was elected Chancellor of the University of Oxford, with only one dissentient voice. He held the office for two years, then, pleading his "crazy head and infirm health," he resigned, and his nominee—the Duke of Ormond—was chosen as his successor. His great love for his University took practical shape when he built the noble Sheldonian Theatre for the annual "Acts" (now called "Commemorations") which had previously been held in St. Mary's Church. So much scandal was caused by the ribaldry and profanation which went on at these times that he took this step for the prevention of sacrilege (Burrows, p. 227). It is an additional feather in Sheldon's cap that he fixed on a man for his architect previously unknown—Christopher Wren. Sheldon contributed a large sum to the rebuilding of St. Paul's after the Fire. We have not space to tell how bravely he fought against corrupt practices connected with the elections to All Souls Fellowships, in some of which the King himself was concerned.

Sheldon's Registers contain some interesting instructions which he issued to the Bishops of his province with a view of raising the standard of clerical character. Thus, on July 7, 1665, he writes to all the Bishops, urging them to be very careful whom they admit to Holy Orders, not to ordain any man out of their own diocese without license of the Archbishop. Each Bishop is "within 30 days after the Feast of the Annunciation of our Blessed Lady St. Mary the Virgin" to send the Archbishop the names, degrees, titles and orders of all men ordained by him within the year ending Candlemas last. Then, concerning pluralities: before next Lady-Day each Bishop is to send full particulars of each man holding more than one benefice or ecclesiastical dignity, with or without cure, whether in the same or in different dioceses; the distances between such preferments; the tenure on which they hold

them; where they reside; whether they keep and maintain able, orthodox and conformable curates upon the benefices in which they do not reside; the names and degrees of such curates; and whether they be properly licensed. And, concerning lecturers: a list is to be sent of "lectures sett up," and of the lecturers filling them; "names, degrees and qualities"; whether they are lawfully licensed by the Bishop, and how they appear affected to the Government of His Majesty and the doctrine and discipline of the Church. He also requires a return of all free-schools in each diocese; where and by whom founded, and how endowed; the names and degrees of the master and ushers; "and also the names, sirnames and degrees of all other publique schoolmasters and ushers or Instructors and Teachers of youth in reading, writing, grammer or other literature and whether they be lycenced and by whome. As allsoe of all publique mistresses of Schools and instructors and teachers of young maydes or women, and of all other men or women that keep scholleres in their houses to board or soiourn and privately teach them or others within their houses"; and whether these teachers regularly attend Church, or cause their scholars to do so; and whether they appear well affected to Government and Church. Then he goes on to call for a return of the "names, sirnames, degrees and qualities of all practisers of physicke" in each diocese, "whether they be lycensed and by whom and whether they too are well affected," etc. And lastly, he inquires concerning Nonconformist ministers, the names and degrees of all "who have been ejected from ecclesiastical Benefices for Nonsubscription and Inconformity." If any have moved from one diocese to another, the fact is to be returned (Sheldon's Register, p. 206).

Here is another interesting circular which he issued to all the Bishops of his province in February, 1664. It deserves to be chronicled, as it is perhaps the first episcopal recognition of the need of spiritual care for our navy, which was now rising to its full importance. He calls on the Bishops "to find out and procure for the King's service two or more able clergymen, beneficed or not beneficed, such as in your judgment, as well for their good doctrine and preaching as for their sobriety of life and discretion, you shall think most apt and fit to be employed" as chaplains for the ships of the fleet about to sail, under the command of the Duke of York. "In doing this," he continues, "you will do God and His Church good service, and pay an acceptable duty to his Majesty. And for the encouragement of such as shall be willing to undertake this employment, you are to let them know that whatsoever they hold already in the Church shall be secured unto them notwithstanding their absence. And

after their return, as His Majesty recommends it to your Lordship's consideration, to reserve such benefices and promotions for them as shall be in your dispose and according as you shall think them capable. So likewise are you to assure them of His Majesty's favour in having such livings and preferments as shall fall in His Majesty's gift, according as they shall be found to have demeaned themselves and deserved in this service. When you have found out the persons, you are to give me notice as soon as may be of their names and states, and how they may be sent to, that, they being ready, I may know how to send for them to attend his Majesty's order. If any person whom you shall think fit for this employment shall, without apparent good reason, refuse or show their unwillingness to it, you are likewise to signify these names that such course may be taken with them as to His Majesty and his Council may seem good." Here let us note that with the co-operation of Clarendon Sheldon took from Convocation the right of the clergy to rate themselves. From that time they were rated with the rest of the community.

That Sheldon was very severe on the Nonconformists, or at any rate on their principles, can hardly be disputed. But he rather lagged behind the House of Commons in this respect. In 1662 the King wanted to be entrusted with a "dispensing power," such as should enable him to give more license to the Nonconformists. Parliament declared against it. He issued a Declaration of Indulgence in spite of this, and the House of Commons declared that it was encouraging schism and nullifying the Act of Uniformity. The clergy sent up a host of petitions against it, and in consequence, in 1664, Parliament passed the Conventicle Act, which enacted that every person above sixteen who should be present at any religious service other than that of the Church of England should be liable to fine, and in case of second and third offences, to imprisonment and to transportation. According to Baxter, this Act was not really put in force except as regards Quakers and Baptists. The King was angry, especially as he was known to be favourable to toleration of the Roman Catholics, and from that time he was bitter against the Bishops and clergy. But Parliament remained firm, and during the Great Plague, whilst they were sitting at Oxford, the "Five Mile Act" was passed, by which all Nonconformist ministers were required to make oath that "it is not lawful on any pretence to take up arms against the King" . . . and that they would not at any time endeavour any alteration in Church or State. If they refused, they might not come within five miles of any place where they had been ministers. Sheldon

strenuously supported this Act. He believed it would be the deathblow of political Nonconformity, the strength of which lay in the market-towns. And it would seem also that he believed that the taking the oath would secure them against molestation. It was the conduct of these Nonconformists during the Great Plague that did so much to turn the tide of public opinion. When some of the Church clergy fled from the stricken city many of the Dissenting came thither, and yielded up their lives in their pious ministrations. We have seen how Sheldon himself remained bravely. But for a while there was no sign of relaxation. A second Conventicle Act was passed in 1670, Sheldon again approving, in the belief that it would "promote the welfare of the Church and the happiness of the whole kingdom." The King secretly encouraged this Act, because he saw that it would be unpopular, and that it would give him more ground for the Declaration of Indulgence on which he had set his heart. He issued it on March 15, 1672. It suspended all penalties against Dissenters and Romanists, allowing them to hold their services in private houses. But the House of Commons sternly passed a resolution that the King's prerogative could not repeal Acts of Parliament, and they passed a Test Act requiring Roman Catholics to receive the Holy Communion according to the Anglican use before accepting any civil or military office.

This was the great turning-point. From this time onwards the Commons, seeing that the Roman party were being favoured, and that the grievances of the Nonconformists were a strength to these, passed a Bill giving them toleration, with certain safeguards. It might have brought peace, but when it was sent up to the Lords they rejected it, led by the Bishops. Thus began a fresh cleavage between the Church and the House of Commons. Titus Oates, by his ghastly perjuries, fed the rising flame, and the attempt of the Commons to exclude the Duke of York from the succession, on the ground that he was a Roman Catholic, was a most ominous sign of the times. The rank and file of the clergy, too, and the Nonconformists, showed strong signs of making common cause. Baxter was one of the leaders of a party who were desirous of finding a basis of union. The rise of the "Cambridge Platonists" was owing to the same influence; men of learning and piety—Whichcote and Henry More, joined by Stillingfleet, Tillotson, Patrick in London, all great names—set themselves to exalt piety and charity above tests and rigid conformity. The writings of some of them are very beautiful, and breathe a spirit which finds place in the minds of all modern religious men. But there was a snare in this. They

were nicknamed "Latitudinarians," and the name stuck. They were followed eagerly by men who had not their piety and genuineness—men who looked only on the hope of indifferentism and slackness in religious duty.

Sheldon was now an old man. The earnest friendship between him and Clarendon, which had been maintained unbroken for half a century, in adverse and prosperous times alike, was brought to an end by Clarendon's death, in exile, in 1674. In his will the famous statesman bequeathed all his papers to his sons, to be used by them as Sheldon and Morley of Winchester should advise; and with simple pathos he besought the two prelates to commend his children to the King, as "having all possible need of his Majesty's charity, being children of a father who never committed fault against his Majesty." The result of this advice was that the great "History of the Rebellion," now one of our classics, was withheld from publication. This was wise. Too many persons were implicated. It was published in the time of Queen Anne, and produced a profound effect.

The old Primate was indefatigable to the last. One of his last letters was written to exhort a negligent and non-resident Bishop to a better discharge of his duty. Here is his will, which I take from Professor Burrows' "Worthies of All Souls," he having printed it for the first time:

"I, Gilbert Sheldon, Archbishop of Canterbury, being in good health of body and sound and perfect in memory and understanding (God be praised for it), doe make and ordaine this my last Will and Testament in manner and forme following. First I recommend my soule into the mercifull hands of my gracious Redeemer, my only Lord, Saviour and Master, Jesus Christ, relying wholly upon His goodness and mercy for my salvation, giving Him most humble thanks for calling mee by His gospel and grace to His knowledge and obedience, abhorring all sects, sidings and tyranny in religion, holding fast the true orthodox profession of the Catholique faith of Christ, foretold by the prophets, and preached to the world by Christ Himself, His blessed Apostles and their successors, being a true member of His Catholique Church within the Communion of a living part thereof, the present Church of England, desiring God to confirme me in this faith, and in all Christian charity and His holy feare to my lives end. My body I desire may be devoutly buried, but very privately and speedily, that my funerall may not wast much of what I leave behind me for better uses."

He died at Lambeth November 9, 1677, and was buried at Croydon. The Episcopal Palace there had during his last years been his principal residence. He was never married,

and died very poor. But he had spent on good works for the Church £72,000, having come into some family property late in life, and some portion of his money was given to good men who had "been deprived under the Act" of 1662. There are two portraits of him in Lambeth Palace, representing him as tall and thin, with a high colour and a small, dark moustache, the whole aspect severe, almost repellent, marking stern self-reliance.

W. BENHAM.

(To be continued.)

ART. II.—A WELSH CLERGYMAN'S REMINISCENCES.

I HAVE been spared to see and help to celebrate two Jubilees of the Queen's reign. Had Her Gracious Majesty reigned as long as I have lived, and the interval between the two Jubilees been taken as a precedent, we should have had three such commemorations. The two we have kept were naturally calculated to invoke the siren Memory; it is not strange, therefore, that at each commemoration I intended to recall and put on record, were it only for my own satisfaction and the satisfaction of those immediately around me, some of the more notable events that transpired during the period of which the Jubilee formed a climax, offering as each did a vantage-ground for a compendious review. But both commemorations passed by and left my purpose still unaccomplished. But now, again, when standing so much further away from the actual scenes, and so much nearer to the frontier line of oblivion and eternal silence, but with greater leisure and facilities for the undertaking, the intention revives, and I venture here on the task of recounting a few of my reminiscences.

My first reference shall be to the agitation which convulsed the country at the time of the Reform debate. This had invaded the seclusion of my humble and remote native place. The House of Lords had rejected the first Parliamentary Reform Bill, and Earl Grey's Ministry had appealed to the constituencies. The scene on the day of the Election with us made such an impression on me that it still vividly recurs to my memory. My mother had pinned an orange rosette on my breast, and I was taken down to the adjoining townlet, where, amidst a large and excited crowd, and the discordant cries of the rival parties, I could point to my rosette with the pride of an eager partisan. Orange was the colour of the Tories, and blue of the Whigs. The term "Conservative" was then unknown, being subsequently coined and used as the substitute for that of Tory by Sir Robert Peel, whilst the

word "Radical," although bandied about in the English manufacturing districts, was equally unfamiliar to us. Having been accustomed to orange as the symbol of the Tory party from my earliest years, I was surprised to read later on in one of Bulwer Lytton's novels that true blue was the orthodox tint, but when I went to live in Monmouthshire I found that party colours varied in different counties, blue being there also the Tory and red the Radical colour. It was also observed at the Election that the more enterprising, and probably the more intelligent, portion of the community was on the side of reform, whilst the poll was overborne and triumphantly carried by the stanchness of the tenants to their landlords, who were almost to a man anti-reformers. The wealthy and large-acred men lived in great comfort and wielded immense social and political power, and would naturally look askance on any revolutionary changes. And yet by opposing reform they shook society to its very foundation. The restricted and capricious distribution of the franchise was glaringly unjust, and could no longer be maintained without a civil war. This was averted by the wise and timely submission of the House of Peers to the will of the nation.

Whilst the last-mentioned day was marked by considerable tumult and variance, the next memorable day in connection with any public event displayed a perfect unanimity of feeling and produced one common outburst of joy and festivity. I can look back on the first Sunday when *Gwilym y Pedwerydd* (William IV.) ceased to be prayed for, and Queen Victoria succeeded as the appointed subject for public devotions. And it seems but the other day when, a wee toddling thing, securely held in my father's strong and loving hand, I witnessed the illuminations which celebrated her accession to the throne. Our little townlet was illuminated, at the particular request of the mayor, by each occupier of a house placing a lighted candle in every pane in the windows. And the reader may rest assured that this simple contrivance made a wonderfully brave and effective show.

I was still very young when the country was again in the throes of a violent commotion. This was occasioned by the menacing attitude of the Chartists, and their daring attack on Newport, Monmouthshire. Chartism, no doubt, was the reflux wave of the turbulent era of Reform, and owed its growth and wide prevalence partly to the irritation arising from the Reform measure not having gone far enough to please men of extreme views, and partly to the disappointment of those who had hoped that, unsatisfactory as it was in some of its details, it would yet effectually curb the power of the privileged families, and abridge the area of public corruption.

But though some substantial grievances remained in the late legislative enactment, and the desire to remove them met with the sympathy of the intelligent part of the community, yet when the Chartists proceeded to acts of violence, they were sternly and speedily put down. On the fourth day of November, 1839, some thousands of resolute and well-armed men marched down from the Welsh hills to Newport, but they were easily dispersed by a handful of soldiers. I well remember the Sunday when it was understood that the Chartists would be on their way to the town, and their purpose formed a covert topic of conversation in our circle. In those days Merthyr and Dowlais and the surrounding coal and iron district were the refuge of the unsettled and lawless classes. Several of this character, whom I personally knew, and who had been implicated in riotous proceedings in our June Fair, had left our neighbourhood and gone to seek employment at what was familiarly known as "the Works" (*y Gweithfeydd*), and through them an intimation had found its way to our place that the Chartist rising would commence on that particular Sunday evening. The night proved exceptionally wet and stormy, and it was hoped among us that the contemplated rising would not take place. But in a day or two we were informed that it had been actually made, but proved abortive. One noticeable result of this deplorable display of the ignorance and heedless temerity of the lower Welsh classes was the famous Government Commission which was soon after issued for investigating the social and moral condition of the Principality. The Commissioners' Report contained some erroneous inferences, and employed a plainness and vigour of language which a wider acquaintance with the country would doubtless have modified; but emanating in an unexpected form, and from strangers, and acting on a sensitive and impulsive people, it gave great offence. The Blue Books (*y Llypangleision*) became the target for the invectives of patriots who loved their country not wisely, but too well. Notwithstanding the clamour raised against them, they exposed some serious defects in the habits of our people, and in the relations between the employed and their employers, and were not unfruitful of beneficent results. They led to better and more considerate treatment of the mining population, and to the sanitary and educational measures that have been subsequently taken for the amelioration of the toiling masses.

Having now reached the period when I left my native home, and never resided there again except for brief intervals, I here pause for the purpose of letting the mind dwell for a moment on the place and its inhabitants. The place was

situated on the wild but romantic coast of Pembrokeshire, on which, as is well known, are still found two different nationalities, and two spoken languages. In our district we prided ourselves on the fact that Welsh was our mother tongue, and that the purity of race and language remained uncontaminated and unbroken among us—I might indeed add another and a more valid, though less paraded, subject of commendation, the kindly, unsophisticated manners and pure morals of an ideal olden time which prevailed there. For, with very few exceptions, the residents were unquestionably sober, honest, industrious, thrifty, hospitable, manly in bearing, independent in spirit and sincerely religious. It must be confessed that the circle in which we moved was in some important respects restricted, and life in some of its aspects uninviting and monotonous. The defective side was the intellectual; probably it was also weak and poor in recreative resources. We knew but of one newspaper, the *Carmarthen Journal*, which was a weekly one; and though the population of the parish was upwards of fourteen hundred, it was taken in only by the Rector and the leading innkeeper. A few dozen books would be reckoned a considerable library in any home, and the fifteen miles between us and the county town a formidable distance to traverse. There were old inhabitants, I am sure, in the place who had never travelled so far as that in their lives. In the light and with the experience of modern facilities for locomotion, and the ceaseless activity to which we have been accustomed since, it is hard to conceive how such a slow and colourless mode of living could have been at all borne. But we were a contented and unrepining set of folks nevertheless; and I am not certain but that the staple, the main material of life, plain and simple as it was, did not contain as great an apportionment of innocent happiness as falls to the lot of the present restless, anxious, competitive, and over-sensitive generation. And yet we who lived in those early years of Her Majesty's reign, when at the extremities of the body politic the pulse beat but slowly and intermittently—we, too, were not destitute of sources of animated interest, which stirred the otherwise stagnant current. One of these would be the prevailing taste for literary essays, chiefly in a poetical form, to which the Welsh language, no less by its strenuous and strident accents than by its true native melody, seemed to lend itself with great facility. The productiveness in this field, and the high pitch of excellence attained, were surprising, especially considering the humble condition of the writers. I know of no parallel case anywhere except perhaps in the Lowlands of Scotland, and in the time of Burns and his peasant compeers. But

what gave its prevailing tone to life, and proved its mainspring in motive and action, was more or less connected with religion. An eloquent preacher never failed to draw a large and eager audience, and supply ample means for quickening and stimulating the mind, and forming a standard of public excellence, and holding up an object of ambition for young men of conduct and talent, as well as for affording opportunities for discussion and the interchange of opinion among us.

Having now mentioned some intellectual inconveniences under which we laboured in those far-off days, and by comparison indicated the beneficial changes that have occurred since, let me refer to other disadvantages, and to our obligations to science in their removal. I do not refer to the application of steam-power to new spheres of labour, to electricity, photography, or the telephone, nor to the later discovery—the Röntgen rays. These receive due recognition, and are confessed to have rendered the present reign illustrious for all time. But I would speak of some less conspicuous gifts of science to the service of man. These perhaps lie in an humbler domain, and secure a slenderer meed of admiration, but they, too, are indeed invaluable. The invention of the lucifer match must be reckoned as one of these. In my youth I often expended a good deal of time and temper in trying to light my morning fire in my study with a flint and steel bar, which was in the form of a horse-shoe. How easily now is this part of domestic economy performed by means of the phosphorated match! Who can estimate the amount of suffering alleviated by chloroform? And what an amount of pleasure and healthy recreation has been conferred on both sexes by the bicycle! And even by the steel pen, such as I now hold in my hand, and which has succeeded the goose-quill of my early days, how much irksome labour has been spared us, and the task of writing made comparatively easy! In another direction, is it not simply a marvel, as well as a blessing of the first importance, the advancement made in general knowledge by means of the penny postage, the reduction in the price of the best literature, and the universality of the daily newspaper! These have not only informed and moulded public opinion, and immeasurably added to the public stock of intellectual enjoyment, but have also knit together the different parts of the United Kingdom in a way that was never done before, and are not unlikely to be the means of bringing all nations into sympathy and friendly relations with each other, and thus hastening the coming of the predicted Divine kingdom of peace and goodwill among men.

The disturbances which happened at that time in Cardigan-

shire and Carmarthenshire may, as well as the Chartist riots of which we have spoken, be also ascribed to the successful Reform period, when the common people began to feel their strength, and learnt the lesson that no means for redressing grievances and removing oppressive burdens were so prompt and efficacious as self-help. These disturbances were known as the work of "Rebecca and her daughters." It was currently reported at the time, and no more satisfactory explanation has been given since, that this odd appellation derived its origin from Gen. xxiv. 60: "And they blessed Rebekah, and said unto her, Thou art our sister; be thou the mother of thousands of millions, and let thy seed possess the *gate* of those which hate them."

The rioters were young men of the agricultural class. These would disguise themselves in female attire, and in the long autumn and winter nights would assemble in large numbers, and set themselves to destroy all the toll-gates in the vicinity. Their proceedings at first undoubtedly enlisted the sympathy of their countrymen. However fair in theory, in practice the old system of toll-gates, unreasonably numerous as they were, and many of them placed in invidious positions, were extremely vexatious and oppressive. But unfortunately the gatherings for their removal proceeded to acts of personal violence and wanton destruction of private property. The soldiery was summoned, and the supremacy of the law vindicated in the punishment of the ringleaders. I happened to reside then close to a public road which led to several gates, and used to listen in my bed at night to the tramping of bands of stalwart men, whose steady and regulated tread was singularly impressive, but who otherwise passed by in deep silence to the scenes of their nefarious doings. Remembering the general tranquillity and peaceful disposition of the great majority of the inhabitants of those parts, who were really more amused than alarmed by the "daughters of Rebecca," I find it strange that such a grave and philosophic seignior as Bishop Thirlwall, in his palace at Abergwili, should have written in that autumn to a correspondent: "There is here, on the one side, perfect impunity from the law, on the other no protection from outrage. In fact, nobody who has anything to lose considers either his property or his life as secure."[1] This wild and unwarranted language of so able and great a man is surely an exemplification of the poet's satire when he speaks of "fears of the brave and follies of the wise." It may be added that ultimately and by a gradual and peaceful process the turnpikes were everywhere abolished.

[1] Bishop Thirlwall's "Letters," p. 188.

I do not know of any existing at the present moment in South Wales.

The next incident I shall mention as forming an era in our annals was the conflict between Protection and Free Trade. In the result it revolutionized our commercial policy; and in the course of the debate in Parliament produced protagonists of transcendent powers, one of whom displayed unsuspected resources as an oratorical athlete, and in the course of the fray emerged from comparative obscurity to become the leader of an old historic party, and one of the most shining examples of success in the political sphere by dint of sheer ability.

The agitation into which the country was thrown was unparalleled. All the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the country was filled with bitterness and strife. So many and intricate were the interests at stake, and so rancorous the feelings evoked, that the evangelical prediction seemed to be literally fulfilled: "Brother betrayed brother, and children rose up against their parents."[1] The manufacturing influence was undeniably strong and rapidly growing stronger, and threatening to become at no distant date predominant; whilst the landed interest, with its long prescription of power, its natural dislike of change, and all the hatred of the outgoing occupier for the destined supplanter, resolutely faced its antagonist, and disdained to yield without a long and severe struggle. The Free Traders got their majority in the constituencies and won the position; and the position then captured must no doubt be taken as irrevocable, at all events so far as any at present can forecast the future.

As in the physical world there are certain days in early spring, with their mild sunshine, bursting buds, and balmy breezes, which seem to tell that the winter is past and the summer at hand, so in the case of a nation—it may be of the human race at large—there are certain halcyon seasons which form a striking contrast to the trouble and turbulence of the past, and promise the speedy advent of general peace and unbroken progress. And though the glad and ardent period of youth may in my case have unconsciously coloured the scene, something of the kind seems to have prevailed in the British Isles between the inception of the Free Trade measure and the Crimean campaign. There was at that time a lull in the jarring elements, a buoyancy and a stir of life in the air,

---

[1] In this election Lord Lincoln stood for Newark in defiance of his father's wishes and political views; and a Somerset led the revolt in Monmouthshire against the long uncontested influence of the House of Beaufort.

and a lofty hopefulness in every breast. The increase of material wealth proceeded at an unexampled pace; the mastery gained over natural forces and the discovery of new motive powers whetted the desire and fed the hopes of the nation for yet greater commercial and scientific achievements. Intellectual activity was no less general and fruitful. Macaulay wrote his History; Dickens, Thackeray, and Charlotte Brontë their most famous novels; Tennyson and Browning their choicest poems; Carlyle established his fame; Darwin was known to be carrying on his researches; the Pre-Raphaelites were giving assurance of their coming triumph in the realm of Art, and the periodical press showed at its best. Nor was this unprecedented advance checked by the startling series of Revolutionary movements on the Continent. These served rather as a foil to our own insular security and progress, to which the Great Exhibition seemed to set its seal and consecration. The spirit of the nation never rose higher than then, nor did the future ever look brighter. And yet at that moment we were on the eve of an outbreak of a succession of wars which were never exceeded in the costliness of armaments, the wholesale destruction of human life, or, as their immediate results, in the intensity and wide prevalence of rancorous and vindictive feelings among the different nations of Europe. And at present we perceive no sign that this eruption of warlike spirit and the era of mutual slaughter is abating and coming to a close, unless the Czar's recent action in favour of a return to counsels of peace be taken as such.

I may insert here the record of a day spent in Pembrokeshire in the year 1859. I venture to do so inasmuch as I happened to mark the rising, and felt the full force, of the storm which caused the loss of the *Royal Charter*. I was then on my return from a brief holiday, and engaged to go and visit the Rector of Laurenny. I left my Welsh home for this purpose early in the morning of October 25 in the above year. When the day dawned the weather was perfectly calm, without the slightest portent of any coming change. Before long the sky darkened, and beneath its sullen, leaden look the sea seemed to gloom and become increasingly uneasy. The clouds lay in low thick lines, the sun struggling against the accumulating obstruction, but only succeeding in casting a lurid gleam here and there on the troubled waters. Early in the afternoon the storm broke, and by the time the Ferry at Nayland, opposite the Pembroke Dock, was reached, it was at the utmost risk that any boat could venture to cross. At Pembroke Dock a vehicle was secured, and the journey to Laurenny commenced, but so great was the fury of the tempest that we were forced to return. At the hotel where

we put up we were all disturbed at midnight by the officers of the regiment quartered in the vicinity rushing in for shelter, with the information that their tents and all their soldiers' huts were blown down and clean swept away. It was indeed a night to be remembered for the unparalleled fury of the elements and the waste of life and property on sea and land. We heard next day that the *Royal Charter*, a steamship on her way from Port Phillip to Liverpool, with over 500 sailors and passengers on board, and gold nuggets worth a million in specie, was thrown that night on the iron-bound coast of Anglesea and totally wrecked. After a long and prosperous voyage, and when fondly expecting to reach the "desired haven" in a few hours, all on board were drowned, fast by their native shore, with the exception of one man.

We will close these desultory remarks by summing up the most obvious results of our brief retrospect as they relate to Wales. These results unavoidably connect themselves, as might be expected in a world where mutability is the chief element in the counting of time and impressing the memory and replenishing its stores, with various changes arising from growth or decay. The changes may be discerned in many spheres and in countless forms, but they can be conveniently defined as material, social and religious. The physical aspect of the country, as may be safely assumed, has but slightly changed during the last sixty years, and yet it has not remained uniformly the same. We are happily not subject to volcanic disturbances, wide inundations, the gradual accumulation of shifting sand, or accretion of coral, or the wild tornadoes, which in other parts of the world transform the landscape, remove old landmarks, and create new and unexpected scenes. We have with us still the same gray, rounded hills, the green retired valleys, the silvery streams, the purple moorlands, the winding bays, and the sandy beach, all breathing peace and comfort such as our forefathers knew and ourselves have loved for more than half a century. But in the meantime commons have been everywhere enclosed and turned into pasture or ploughland, forests stripped by the woodman's unsparing axe, many a fair spot scarped by the miner's pick, deformed by immense cinder tips, and made to look otherwise than it was by deep embankments, new roads and numerous bridges, necessitated by the endless branches of railways among us. And while some old country towns have remained stagnant, and many rural parishes been partly denuded of inhabitants, towns like Cardiff, Swansea, Llanelly and Pontypridd have come to the front, and in spacious and stately streets and sumptuous edifices are not a whit behind the large and wealthy towns of England; and places also like the Rhondda and Ogmore

valleys, which were formerly the haunts of a few shepherds, dwelling in rude huts, are now lined with rows after rows of decent cottages, and teeming with myriads of busy and intelligent men. And so great is the demand for Welsh coal, and the corresponding effort to supply it, as well as the creation of new facilities for every department of trade, that we see at present no limit to the marvellous advance we have lived to witness.

The wide range and deep significance of this national prosperity may be perhaps best gauged by the improvement which has taken place in the condition of the labouring classes. Whilst their wages have been doubled, their habitations better fitted for rational beings to live in, their food in the main become much cheaper, and equal in quality to the food of the higher classes of the previous generations, the objectionable practices of which they complained as only calculated to enrich the employer at their own expense, such as the truck system, have been abolished, and praiseworthy efforts made everywhere to apply the best skill in the promotion of sanitary measures, while in their habits they have become more provident and self-controlled, and less addicted to low and gross sports and pursuits. Perhaps the vice which clings the longest, and may be still considered the prevailing blemish, is drunkenness. But even this, under the persistent efforts of temperance advocates, the elevating and counteracting influence of education and the operation of the Sunday Closing Act (though it must be added, in a parenthesis, this last cause is still a debatable point) seems to give way, and before long sobriety may characterize the lower as it has for so many years characterized the higher orders of society.

No subject directly bearing on the welfare of a nation has made such rapid progress among us as that of education. Though the initial start was taken many years before, the advanced stage in which we at present find it was but recently reached. In the first quarter of the century the deplorable destitution of the means of public instruction led to the establishment of the National Society and the British School Institution. But laudable as were their efforts, these could only act on a few isolated spots, and those the most favourable specimens of their class, and from local influences the easiest to be cultivated. With regard to the community at large, the partial and desultory attempts of the two Societies only showed the more palpably the dark surrounding wastes which still remained untilled and untouched. Mr. John Foster and others of a kindred spirit did yeoman service by directing attention to popular ignorance, and Lord Brougham and other patriotic men appealed repeatedly to Parliament to close with the

evil and set itself to its removal. A small grant of a few thousand pounds was made for this purpose, in the reign of William IV. That small Parliamentary grant has gradually risen to many millions of pounds in the year, and the whole United Kingdom has been supplied with the means of a sound elementary education. But what more particularly concerns us here is our own position with regard to higher education. Whilst every other part of the kingdom was very sufficiently supplied with institutions for its promotion, Wales was left destitute and neglected. But on a widespread revival of a spirit of patriotism among us, fostered and guided by leading Welshmen who possessed their countrymen's confidence, we have been lately provided, besides St. David's College at Lampeter, with three other colleges—those of Aberystwith, Bangor and Cardiff—which have been since formed into one degree-conferring university. And in addition, and as a crowning boon, we have been supplied with a system of intermediate schools, which should serve for the more talented and aspiring pupils as stepping-stones to a course of collegiate training.

The next subject to notice, and it shall be the last, is religion. This must be acknowledged to be one of great significance, were it merely regarded as the high-water mark of advancing civilization; but it is, moreover, the only guarantee of the security of our present proud position, and the inspirer of any hope we may cherish of future progress. To attempt an estimate of our condition in any essential respect and leave this out of our calculation would be like the attempt to find out and comprehend our geographical situation without a knowledge of the bearings of the cardinal points of the compass. All would be vague and bewildering unless we knew how we relatively stood to the east and west, the north and the south. But all-important as is the subject of religion, our reference to it here must be necessarily brief. This is of less moment when it is considered that our experience in the Principality is almost precisely analogous to that in England. What affects the one affects the other, and the same survey could be applied to both. This holds good with regard to the two great movements which are popularly known as the Evangelical and Oxford Movements. In the object aimed at, the infusion of fresh life and a new access of enthusiasm in the ecclesiastical sphere, both have been remarkably successful. Although the one is already sixty years old and the other one hundred and sixty, whatever occasional appearances of languor may show themselves, neither of the two movements has spent itself or lost the ardour of its first love, and the fruits of such an unflagging zeal are perceptible everywhere around us. But it must be admitted that the Oxford or Tractarian Move-

ment has not succeeded in obtaining anything like the same hold on the middle and lower classes as the Evangelical.

With regard to Nonconformists, they have also during the whole period covered by the two Jubilees been conspicuously active; and at the present moment, so far as visible results are concerned, do not stand so much behind Churchmen as some would have us believe. Misdeeming the signs of the times, and misled by their own enthusiastic spirit, the conveners of ecclesiastical coteries may be pardoned for speaking of the wonderful progress of the Church, and anticipating the extinction of the surrounding sects. They seem to imagine that the walls of Jericho will fall at a blast, and the promised land be reached by leaps and bounds. To all who have witnessed the strides made by the Church of late years in order to regain the ground lost through the remissness of former generations, her progress indeed is too patent to be questioned. But there is such a thing as a false confidence and erroneous assumptions, and we would do well to discount the triumphant anticipations of a sanguine and overweening temper. In some rural parishes and populous centres, in seasons of agricultural and commercial depression of trade, and consequent dislocation of labour, the Dissenting system has been unable to stand the stress and successfully cope with the situation, otherwise the evidence adduced of the rapid and general decline of Nonconformity cannot be accepted as satisfactory. Its adherents are still a force to be counted as being in actual possession of a most extensive patrimonial domain, and doing their utmost to retain and enlarge it. If their hold on the higher classes has always been slight, and the general diffusion of advanced knowledge threatens still further to weaken it, it must be admitted that they have lost little, if any, of their old power for attracting and influencing the common people. Whatever deductions we might make at another time, and in a more critical mood—and assuredly candour in its least censorious temper could not fail to advert to some serious shortcomings—we would here gratefully record the conviction that their power has been hitherto most beneficially used for the moral and religious welfare of our common country.

JOHN MORGAN.

Llanilid.

Art. III.—CHAPTERS I. and II. OF THE "POLYCHROME ISAIAH."

THE appearance last year (1898) of the "Polychrome Isaiah" in England must have given a shock to many lovers of the Bible. They could not but ask, "If this is the result of 'the ripest biblical scholarship of the present generation,' what will the next generation do?" Only a fraction of Isaiah is left as belonging to him; will that fraction be taken away too? Chapters and paragraphs are mixed up in quite a different order from that of the old Bible; yet the author thinks he has not done enough, and excuses himself that "the ancient collection of Isaiah's prophecies have not been entirely broken up and their contents redistributed" (p. 209, ll. 29, 31). Hence, even the dates which are given by the author to some portions do not follow one another in a strictly chronological order; and the author says, "A strict adherence to the chronological principle would not have been in the interest of the reader" (p. 209, ll. 31, 32). It would have been interesting if he had given some reasons not for what he left unchanged, but for the changes he did introduce, and for calling so many parts "post-exilic," and declaring so many others "imperfect" or "not in their original state;" but scarcely any are given. I purpose, therefore, to examine the first two chapters of Isaiah as a test, hoping to show that the result of a more careful study will not be further to diminish or confuse Isaiah, but rather to restore what was condemned before, and that the true chronological principle is not altogether guess-work, but is founded upon history which can be traced for nearly every part of Isaiah, and agrees well with the order of the Bible, and not of the Polychrome.

Chapter I.

The first alteration that meets us in the Polychrome, and for which no reason is given, is its pushing chap. i. out of its place to be the sixteenth prophecy, calling it "Preaching of repentance during Sennacherib's invasion before the siege of Jerusalem (701 B.C.)," and making chap. ii. 5, etc., prophecy 1, dated "soon after 740 B.C." The latter would be in the time of Uzziah, after the conquest of Arpad by the Assyrians. But the first time we find God commanding Isaiah to write anything is in the reign of Ahaz, as recorded in chap. viii. 1. The Syro-Ephraimitic confederacy was then threatening a second invasion of Judah, when Ahaz conceived the plan of inviting the Assyrians to his help. Isaiah wished to prevent this unholy alliance with Assyria, and had an interview about

it with Ahaz. But this interview only caused him great disappointment and grief. Then, I say, God told him to write a great roll "with a human pen concerning Speed spoil, haste booty." It would weary the reader of this if I tried to dispute other men's interpretations of these words. I therefore only say that the natural meaning of them is that God commanded Isaiah to write a large volume in human language upon the subject of "Speed spoil, haste booty." On the face of it, this information of Isaiah is evidently of the nature of an apology made with a feeling of diffidence as to his writing so large a volume for the first time at the command of God. What, however, was the beginning of this great "speed spoil, haste booty" volume? The Polychrome thrusts chap. i. away to Sennacherib's invasion. The argument in the author's mind probably turns upon the description of the desolation of the country. But does not this description fit at least equally well to the time I mentioned, *i.e.*, the time after the first invasion of Judah by the northern confederacy? The country could never have been more desolate and sick from head to foot than when 120,000 were killed in one day, and 200,000 women and children were taken captive (2 Chron. xxviii. 6-8). But the reason which compels us more particularly to consider this the fittest time for chap. i. is because it was the time after Isaiah's grievous interview with Ahaz about the Assyrian alliance; and this chapter, which contains evidences that it was written with a heart still burning with vexation and grief, may, from the nature of its contents, be called a lecture to those citizens who supported Ahaz in his mad policy of inviting the Assyrians. Then chap. ii., also, does not belong to the time of Uzziah, or "soon after 740 B.C.," as stated in the Polychrome, but follows suitably chap. i. For it is addressed to the Ephraimitic kingdom, pleading with them to desist from the second invasion of Judah which they were threatening, and which was the cause of the intended *mésalliance* with Assyria.

Another direction in which the author of the Polychrome thinks he has not done enough to discredit Isaiah is in the way of glosses. For he even begs the student (p. 209, ll. 32-34) not to "be startled if he does not find all insertions which have the nature of glosses relegated to the foot of the page." But I humbly think that very many Hebrew students will agree with me that it is the other way. We are not startled at the small number of footnotes, but at the great number of them, which we think altogether unnecessary. We find here, in what is less than a chapter, that there are no less than five instances of sentences and words treated in this manner, and we can see no reason for any of them.

The first instance is particularly unfortunate. In ver. 7 not only are the words "and it is desolate, as overthrown by strangers" omitted from the text, but also in the footnote they are altered into "And it is desolate, like the ruined land of Sodom." But, in the first place, the words are not a gloss at all. If they are only literally translated and properly understood, they form an integral part of and give an impressive finish to the preceding description of the state of the country. Isaiah says, "And the desolation is as the overthrow of strangers," meaning that though Judah till then has not suffered by war so much as other nations have, especially at the hands of the Assyrians, now, after the first invasion by the northern confederacy, its desolation is very much like theirs. In the next place, it is easily seen that the correction by the addition of the word "Sodom," to which the author was tempted because the original word for "overthrow" is always connected with Sodom, not only makes no improvement here, but also spoils the sense.

The next instance is in vers. 16, 17 of the two sentences, "Cease to do evil; learn to do well." I confess I know no cogent reason why these sentences must be retained, neither am I critical enough to see any reason for their removal from the text.

The third instance is in ver. 21, of the clause "and now full of murderers." But the mistake began with translating the preceding sentence in the past tense, when it is in the Hebrew in the future. The two parts together should be "Righteousness should dwell in it, but now there are murderers." The prophet laments that the city which was betrothed to Almighty God is committing adultery by courting foreign allies who are murderers.

The fourth instance is that of the words "weakened with water," in ver. 22. But here other words, "a thick juice" are substituted in the text. Again I plead not being critical enough to see any reason for these changes.

The last instance is that of the words "JHVH Sabaoth," in ver. 24.

Other changes in this chapter are, first, taking over the last two words from ver. 12 to ver. 13. This is right enough. But the translation should be, "Treading My courts, bring no more vain gift offerings. It is incense of abomination unto Me." The prophet seems to rebuke a custom then prevailing of bringing cheap gift offerings in order to have an opportunity of promenading the temple courts. It seems to have been the same custom which the prophet Jeremiah in later years so well used as an opportunity for publishing his prophecies among the people (Jer. xxxvi. 5, etc.).

In ver. 23 two sentences are transposed. I see no valid reason for it.

Vers. 27, 28 are called a "Post-Exilic Appendix." Why, again?

Vers. 29, 31 are torn away from this chapter, and put down as "a fragment" of the eighth prophecy, entitled "Against tree worship." But the prophet says nothing about worshipping trees. He speaks of trees and gardens figuratively for the Assyrians and the Assyrian country, and prophesies of the people's future repentance at having invited the Assyrians to their help. Ver. 29 should be translated thus:

> "For they shall be ashamed of the oaks which ye have desired,
> And which ye shall dig out of the gardens which ye have chosen."

Such a prophecy cannot well be separated from the preceding part of the chapter.

Chapter II.

The prophecy vers. 2-4 is rightly called a "Messianic Appendix." But it is also marked "Post-Exilic," and is said probably to have "exactly filled up the space taken by a passage of Isaiah's prophecy which had become illegible" (Note 4, p. 147). Then, apparently because the first verse ascribes this Appendix to Isaiah, this verse is removed from its proper place to the next paragraph, and is coloured light blue as a mark that it also does not belong to Isaiah, but to a redactor. Now, in the first place, the story about the illegible passage does not hold, because the last three verses, as we have seen, are not a "fragment" of a prophecy "against tree worship," but a suitable finish to the preceding address. Then, it is a great mistake to attach this first verse to the next paragraph after the Appendix. For in that paragraph the prophet begins to address the ten tribes, both pleading with them to desist from invading Judah again, and warning them of the coming of the day of the Lord; whilst this verse speaks distinctly of a vision concerning Judah and Jerusalem. It seems hardly credible that a redactor would make such a mistake, and that a post-Exilic Jew would correct it in this novel way of inserting after the verse a prophecy which is concerning Judah and Jerusalem, but which belonged to another writer, not to Isaiah.

The original place, then, of this verse must be before this prophecy; and if it was not written by Isaiah originally with the usual motive of testifying that he had this vision from God, or that he had it concerning Judah and Jerusalem, there must have been a special motive for writing it afterwards, which was to testify that Isaiah was the first writer of it, and no one else. For this prophecy must have appealed to the

people's mind with wonder and joy, and must have been much pondered and talked about, till it became as familiar as an oft-repeated creed, and was quoted and rehearsed on all hands, even as Micah did (Mic. iv. 1-3), without preface or apology, so that its origin was nearly forgotten. Then, I say, this verse must have been written in order to recall to the minds of all that Isaiah alone was the first author of it. But, then, even for that purpose it is not necessary to suppose a redactor to have done it. Isaiah himself might have inserted this verse at a revision.

We have, then, further to prove that the prophecy vers. 2-4 is what the first verse testifies concerning it, viz., not post-Exilic, or Micah's, but Isaiah's own. Micah himself shows clearly in his fifth verse that his own thoughts were not in harmony with it, or that he quotes it with popular additions which did not originally belong to it, and therefore he was not the original author of it; whilst Isaiah proves his own paternity by kindred prophecies, as chap. xix. 18-25.

But there are other internal evidences in the prophecy itself that it is Isaiah's. First it contains a vision of the elevation of Mount Zion. Though, concerning this vision, the Polychrome (p. 147, ll. 40, 41) says, "This strange idea (the physical elevation of Jerusalem) is only Exilic and post-Exilic," it gives only two references — Ezek. xl. 2, and Zech. xiv. 10—and of these references the first says only that the Lord brought the prophet in a vision to the land of Israel, and led him to a very high mountain. This, therefore, has no elevation of Jerusalem in it at all. But even in the second reference the idea is not quite the same. For the depression of the country round about Jerusalem is a different thing from the elevation of the mountain of the Lord, *i.e.*, Mount Zion. Is, then, the mere similitude of a thought found in the books of an earlier writer, and of one or two later ones, a good reason for saying that it can only belong to the time of the later writers, and therefore must be an interpolation in the earlier one? To maintain this, I humbly think, is to maintain a much stranger notion than that Isaiah, who in one vision (chap. vi.) saw the temple so exalted and amplified that it contained the throne of God and the hosts of heaven, should see in another vision Mount Zion elevated above the surrounding hills, which undoubtedly meant to be figurative of its spiritual exaltation. Besides, the authenticity of this verse ought to be sufficiently defended by its being both a very apposite vision, as it were, of the other side of the picture of chap. i. 11, etc., and a congruous preliminary to the next prediction, the conversion of Gentile nations to Jehovah; and also by its being suitable for the time when

King Ahaz sacrificed on high places and hills in preference to Mount Zion.

As regards the next prediction, the conversion of Gentiles, the Polychrome again says (p. 147, ll. 42-44), "From Jeremiah's time onwards the religious future of the nations preoccupied the minds of the prophetic writers." But I have already alluded to cognate prophecies in Isaiah. Should not these prophecies prove that his mind, too, was preoccupied with the same subject, perhaps more than the minds of the later prophets? I may further say that for this prediction, too, there could be no more suitable time or place than the time of Isaiah, and immediately after the last chapter. It was the time when the servants of God, and especially Isaiah himself, felt themselves compelled to resist Gentile alliances; and it is the place in the book after a notable instance of Isaiah's opposing such an alliance. Here, therefore, he suitably adds this prediction, opposing that unholy alliance, as it were, with a future one of a much better kind—an alliance not for war and destruction, but for brotherly love and the common worship of the great Jehovah.

Then there is the second part of this Appendix, predicting that war shall be abolished among nations. Can this be post-Exilic at all? What Jew in post-Exilic times was likely to care whether the Gentile nations were destroying one another or not? If he had written a prophecy about war at all, it would have been to the effect that the Jews should not be harassed by war any more, or, rather, that the Jews should conquer the nations. Therefore, again, only in Isaiah's time, and especially by Isaiah himself—who in a great part of his writings manifests much sympathy with Gentile nations, when they were ruined and destroyed by the Assyrians—was such a prophecy likely to be written.

Vers. 5 and 6[a].—The Polychrome, with regard to these one and a half verses, is ambiguous. In the text it puts them together in light blue, as belonging to a redactor or editor, and in Note 4, p. 147, it speaks of a "complete change of subjects in ver. 6," and connects ver. 5 with the preceding prophecy, saying, "Probably vers. 2-5 exactly filled up the space taken by a passage of Isaiah's prophecy which had become illegible." But we have proved already that the prophecy belongs to Isaiah only, and is not post-Exilic; and, besides, ver. 5 does not belong to the preceding but to the following.

Now, the author not only marked these one and a half verses as belonging to an editor, and not to Isaiah, and speaks in the above note of "the awkward transitions in ver. 5 and the opening words of ver. 6," and says in another note (Note 2,

p. 132) that "the opening words of ver. 6 (due, like ver. 5, to the editor) . . . take the place of something which has been lost. For the prophecy or poem which follows is certainly imperfect. Probably it is made up of more than one poem, relative to JHVH's judgment upon all human glory, especially that won so recently by Uzziah (778-736) for the kingdom of Judah"—but he also inserts the name of JHVH in ver. 6[a] as the person addressed. But all these statements and manipulations of the text are mistakes caused by the faulty translation of the passage. In the present translation there certainly are "awkward transitions" both here and further on, and even the insertion of JHVH does not improve them, but rather confirms them. But let the translation be mended, and the awkward transitions will disappear; and it will be seen that Isaiah does not address the Lord in 6[a], or even in ver. 9[b], but all through, from ver. 5 to the end of this second composition, the "House of Jacob," *i.e.*, the ten tribes, concerning their hostility to Judah in the time of Ahaz. In ver. 6[a] he says: "For thou, O house of Jacob, hast forsaken thy people," *i.e.*, they have forsaken Judah, and joined themselves to Syria.

Ver. 6[b].—No fault can be found with the rendering, "And with foreigners they strike hands in agreement." Only it should be understood that the foreigners were the Assyrians.

Ver. 7.—"Israel" is not in the original, and has no right to be in the translation. Isaiah, like the prophet Oded (2 Chron. xxviii. 9), whilst pleading for Judah, has also much to blame them for. He began to do so in ver. 6, and he continues it in vers. 7, 8; and the things he charged them with are also alluded to by other prophets, as Hos. 1. 7; Mic. v. 9.

Ver. 9[a].—Still continuing to speak about Judah, the prophet confesses their entire humiliation. Therefore, the word "mankind," which the Polychrome puts for "man," is not suitable.

Vers. 9[b], 10.—Isaiah does not say, "And thou canst not forgive them. Go into the clefts of the rock," etc. But he adjures the Israelites, "By the fear of the Lord and by the glory of His Majesty," not to make Judah's condition still worse, or, in Isaiah's own words, not to suffer them "to go into the clefts," etc.

Further, ver. 10, when thus understood, does not admit the insertion of the sentence, "When he ariseth," etc. This sentence is right enough in vers. 19 and 21; but here it would only spoil the sense, and break up the connection of the passage.

Ver. 18.—Why is this verse not translated, but marked as a corrupt and unintelligible passage with lacunæ after it? The prophet only says, "And as for the idols, they shall utterly pass away."

Vers. 20-22.—Why are these verses banished to the footnotes? Isaiah only predicts that, in the day of the Lord, "shall a man cast away his idols of silver and his idols of gold which they shall have made for him, that he may bow down to moles and bats when entering into the clefts of the rock."

The last verse is a final persuasive appeal to the ten tribes to leave poor Judah alone. A similar appeal was probably made to them by the prophet Oded after the first invasion of Judah, with the happy result that they released the captives whom they had taken (2 Chron. xxviii. 9, etc.).

In conclusion, it is impossible within the limits of this paper to notice everything the author of the Polychrome said and did in these two chapters. But, considering the great scholarship that is arrayed against Isaiah, I feel exceedingly grateful to Almighty God that, by His grace and by more correct and more literal translation, I have been able to vindicate the truth so much as I did. I am confident that many unbiassed Hebrew students will deem it enough to show two things. First, it shows that all glosses, interpolations, omissions, corruptions, etc., which this Book of Isaiah is supposed to contain entirely disappear when the Hebrew is properly understood. Secondly, it shows that a good rendering of Isaiah is yet wanting. E. FLECKER.

ART. IV.—LANDMARKS OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

"REMOVE not the ancient landmark which thy fathers have set" (Prov. xxii. 28). Thus spoke Solomon the Wise; and we members of the Church of England would do well in these days of change and impulsiveness to attend to his advice, and not hastily allow our Church's doctrinal landmarks to be thoughtlessly altered or wilfully ignored.

There are few things more remarkable in Scripture than the care with which God fixed bounds and limitations. In all God's arrangements there is *exactness* and *definiteness*: the alternation of day and night, the succession of the seasons, the Divine restraint over the restless billions of the ever-aggressive sea (Jer. v. 22), His interposition even in the matter of national boundaries, "when he set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel" (Deut. xxxii. 8), to say nothing of the countless instances when tribal and family boundaries were settled by direct Divine guidance (for the word translated here "bounds" occurs fifty times in the Book of Joshua), all assure us that order and restraint are principles of perpetual obligation and universal utility.

1. First, let us remember that "landmarks" or "bounds" *are a necessity.* For purposes of convenience, discipline, and peace, it is of the highest importance that we should know most distinctly and plainly what is ours and what is not, "where we are," in fact, that there may be no undue intrusion on the rights of others. In the East, a trench or stone sufficed to show people's respective possessions and territories, so that he was cursed that removed his neighbour's landmark (Deut. xxvii. 17).

Now, what is necessary and beneficial for individual and social life is equally so for the Church.

2. Then they were *assigned deliberately, after due consideration and thought* concerning the character and circumstances of the persons for whose benefit they were placed. It was so in the case of Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh, on the further side of Jordan (Num. xxxii. 4, 5, 33); and we can certainly claim these principles for the doctrinal boundaries of our Church. Most carefully and considerately are they drawn up. We are clearly told in Article XXXIV. that "It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one and utterly alike, for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's Word"; and "Every national Church hath power to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying."

That there is no vagueness or haziness in our Church's treatment of doctrinal and ritual restrictions we shall abundantly prove; but the very strength of her position, founded on the rock of Holy Scripture, enables her to dispense with unnecessary and antiquated limitations.

3. But with regard to the placing of these bounds, *the Divine guidance was always most earnestly sought.* All the land of Israel was divided by lot; the portion of each tribe, each family, was referred to the Divine decision (Num. xxxiii. 54; Josh. xviii. 10), and being thus referred, no doubt was entertained that God did really hear and direct. Would that we had such faith in carrying out all His commandments! And do we not know full well how devoutly and prayerfully our Reformers sought the guidance of the great Head of the Church when they fixed "the landmarks" of this our section of it?

4. *Their long continuance was a strong argument for their retention.* Their utility was proved, their necessity was a matter of constant experience; then, surely it would be unwise to remove or alter them (except under extraordinary

circumstances). It might be very easy to do, but it would be very foolish. Anyone can disorder and destroy, but very few can satisfactorily arrange and define. Let us acknowledge that landmarks which have served successfully our Church and nation for more than three hundred years are not lightly to be set aside.

We are distinctly told in Scripture that it is a sign of the last days to disregard "bounds." There is to be at the close of this dispensation a hatred of all restraint, an impatience of control, a manifestation of lawlessness and self-will, in antagonism to Divine authority and order, which shall be unprecedented (1 Tim. iv. 1-3; 2 Tim. iii. 1-7, iv. 3, 4). This is a Divine warning that we must not ignore.

5. But yet, again, *they were designed for the purpose of being both inclusive and exclusive.* They afforded liberty and freedom of action within bounds, with due respect to limitations. They showed exactly where and how far a person might go, but beyond these limits they assigned penalty; they forbade encroachment. We cannot fail to notice how strict and precise were God's rules for the ritual and ceremonial of the tabernacle worship; all the enactments were specially suitable to protect Israel from the surrounding temptations to idolatry, materialism, and sensuality, while, at the same time, they permitted all lawful freedom and happiness in the individual and national life. So the landmarks of our Church are intended to fence us off from all that would be misleading and pernicious in doctrine and practice, while preserving for us all healthful and useful freedom. Let us now consider some of the more prominent landmarks of our Church, with their reasonable liberty and their needful restriction.

These "bounds" are clearly laid down for us in those formularies of which every clergyman expressed his approval in a precise and public manner at his ordination, namely, the Prayer Book, the Articles and the Homilies. (We may say, in passing, it seems a matter of regret that no more decided steps are taken than usually is the case to ascertain how far ordination candidates do really understand the contents of these Homilies, to whose doctrine they assented in their subscription to the Articles, but of whose teaching they seem to be lamentably ignorant, or hopelessly at variance, if we judge by the utterances of many of them after their ordination.) And taking for our consideration the principles enshrined in these official documents of our Church's belief and practice:

1. *Let us never permit that landmark to be removed which includes the Gospel minister and excludes the mediæval priest.*

The Church of England places as pre-eminent among the duties of her clergy the ministry of the Word. Her ordinal bears abundant and conclusive evidence to this fact. Deacons are to read the Scriptures in the church. Priests are to be "studious in reading and learning the Scriptures;" they are to "draw all their cares and studies that way;" they are, "by daily weighing and reading the Scriptures, to wax stronger in their ministry;" they are publicly questioned as to their belief in the sufficiency of Scripture, and their determination to teach nothing but what can be proved out of it; they are cautioned to drive away strange doctrines contrary to God's Word. Not the slightest hint is given of their being "propitiatory priests;" no mention whatever is made of their duties or responsibilities in that respect. They are called "Messengers, Watchmen and Stewards of the Lord," they are told to "teach, premonish, feed and seek for Christ's sheep," but there is no mention of their offering propitiatory sacrifice, of their regularly hearing confessions, or personally absolving people's sins. If they are supposed to do these things, it is strange that at the most important moment of their lives the Church so deliberately leaves them unreminded of it. In the Exhortation to Priests Sacraments are positively not mentioned, while the concluding prayer is a beautiful petition that they may faithfully and lovingly *preach the Word* and the people obediently follow the same.

The Articles do exactly the same thing. While they place the Sacraments in their proper position, as of Christ's direct institution, they place before the administration of the Sacraments the preaching of the Word (see Articles XIX., XXIII., XXVI.). "The Ministration of the Word" is first, the "Sacraments" second. "We may use their ministry, both in hearing the Word of God and in receiving the Sacraments." This order of expression must be intentional; there is no carelessness in the wording of our Formularies.

Our Church emphatically declares her doctrinal difference with the Church of Rome (and what a vital, fundamental difference is it!) by giving the ordained minister a *Bible*, and not, as the Romish Church, the Cup and the Paten. Surely no object-lesson could be more instructive and decisive than this. For no consideration must we allow this landmark to be altered. It guards against all the mischief of auricular confession and the Mass, it prevents all "official" interference and arrogance, while it secures to us the pure ministry of God's Word and Sacraments. By every dictate of humanity, purity, honesty, this "bound" must be respected, and all encroachments forbidden.

2. *Next we must loyally maintain that landmark which*

includes the sovereignty of Scripture and excludes the authority of tradition. The Church of Rome asserts that tradition is of equal authority with Scripture; she affirmed this principle at the Council of Trent, and it is necessary to her very existence. Not for one moment could her vast fabric of superstition and fraud be upheld were its only foundation the Bible; but it is not founded on the Bible, it does not pretend to be; it is maintained solely by a complex mass of human tradition, which Cardinal Manning defined as every word the Popes have uttered in every age, whether by Bull, brief or encyclical.

The Church of England erects a definite barrier against this, and appeals to God's written Word as the supreme authority for all her beliefs. She rejects this vague, nebulous mass of human tradition as worthless and meaningless for doctrinal purposes. "Nothing is to be ordained against God's Word" (Article XXXIV.). She does not reject the light any tradition, well substantiated, may throw on primitive doctrine or practice, but she steadily refuses to allow it any equality with Scripture. It is the best and earliest of the Fathers to whom she refers as interpreters of Scripture. With her "Holy Scripture containeth *all* things necessary to salvation" (Article VI.). The Creeds are only to be received and believed because they can be "proved by most certain warrant of Holy Scripture" (Article VIII.). She is not led away by any dream of General Councils, but boldly declares "they may err and have erred even in things pertaining to God," therefore their decisions are not to be received unless they have the clear support of Scripture (Article XXI.). She declares the Church itself is only "a witness and keeper of Holy Writ, and must not enforce anything contrary to it" (Article XX.). In the whole of her Prayer Book she reminds the devout Churchman that his strength, his power, his comfort, is the Word of God, as John Wesley well said to a man who complained to him of the poor chaff they got in the pulpit. "At any rate," he said, "you have plenty of good wheat in the reading desk."

Thus does our Church ever glorify and reverence the Bible. Let us take great care that this priceless landmark is maintained.

3. *Another boundary* we must not suffer to be tampered with *is that which includes the Sacraments of the Gospel, but excludes the Sacraments of superstition.*

Our Church acknowledges but *two* Sacraments as of Divine institution, namely, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. Article XXV. is perfectly clear on the subject; it is as precise in its statements as plain English can be. It says the other five so-called Sacraments are the outcome of corruption or

misapprehension, and "have not the like nature" of the first two. "Orders" and "matrimony," etc., are simply "states of life," and not Sacraments at all. "Sacrament" was a word used originally in the loosest manner, and having the widest signification. Kneeling, crossing, reading the Creed or the Gospel, etc., had all been called Sacraments. Their number varied, sometimes being reckoned at more than a dozen; they were in the time of Peter Lombard reduced officially to seven, perhaps with reference to the sevenfold gifts of the Holy Ghost. But the Church of England, under the wise guidance of her reformers, determined to put an end to all this vague phraseology and unscriptural exaggeration, and limited the word "Sacrament" to those two which were alone ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel.

Upon this boundary-stone our Church also inscribes the noteworthy statement that no merely mechanical reception of any Sacrament is of any avail; to have a wholesome effect "we must duly use them"; "we must worthily receive the same." She acknowledges no mechanical theory for the reception of grace, no *ex opero operatum* idea of getting good. She takes the divinely-appointed means of grace, and puts them in their proper place with all reverent attention, but with no insensate adulation.

This discreet and most necessary landmark must be maintained intact, and with its inscription clear and legible.

4. But no less important is *the landmark that includes the Lord's Supper as a memorial, but excludes it as a propitiatory sacrifice.*

The boundary mark is so clearly defined in all our formularies that it can only be deliberately and ruthlessly neglected or destroyed. The whole tone and tenor of the language used emphasizes the fact; it is "writ large" throughout.

This is no little insignificant waymark so small as to escape notice except from the cautious and observing eye; it is a great "cairn," riveting the instant attention of every traveller through the history and phraseology of the English Church. Most strenuously does the Prayer Book in its Communion Office remind us that this Holy Sacrament is "*in remembrance* of His death and passion"; "a *perpetual memory* of His death"—"a *perpetual memory* of that His precious death until His coming again." Not the slightest loophole is given to suggest the idea of any propitiatory sacrifice or carnal presence.

The Articles (XXV., XXVIII., XXIX., XXXI.) and the Homilies (specially those on "Common Prayer and Sacraments," and "The Worthy Receiving of the Sacrament") entirely coincide with the Prayer Book. It is perfectly childish

to say the reformers wrote one thing and meant another; or used language which will bear a different construction in the Prayer Book, etc., to what it would anywhere else. The circumstances under which they purified and rearranged and moulded our Liturgy were not those to make men careless and indefinite. Human bonfires were then too common a spectacle to make persons desirous of courting a nearer acquaintance with them through thoughtlessness.

No candid person can read the outspoken condemnation of transubstantiation in Article XXVIII., and the clear statement "that the Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper *only after an heavenly and spiritual manner*," and say it can by any juggling with words be made to agree with the Creed of Pope Pius IV. (Article V.) or the decrees of the Council of Trent, by which it is affirmed that "in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there is really, truly, and substantially the Body and Blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ," etc. This materialistic notion is maintained in the most direct terms by Romish ecclesiastics of our own day. The Church of Rome has erected her "landmark," imposing, strong, conspicuous; we have erected ours, and we mean to have it maintained. We exclude what she includes, and she excludes what we include. Let anyone deny it who can. Instead of destroying or suffering to fall into "mossy" neglect this glorious boundary-stone, we must keep it clean, strengthen it, draw attention to it.

5. But lastly, we must, in the name of God, keep standing upright and intact *the landmark which includes Justification by Faith and excludes Justification by Works.*

We can most thankfully affirm that no poor pilgrim on life's journey need go astray on this subject if he will but listen to the utterances of our Church on this vital matter.

What says Article XI.? "We are accounted righteous before God only for the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings."

Most impressively and solemnly does the Homily "Of the Salvation of all Mankind" accentuate the same blessed truth; and this Homily has especial authority, being incorporated in Article XI. Nothing can be more beautiful and instructive than its carefully chosen language; it glorifies Christ and His finished work throughout. Let us consider a few of its sentences.

(*a*) "Consider diligently these words: without works, by faith only, freely we receive remission of our sins."

(*b*) "But this saying that we be justified by faith only,

freely, and without works, is spoken for to take away clearly all merit of our works, as being unable to deserve our justification at God's hands."

(*c*) "The grace of God doth not shut out the justice of God in our justification, but only shutteth out the justice of man, that is, the justice of our works, as to be merits deserving our justification."

(*d*) "Justification is the office of God only, and is not a thing which we render unto Him, but which we receive of Him; not which we give to Him, but which we take of Him by His free mercy."

Yet most earnestly does the Homily urge the Churchman to remember that *faith in itself has no justifying merit;* it is only the hand that takes hold of Christ at the same time; out of this faith will necessarily spring good works. "For that faith which bringeth forth no good works is a dead, devilish counterfeit, and feigned faith," or, as Article XII. expresses it, "insomuch that by them a lively faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit."

That this is in accordance with Scripture we all know. "Not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law," says Paul (Phil. iii. 9); or again, "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness" (Rom. iv. 5).

The doctrine of the Church of Rome is hopelessly obscure and confused on the whole subject. By the decrees of the Council of Trent she denied justification by faith, though her earlier Popes and doctrines allowed it (but contradiction of previous decisions is dust in the balance to the Church of Rome; she rather glories in an ostentatious inconsistency!). She mixes up in an inextricable tangle justification and sanctification, and she leaves her unfortunate adherents in absolute darkness where they most need light.

Thank God our Church has erected this grand and blessed "landmark," so useful to men, so honouring to Christ! Let us never suffer it to be interfered with by any one, in any way. These are some of the more imposing and important landmarks of our Church. They were erected carefully, thoughtfully, prayerfully, deliberately, by men of vast learning, eminent piety, devoted patriotism, unflinching courage. They knew well the dangers they fence us off from, the blessed privileges they enclose to us. To us remains the solemn duty of seeing that they are preserved and respected. Once let these barriers be altered, or suffered to fall into decay and desuetude, and we cannot tell what torrent of error, superstition, and evil-living will sweep over our Church and nation. Let us "hold fast the form of sound words," and

not permit any power or person to remove the ancient landmarks which our fathers have set.

W. B. RUSSELL-CALEY.

ART. V.—THE VOICE OF GOD IN HOLY SCRIPTURE.

WHAT is the reason why we educated Englishmen, living at the end of the nineteenth century, in an atmosphere of cosmopolitan ideas, with all the latest productions of criticism on our bookshelves and on our library tables, and able to make easy personal acquaintance with every religion of interest which has had its day in the world's history, attribute with all our hearts and souls supreme importance to the old sacred literature of the Jews?

Did not Voltaire prophesy that the Bible would not be read in the nineteenth century? Did he not say, more than a century ago, that in less than 100 years Christianity would have been swept from existence, and would have passed into history? Certainly the infidelity which he did so much to promote ran riot through France, red-handed and impious. More than a century has passed away. Voltaire himself has passed into history. But it is a curious coincidence that his own printing-press has been used to publish the revelation at which he scoffed; and the very house where he lived is packed with Bibles, as it has become the depot of the Geneva Bible Society.

Did not Tom Paine, in this country, think he had demolished the Bible by his "Age of Reason"? What is the fact? Since Tom Paine went despairingly to a drunkard's grave in 1809, more than thirty times as many Bibles have been produced and scattered through the world than had been produced since first Moses began the Pentateuch. Why is this?

It is because, without prepossession or predilection, on a calm survey of the facts, we have made up our minds that this unique and extraordinary literature is actually the transcript of God's message from the unseen world of spirit, thought and eternity, into the world of time, space, sense and action. There is no other book or literature like the Holy Scriptures in the whole history of mankind. It is of no use to mention the Egyptian Ritual of the Dead, or the Assyrian Tablets, or the Maxims of Confucius, or the Hindu Vedas, or the Homeric Hymns, or the Mohammedan Koran. The religious literature of all countries and ages has been brought into one focus by a great literary publication. Even a cursory

glance will show that there is no possibility of comparison of these ancient documents on the one hand, and the Holy Scriptures on the other. It is a mere fact of literary history that the Holy Scriptures are unique because they are the record of the progressive stages of Divine revelation to the only race who in the ancient world understood religion in its true sense as the reign of righteousness and the kingdom of God. Every great nation has contributed some gift from the Divine omnipresence for the welfare of mankind; but none has had it in them to contribute such a gift as the wonderful race of the Hebrews. The Egyptians had their long centuries of science, civilization, ceremonies and architecture. The Assyrians had a grand idea of the consolidation of power. The Greeks had arts and literary perfection which have never been surpassed or even equalled. The Romans had unrivalled skill in law-making and administration. It was the glory of the race of Abraham to be the mouthpiece and human interpreter of the great omnipresent Spirit of Righteousness. What advantage, to use the words of St. Paul, had the Jew in his little country, so open to attack, so frequently invaded and conquered by powerful neighbours, so poor in the endowments that made other nations great and famous? Much every way: chiefly that unto them were entrusted the oracles of God.

We believe deliberately, on an impartial survey of the whole facts, that this literature is absolutely unique in being the record of God's dealings with men, concerned from beginning to end with a unique person, the Lord Jesus Christ. "Bring the book," said Sir Walter Scott, when he lay dying. "What book?" asked his friend. "There is only one book," said the dying man—"the Bible." We do not say that God did not deal at all with the Egyptians, or Assyrians, Hindus, Chinese, Greeks, Romans, Arabians. "Be wise, O ye kings," said the Hebrew psalmist to the rulers of the pagan empires. "Be instructed, ye judges of the earth. Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling." Or again, "It is He that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers, that bringeth the princes to nothing; He maketh the judges of the earth as vanity." Nowhere did he leave Himself without witness. "The heavens declare the glory of God. There is neither speech nor language where their voice is not heard." The eternal laws of right and wrong, justice and injustice, were silently working wherever man was to be found, and were speaking to man of God; but it was the Hebrews who had the privilege of recognising those laws in a way in which no other people recognised them, recognising their Almighty Author in a way

in which no other people knew Him, and so of rising from one step of inspiration to another.

There may have been other men in Ur of Chaldees to whom intimations came of the unity of God; but it was Abraham alone who understood them and obeyed their direction. To the people that had, more was to be given. Because there was an Abraham, with his absorbing belief in the goodness and oneness of the Divine Being, who obeyed the call, and became in virtue of that the father of all men of faith, there could be an Isaac, a Jacob, carrying the tradition on, a Joseph with his exalted typical protest for purity. Because of the acceptance of the revelation by the patriarchs, however dimly and imperfectly, there could be a Moses, the moulder of the thoughts and customs of God's people to the end of time, the founder in the dim ages of primeval darkness of the sublimest, completest and most enlightened legislation that ever nation has enjoyed. Because there was a Moses, David was prepared for yet clearer visions, could live still nearer to God, could pour forth aspirations of devoutness which would be the chosen words for the piety and penitence, the hopes and struggles, of every future generation of sorrowing and believing souls, could descry more clearly the outlines and the office of the coming Deliverer. And so the stages of the revelation succeeded each other, each increasing in definiteness and truth, till at length there appeared the visible glory of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God made flesh and dwelling among us, full of grace and truth; and none can say that He is an inapt or incomplete fulfilment of the ancient lessons and predictions.

From stage to stage the revelation came from the Divine Spirit, speaking through human minds, and human hands, and ordinary human affairs through the history of an inspired race rather than as a series of isolated oracles philosophically systematic, manifesting itself in different ways and through different intelligences, but with one purpose; in unity, though not in uniformity; in infinite variety, in constant growth, in terms intensely human, that it might be understood by human minds and might touch human hearts, shining more and more until the perfect day of Christ.

Thus we are compelled to treat the sacred literature of the Hebrews as something holy and unique, and of a value entirely by itself. Some of it is of local importance. We do not care about lists of clean and unclean animals, or the traditional ages of the patriarchs, or the pedigrees of the tribes, or the disasters of the apostate kings of Northern Israel. The interest of these things is past. But it is of supreme moment to us because it speaks of the Lord Jesus Christ as the Son of God,

the Lamb taking away the sin of the world. It is because we find the whole Old Testament leading up to Him, and the New describing His coming, His life, and His lessons. It is because it brings light to those that sit in darkness, and can get no other light; because it gives the only satisfactory answer to the riddle of existence; because it appeals, as no other book appeals, to the best aspirations of the human conscience; because it brings to those who are in doubt a reasonable hope, wisdom and clear guidance to those in perplexity, to the troubled well-assured comfort, peace to those whose hearts are vexed with hatreds and agonies of which they cannot otherwise be rid, the promise and experience of forgiveness to those who are weighed down by the consciousness of sin; because it has, when taken at its own meaning and its own value, as a matter of fact, supplied strength to innumerable men and women who were weak, and rest to the weary; because it contains all that we know, the life and words, of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Founder and Head of the Christian Church; because it contains all that we know, the life and words, of the twelve Apostles, on whom as a sole foundation the Christian Church was built; because it has spoken to the dying of the home in the blessed mansions with a calmness of conviction that is all-persuasive; because it has, in very truth and deed, brought the fainting soul of man into touch with the eternal life of God. Nothing but the words of Holy Scripture itself will bring home to the wayward human heart the fulness and power and unshakeable truth of the love of God in Christ Jesus.

The Bible, says Dr. Westcott, contains in itself the fullest witness to its own Divine authority. If it appears that a large collection of fragmentary records, written, with few exceptions, without any designed connection, at most distant times, and under the most varied circumstances, yet combine to form a definite whole, broadly separated from the books—if it further appears that these different parts, when interpreted historically, reveal a gradual progress of social, spiritual life, uniform, at least, in its general direction—if, without any intentional purpose, they offer not only remarkable coincidence in minute details of facts (for that is a mere question of accurate narration), but also subtle harmonies of complementary doctrine—if, in proportion as they are felt to be separate, they are felt also to be instinct with a common spirit, then it will be rapidly acknowledged that, however they came into being at first, however they were united afterwards into a sacred volume, they are yet legibly stamped with the Divine seal as inspired by God in a sense which can be said of no other writings.

In the same way Dr. Pusey: "It has been for thirty years the deep conviction of my soul that no book can be written on behalf of the Bible like the Bible itself. Man's defences are man's word . . . the Bible is God's Word, and by it the Holy Ghost, who first spoke it, still speaks to the soul that closeth itself not against it."

To take only the first and earlier portion of Holy Scripture: however much may be discovered about the authorship and structure of the books of the Old Testament, the fact that underlies them all is sure and unassailable, and it is contained in the words of our Lord Himself: "Search the Scriptures: for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of Me."

That was the way in which our Lord and His Apostles regarded the Old Testament. It is sometimes said that the Christians in apostolic times were dependent on oral teaching and repetitions, and had no Scriptures. Such a misstatement entirely disregards the obvious facts of the case. They used the Old Testament as the oracles of God with as much zeal as the Jews, and with greater enthusiasm, because everywhere they found in them the preparation for the Incarnation. "Had ye believed Moses and the prophets," said our Lord, "ye would have believed Me: for he wrote of Me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe My words?" All types and sacrifices of Moses were to be fulfilled in the person of the Redeemer and the sacrifice of Calvary. "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken; ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into His glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself." Once more, to the eleven disciples, He said: "These are the words that I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning Me. Then opened He their understandings, that they might understand the Scriptures."

"Search the Scriptures: for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of Me." It is the voice of the Apostles as well. In the New Testament there are 165 direct quotations from the Old; when those that are indirect are added, it brings the number up to 700. "All Scripture," writes St. Paul of the Old Testament, "given by inspiration of God, is profitable also for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." St. Paul, you will observe, gives the true key for the interpretation. It was not intended for the teaching of science: scientific truth in all its various branches man must discover for himself by

patient and reverent investigation; the revelation of God through the Old Testament writers was moral and religious. Listen again to St. Peter: "We have a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the Day-star arise in your hearts: knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scriptures is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not of old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." So St. Peter had said to Cornelius: "To Him bear all the prophets witness, that through His name whosoever believeth in Him shall receive remission of sins." And again: "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you, searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow. Unto whom it was revealed that not unto themselves, but unto us, they did minister things which are now reported unto you by them that have preached the Gospel unto you." To all the Apostles, to all the Christians, throughout the New Testament the written Word of the old sacred oracles is the very breath of the spiritual life, the ground and confirmation of all their hopes, the sanction and authority of all their beliefs.

"Search the Scriptures: for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of Me." It is the voice of all the Fathers. If you ask, What about the early Church after the time of the Apostles? did they treat the writings of the Apostles with the same awe and reverence with which Christ and the Apostles had treated the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament? the answer is the same. Nothing is more remarkable than the consciousness which the Fathers who succeeded the Apostles show of the immeasurably superior authority of the inspired writings. The earliest of any, Clement, who is mentioned in the Epistle to the Romans, apologizes to the Corinthians for writing to them at all; he is unworthy even to address those who have been taught by St. Paul. "Look carefully into the Scriptures," he says, "which are the true utterances of the Holy Spirit." And again: "Take up the Epistle of blessed Paul the Apostle; what did he write to you in the beginning of the Gospel? In truth divinely inspired, he wrote to you Corinthians." We have a letter of St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, a disciple of St. John, addressed to the Philippians; he declares that "neither I, nor any one like me, is able to attain perfectly to the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul, who, when he

was with you, before the men who were then living, taught the word of truth perfectly and surely." St. Ignatius of Antioch, writing to the Romans in A.D. 107, assures them: "I do not command you like Peter or Paul, they were Apostles." The famous writer and Bishop, St. Irenæus, who in his early days was connected with St. Polycarp, the pupil of St. John, speaks thus of the inspired writers: "After that our Lord rose from the dead, and the Apostles were clothed with the Spirit of power from on high, they were filled with a perfect knowledge of all things." And again, "The Apostles, being disciples of truth, are beyond all misstatement." Tertullian, the ablest and in some respects the greatest of the Latin Fathers, put the distinction with great force: "The four Gospels are built on the certain basis of Apostolical authority, and so are inspired in a far different sense from the writings of the spiritual Christian. All the faithful, it is true, have the Spirit of God; but all are not Apostles." And the famous Alexandrian master, Origen, whose marvellous and brilliant teaching has always been a subject of the deepest study and attention in the Church, tells us that "the Holy Spirit inspired each of the saints, prophets and Apostles. . . . The same Spirit was present in those of old times as in those who were inspired at the coming of Christ." And again, "There is nothing," he says at the end of one of his homilies, "whether in the law, or in the prophets, or in the evangelists, or in the Apostles, which does not descend from the fulness of the Divine Majesty."

It was this fundamental distinction between what is inspired and what is uninspired that made the members of the four great General Councils of the assembled Churches of Christendom appeal in every case to the exact words of Holy Scripture. Every one of the Fathers who has left writings behind him proves every one of his opinions by quoting Holy Scripture. St. Augustine was the strongest of all upholders of even literal and verbal inspiration. Of modern writers I have only time to quote here the estimate of our present Archbishop, a man who has looked as thoroughly and deeply as any into the claims of scepticism and the claims of revelation. "The more the Bible is spread," he says, "the more the Bible is studied, the deeper, the profounder the thought that is spent upon it, the more careful the criticism, the closer the examination. All the more shall it stand out conspicuous for the spiritual nature, the marvellous power, which breathes through all its pages, and shall tell mankind of the truth. I fear not any examination to which it can be subjected. I fear not criticism of its history nor any investigation of its sources. I fear not any examination of the details of its meaning. I

know that whatever else shall go, this shall stand. This is indeed the message of God Almighty to man; and as long as man remains here on earth, still shall he find, in ever-increasing measure, the power which the Book has to uplift his soul. It is always, for that reason, a matter of joy to me that the Church of England should put forward this Book so prominently before all her sons, should provide that it be read publicly from end to end, should provide that so large a portion should be read in every service that she offers to God; should tell all her members to look there for the authority for everything that she teaches, and should rest the proof of her claim to be indeed commissioned by Almighty God on the evidence that she can collect from the pages of God's Holy Word."

And so Sir Walter Scott wrote:

> Within that awful volume lies
> The mystery of mysteries!
> Happiest they of human race
> To whom our God has granted grace
> To read, to fear, to hope, to pray,
> To lift the latch and force the way;
> And better had they ne'er been born,
> Who read to doubt, or read to scorn.

"Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of Me." It is the voice of the living Church of to-day. The Bishops, in the encyclical letter issued from the Lambeth Conference of 1888, uttered some grave words to us on the subject of the study of the Bible. "The study of the Holy Scripture," they said, "is a great part of the mental discipline of the Christian, and the Bible itself is the main instrument in all teaching of religion." After noticing some reasons for the neglect of the reading of Holy Scripture, they urge that the central point of all our interpretation of the Bible must be "our Lord Jesus Christ, as the sacrifice for our sins, as the healer of our sinfulness, the source of all our spiritual life, and the revelation to our consciences of the law and motive of all moral virtue. To Him and to His work all the teachings of the Old Testament converge, and from Him all the teachings of the New Testament flow in spirit, in force, and in form."

"Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of Me." It is the voice of Christ to ourselves. I conclude by earnestly asking that we should place a higher estimate on the value of the privilege which we have in holding in our hands the Word of our Lord, and of His prophets and Apostles. Let no lesson be read in church without our diligent attention to its meaning.

Too often it is read and listened to like the drone of the bagpipes. We should follow the words in our own copies as we hear them. When the lesson is over, we should ask ourselves what we have learnt. Let no day pass by without the reading of some short passage with our families. Through it God has a message for the souls of all. The words will come back to the hearers during the day, and will be a witness and a warning against every form of evil. They are, indeed, a living message from the unseen world of eternity. We must read some passage also by ourselves—some psalm or lesson for the day; some well-chosen fragment of instruction and importance. It will be a lamp to our feet through all the hours of work and relaxation. Boorhaave, the great scholar and teacher, was once asked how he was able to acquire so much knowledge and overtake so much business. It was his custom, he answered, on rising to spend the first hour of the morning in reading the Bible, and in meditation and prayer. This gave him spirit and vigour for the engagements of the day; the consciousness that he was at peace with God—that a reconciled God was present with him—prepared him for everything that might happen. So it will be with us. We cannot spare so long a time, but one draught from the well of life will refresh us for the whole of the day's march. Above all, when we come to die—when we become aware that we have a mortal illness from which we cannot recover—what shall we not then feel of comfort, hope and consolation if we know that we have before us the living promises of the Son of God Himself! They are spoken to us as vividly as they were to those who heard His very voice. Like evening bells, sounding softly over the woods and fields, and bearing with them the immemorial message of peace and salvation, will fall on our ear, so soon to be closed to every earthly sound: "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in Me. In My Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so I would have told you: I go to prepare a place for you." And with life-long conviction and proved experience our fading voice, soon to be silenced in the grave, replies: "Lord, to whom shall I go? Thou, Thou, Thou hast the words of eternal life!"

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

Reviews.

Notes on New Testament Translation. By the late FREDERICK FIELD, M.A., LL.D., Cambridge University Press. 1899. Price 7s. net.

"OTIUM NORVICENSE, pars tertia," of which the present book is an amended and enlarged reprint, has for some time past been out of print and scarce. A finished scholar of the old school, delighting in that form of "pure scholarship" for which Cambridge has long and justly been famous, Dr. Field achieved for himself a European celebrity by the great edition of Origen's "Hexapla," which was published by the Oxford Press in 1875. As a member of the New Testament Revision Company, Dr. Field regularly contributed a number of the most valuable and acute suggestions, marked by ripe judgment and intimate knowledge; these he put together and published under the title already mentioned—"Otium Norvicense" (Part III.). The present volume contains all these notes on select passages, together with a number of additional notes drawn from the margin of Dr. Field's own copy of his book, and a few longer notes reprinted from various papers and pamphlets found among Dr. Field's literary remains. It is a book every zealous student of the New Testament will cherish. Its worth can hardly be overestimated.

Psychology and Life. By HUGO MÜNSTERBERG. Constable. 1899.

This book is a collection of thoughtful essays dealing with various aspects of the psychological problem, its chief aim being (to use the author's own words) the separation of the conceptions of psychology from the conceptions of our real life.

Though the essays have been written at various times, and handle a considerable number of somewhat abstruse questions, the book possesses a substantial unity. While there is a good deal on which we perforce disagree with Professor Münsterberg, we gladly recognize the learning and thoroughness which characterize his work. Much of his psychology is the reverse of easy to grasp adequately, but all he writes is worth cautious consideration, and we expect his book will have considerable influence in the department of psychology generally, specially in its bearing on educational theories.

The Six Systems of Indian Philosophy. By Professor MAX MÜLLER, K.M. London: Longmans and Co. Price 16s.

It is with deep regret that we have to record the serious illness of the author of this work. Professor Max Müller has deserved well at the hands of every student of language, religion, philosophy, and mythology; he has practically created, for Englishmen, the science of religion and of language; he has identified himself with every movement at home tending to bring into closer bonds of fellowship the relations that exist between the Indian Empire and Great Britain. His edition of the "Rig-Veda" (the *editio princeps*, be it noted) has opened a flood of light on the beginnings of religious history; and there is scarcely a single department of linguistic study that has not felt the impress of Max Müller's skilful hands. A German by birth, he is now a naturalized Englishman, a member of Her Majesty's Privy Council, and one of the chief ornaments of the University of Oxford, where he holds a professorial chair. We can only hope that in due time Professor Max Müller will be restored, despite his seventy-six years, to something of his former vigour and health.

Turning to the book now before us—the final fruit of a life devoted to the elucidation of Oriental thought and language—we are struck by the extreme interest presented by the many problems with which it deals. Probably there is no Christian missionary in India whose power for good would not be increased by a careful study of this volume. The intellectual equipment of modern missionaries ought never to be regarded as a *quantité négligéable;* they ought to approach their difficult task of converting the heathen by first thoroughly understanding the thoughts and habits of those they hope to convert. Professor Max Müller's new book contains a fund of useful and suggestive matter. He shows here how intimately, not only India's religion, but also India's philosophy, is connected with the national character of its inhabitants.

We will undertake to say that a careful and intelligent study of the 600 pages which this book comprises will enable a student to get a firm and clear hold of the framework of the "Six Philosophies of India." The details he must fill in for himself by a first-hand study of the sacred books of the East. The volume is written with all that persuasiveness of which Max Müller is a master; that erudition which he utilizes to illumine, never to burden, his subject; and that rare literary finish which is the admiration of his countless readers. E. H. B.

Short Notices.

The Silver Link. Annual Volume for 1899. Sunday-School Union. Price 2s. Pp. 239.

The annual volume of this excellent illustrated magazine for home and school is full of good things to suit all tastes. The tales are very interesting, and there are a great number of articles containing useful information on many interesting subjects. "Every-day Life in Italy" makes a particularly readable series.

The Day of Days. Annual Volume for 1899. "Home Words" Office. Price 2s. Pp. 240.

This admirable volume of Sunday readings maintains its usual excellence. Amongst a great deal that is so excellent, we may draw special attention to the series of biographical sketches under the title "Our Church Portrait Gallery," which includes Bishop Welldon of Calcutta, Bishop Perowne of Worcester, Canon Wilkinson, Prebendary Webb-Peploe, and the late "A. K. H. B."

The Month.

NEWS from the seat of war has been far from encouraging of late—mortifying in many ways to the pride of a great power, and doubly distressing inasmuch as the news is not of defeat alone, but tells of great sacrifice of life. Generally, the feelings of the English people are becoming slowly roused to something like exasperation; they are aware, in a vague way, that "someone has blundered." As we write (December 18) information is forthcoming that the general advance has begun. We are glad of it; a decided victory for English arms would be valuable in a variety of directions. We have learnt one lesson already—we ought

to have learnt it long ago—that it is a foolish and disastrous policy to underestimate the strength of a foe. In any case, the war is likely now to prove a very serious one. "Videant consules ne quid detrimenti Respublica capiat."

The Lord Mayor's War Fund has already topped £400,000. This is a considerable sum; but it should be remembered that, if everyone in the United Kingdom were to forego, *for three days only*, all alcoholic liquors, devoting the money which would otherwise be spent on such drink to the war fund, we should find the fund augmented, at one stroke, by considerably over £1,000,000.

Many thousands of pounds were guaranteed to meet any deficiency which might arise in connection with the Church Congress expenses for 1899. There is, however, a surplus for distribution for diocesan purposes. The accounts have been audited by Messrs. Prideaux, Booker, Frere, and Co., chartered accountants, 48, Lincoln's Inn Fields, who certify that, after the payment of all charges, there is a balance of £1,100 11s. 10d. In addition to this, the collections in St. Paul's Cathedral, Westminster Abbey, and St. Mary Abbots amounted to £272 17s. 7d. The total of £1,373 9s. 5d. has been allocated by the Bishop of London and the Church Congress Finance Committee, of which the Bishop of Islington is chairman, in the following proportions: One half to the Bishop of London's Fund, and one-sixth to respectively the East London Church Fund, the diocesan branch of the Queen Victoria Clergy Fund, and the Poor Schools Relief Fund administered by the Diocesan Board of Education.

The general subject to be considered at next year's Islington Clerical Meeting, which will be held on Tuesday, January 9, is Archbishop Benson's famous description of the Church of England as "Catholic, Apostolic, Reformed, and Protestant." These divisions will be considered at the morning session by Canon Edwards, Chancellor Bernard, Bishop Barry, and Professor Ryle respectively. In the afternoon the following questions will be discussed: "How can the Church of England Faithfully Discharge her Duties to the Nation as a Whole?" (to be opened by Archdeacon Perowne and the Rev. F. S. Webster) and "How can the Church of England Faithfully Discharge her Evangelistic and Pastoral Office to Individuals?" (to be opened by Prebendary Webb-Peploe and the Rev. E. A. Stuart). As usual, the morning session will begin at 10.30, and that in the afternoon at 2.30, and the meeting will be held, as last year, in St. Mary's Hall, Islington Green.

The Bishop of Carlisle announces in his *Diocesan Gazette* that at the recent meeting of the Archbishops and Bishops, the first Sunday in the New Year, January 7, was selected as the most suitable day for a simultaneous appeal in all churches on behalf of the war funds.

An interesting MS. has lately been given to the Lichfield Cathedral Library by the Rev. T. Barns, Vicar of Hilderstone. It contains the treatise "On Contemplation," which was written by St. Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaulx, and sent in parts to his friend and former pupil, Pope Eugenius III. (1145-1153). The MS. has twenty-seven leaves, vellum, 9 inches by $6\frac{5}{8}$ inches, and is written in an English hand of the fourteenth century.

The Council of University College, Liverpool, have appointed unanimously Mr. Alfred W. W. Dale, M.A., Fellow of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, and son of the late Rev. R. W. Dale, D.D., of Birmingham, to

the post of Principal of the College, in succession to Principal Glazebrook, who has been appointed to an important position under the Royal Society.

The Viceroy of India has telegraphed that the situation in many of the affected districts is being aggravated by want of rain. The total number of persons on relief works at latest reports was 1,358,000.

The authorities of the Evangelical Alliance have issued the following invitation for the annual week of united prayer: "The meetings proposed to be held throughout the world will take place January 7 to 14, 1900."

Through the munificence of the Bishop of Salisbury, the Bishop's School in that city has been endowed to the amount of about £200 a year.

At the unanimous invitation of the committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society, the Rev. John Holland Ritson has accepted the post in the secretarial department of the society left vacant by the transfer of the Rev. J. Gordon Watt to succeed the late Dr. William Wright as Editorial Superintendent. Mr. Ritson held the Brackenbury Science Scholarship at Balliol College, Oxford (B.A., 1890; M.A., 1893), and entered the Wesleyan ministry in 1890. He will be the first Methodist to hold a secretarysbip of the Bible Society, the Nonconformist secretaries having been almost without exception Congregationalists.

The Dean of Rochester has just completed his eightieth year, and the venerable octogenarian (says the London correspondent of the *Yorkshire Post*) will receive from both sides of the Atlantic such a shoal of good wishes as would be accorded but to few other men. "The hold which Samuel Reynolds Hole has acquired over the hearts of his countrymen is due to a variety of causes, but, chiefly, perhaps, to the fact that to a rigid conscientiousness and strictly Christian example he adds a robust common sense and rich humour which seem to come naturally from one of his manly aspect and courtly bearing."

The builders are now engaged upon the second block of the permanent buildings of the Church House in accordance with the plans revised by the late Sir Arthur Blomfield. It is estimated that the cost will be £20,000, towards which about £11,000 has been contributed or promised.

The meeting summoned to his house by the Bishop of Rochester, at which a definite movement was made for the creation of a new South London diocese, calls for attention. It will be remembered that the reconstruction of the diocese of Rochester has been mooted for a great number of years, and that as far back as 1888 Convocation recommended its subdivision; in fact, it is not too much to say that the question of the reconstruction has been before men's minds ever since its construction in its present unshapely form. Its main point is that it recognises the County of London south of the Thames as the future diocese of Southwark, but adds to it the archdeaconry of Kingston, on the ground that such a large area of poor needs the support of some of the well-to-do suburbs; and, indeed, there is justice in this, because the wealth of the suburbs is, in the main, derived from those London enterprises which are served largely by the dwellers in South London. It is encouraging to learn that already, before the subscription list has gone to the public, a sum of no less than £23,500 was announced in the room, and we are

not surprised to hear that the committee thereupon resolved itself into three sub-committees—one to introduce a Bill into Parliament, another to continue the collection of money, and the third for general purposes. The whole sum required is estimated at £100,000, and if it should fall out that any portion of the proceeds of the sale of Addington should be devoted to the creation of a neighbouring diocese such as this, it ought not to be very long before the much-talked-of South London see, with the already restored church of St. Saviour's as its cathedral, is an accomplished fact. (From the *Guardian*.)

Sir Hubert Parry has been appointed Professor of Music at Oxford in place of Sir John Stainer, resigned. The choice is the best that could possibly have been made.

AN APPEAL.

The Bethnal Green Free Library.—In its quiet way this institution is conducting a grand educational work amongst the crowded and poverty-stricken population of the East End. Not only is the library a well-stocked one and varied in character, but evening classes are arranged and other steps taken to interest and instruct the young who live in the vicinity. Year by year the number of readers and students increases, while the healthy influence exercised is self-evident to everyone who contrasts the condition of Bethnal Green to-day with the state of things that existed twenty years ago. At the moment the coffers are well-nigh exhausted, and consequently a special appeal for funds is being made. That it may be generously responded to will be the earnest hope of all who recognise the useful character of the work being done and are aware of the opportunities there are for further development. Contributions should be sent to the Treasurer, F. A. Bevan, Esq., J.P., 54, Lombard Street, E.C.; the Bankers, Messrs. Barclay and Co., Limited, same address; or to the Secretary and Librarian, Mr. G. F. Hilcken.

NEW BOOKS.

The Life of Edward White Benson, sometime Archbishop of Canterbury. By his Son, A. C. Benson (of Eton College). In 2 vols.; 36s. net. Macmillan.

A New History of the English Church. Edited by Dean Stephens and Rev. W. Hunt. In seven vols. Vol. i.: 597-1066. By Rev. W. Hunt. Price 7s. 6d. Macmillan.

Exploratio Evangelica. A Brief Examination of the Basis and Origin of Christian Belief. By P. Gardner, Litt.D. Price 15s. A. and C. Black.

The Book of Proverbs (International Critical Commentary). By Professor C. H. Toy. Price 12s. T. and T. Clark.

The Ritschlian Theology. A Critical Estimate. By Rev. H. E. Garvie, B.D. Price 9s. T. and T. Clark.

OBITUARY.

Lord Penzance, whose name was so familiar to Churchmen a quarter of a century ago, died at his residence, Easbing Park, Godalming, on Saturday, December 9. He had been ailing for some time, but had only comparatively recently resigned his position as Dean of the Arches and Judge of the Court established under the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874.