

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

THE
CHURCHMAN

AUGUST, 1900.

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

VII. WILLIAM WAKE.

ARCHBISHOP WAKE compiled for his son a small volume, "A Brief Inquiry into the Antiquity of the Wake Family," which was printed in 1833 by his great-granddaughter, Etheldred Bennett. Briefly summarized, it says that Hugh Wac, in the reign of Henry I., married Emma, heiress of Baldwin FitzGilbert, who was grandson of Baldwin, Count of Flanders. Who Hugh "Wac" was, whether of Norman or English origin, is doubtful, but the Archbishop is against the Norman idea. He thinks that Le Wake, or "The Watchful," was given to Hereward as descriptive of his character as a military commander. Mr. M. A. Lower, in his book on English surnames, is of the same opinion.

William Wake was born at Blandford, Dorset, January 26, 1657, the son of a well-to-do member of this ancient family. The boy was educated at the Grammar School of his native town, and then matriculated at Christ Church, Oxford (1673), took his B.A. in 1676, M.A. 1679, and B.D. and D.D. by accumulation 1689.¹

His father intended him for commercial life, but he chose the clerical, and was ordained in 1681. Next year he accepted the duty of chaplain to his friend, Sir Richard Graham, who had been created Viscount Preston, and sent as Envoy-Extra-

¹ The Festival of the Sons of the Clergy, which, it is well to note, was founded in the time of the Commonwealth for the benefit of the impoverished clergy, was incorporated by royal charter in 1678, and on this occasion the Archbishop's uncle, Edward Wake, exerted himself successfully to secure care for the widows and children of the clergy in the charter of incorporation.

ordinary to the French Court. Some important results in Wake's life followed from this. He remained three years in Paris, where a very serious controversy was being carried on. The reign of Lewis XIV. had reached its zenith. The crimes and follies of the Fronde had strengthened his position, for the nation in its disgust at these things welcomed a strong unlimited monarchy, and the people were content to acquiesce in the show and glitter; each man saw himself reflected in the King. Public opinion for a while consisted in admiration of the King and the worship of the crown and sceptre. No King of France had been so powerful; never had the boundaries of the kingdom been so wide, or the literature and art of the nation so brilliant. A King at the age of five, he had grown up under clever guidance, and when he attained his majority and assumed the reins of government the nation was united and prosperous. That was the most brilliant and inspiring spectacle of monarchy which the world had yet seen. It was the golden age of pulpit oratory in France, and the King loved listening to it. Controversies there were, and angry ones, too. SS. Francis de Sales and Vincent de Paul had been dead some years, but the great battle between Jansenists and Jesuits was at its height; rival parties at Court were now extolling the logic of the Jesuit Bourdaloue, or the whirlwind eloquence of Fléchier, or the finished periods of Massillon. But all these were paling in lustre before the sustained and fiery power of Jacques Bénigne Bossuet. This illustrious man had been consecrated Bishop of London in 1669, but next year accepted the post of tutor to the Dauphin and resigned his see for an abbacy, devoting himself to his tutorial duties. For his pupil's use he wrote his "*Discours sur l'Histoire Universelle*," in three parts, a work so able that it gained the unstinted praise of Voltaire. In 1685 Lewis made him Bishop of Meaux.

The cleverest woman who ever bore power in France, Mme. de Maintenon, was now at the height of her influence, for good more than for evil, over Lewis XIV. Whatever may have been their relations before, he married her in 1684, after his Queen's death. To understand the basis of his policy, we must remember that Lewis had constantly before him the idea of Charlemagne—the vision of a universal empire. Charles the Great had for a while held sway over Europe, had been crowned monarch of the Holy Roman Empire in 814; but before long his empire had been broken to pieces. The same vision had floated before the eyes of Charles V., but again came disintegration; and the House of Hapsburg had now sunk almost into insignificance. Germany was saturated with Protestantism, and this, if only for its political

affinities, was hateful to Lewis. He hoped to reconstruct a suzerainty over the nations around, which a dread of the still terrible Turks would help to bind together; and it was part of his hope to make England an appanage of his monarchy. Hence his support of Charles II. and his brother James. William of Orange saw clearly his plans, and made it the very business of his life to defeat them. But a formidable difficulty soon rose up against Lewis. He could revoke the Edict of Nantes, which he did in 1685, and so persecute his Protestant subjects in France. But what of the Roman Church itself and his relations to the Pope?

The Jesuits had succeeded in expelling the Port Royalist nuns, but the Jansenists were by no means defeated. And it was impossible that the heavy blows which the Protestant teachers of the Continent had struck at the Papal power should not have effect even upon those who continued to hold Roman doctrine. Lewis himself was almost as determined as our Henry VIII. to assert his royal prerogative, orthodox as he considered himself. He was "the most Christian King," "the eldest son of the Church," the extirpator of heresy; and all this worked together to create in his soul the most boundless arrogance which any despot ever showed. Yet the doom of failure was already gone forth against him. His arms had been so successful that to this day the marks of the brutalities which followed his victories are seen by the tourist all through the Palatinate. "Whom are you fighting against now that the Emperor is dethroned?" said Thiers to Ranke after the fatal battle of Sedan. "Against Lewis XIV.," sternly replied the great historian. The revocation of the Edict of Nantes was the turning-point in his career. The mischief to Germany was done, but from that day onwards his power declined, and when he died, thwarted, impoverished, deprived of children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, hirelings watched by his corpse, and the nation breathed as though a weight had been lifted from its heart.

He had listened to advisers who bade him not be the servile tool of the Roman Pontiff, and he had yielded to that advice when he scolded Pope Innocent XI. for favouring the Jansenists. In his very zeal for orthodoxy he had stood up against the Pope. The maxim of the heathen Emperor M. Aurelius, when he declared to the Christians, "Non licet esse vos," was adopted by Lewis against Protestants and Jansenists alike; and with the same despotic instinct he set himself fiercely against the hopes and plans of men like his friend Bossuet for negotiation and reconciliation between the Catholics and Protestants. Concession of any sort meant diminution of arbitrary authority, and therefore was hateful to

him. Yet it might have seemed that the wider view had hope of acceptance. There had been a struggle between the Holy See and the French King concerning certain feudal rights, which had lasted for nine years. The same year that Wake went to Paris the Gallican Church had published a "Declaration" that the ecclesiastical power has no rights over the temporalities of the kingdom; that a General Council is superior to the Pope; that his power is under the control of Canons, and his judgment is not infallible except when confirmed by the Church. All this was significant enough, and when supported by a monarch so powerful as Lewis was more than the Pope dared resent. Yet it was a failure, because Bossuet himself thus appealed to antiquity, not because he was zealous for liberty of conscience, but because he wanted to serve his master the King. He could not rise above the circumstances of his position; he was the courtier of a monarch whose despotism was like that of a Sultan. Some of his finest sermons are defiled by gross flattery of the King. He certainly does not show to advantage in his controversy with the simple, saintly Fénelon.

But the declaration thus put forth naturally attracted the earnest attention of Wake, who saw hopes of approximation between the Gallican and English Communion. And this hope, though again and again disappointed, never left him. He clung to it so long as he lived. In 1684 a tract was published at Cologne entitled "*Moyens les justes et efficaces pour ramener dans le sein de l'Eglise Catholique ceux qui en sont séparés.*" Wake translated it under the title "*Sure and Honest Means for the Conversion of all Heretics; and Wholesome Advice and Expedients for the Reformation of the Church.*" Writ by one of the Communion of the Church of Rome, and translated from the French" (London, 1688). It has a long preface by him. But at the same time, and, in fact, owing to the same course of studies, he was moved to enter into a firm defence of the Anglican position. Fell, Bishop of Oxford, took advantage of his scholarship to ask him whilst in Paris to collate some manuscripts of the New Testament in the library there for John Mill's projected edition. In doing this he became cognizant of some falsifications of manuscripts by the Sorbonne, of which he afterwards made telling use in contravening Bossuet's "*Variations des Eglises Protestantes.*" He returned to England with Lord Preston in 1685, and immediately set to work with his "*Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England.*" He published it in quarto in 1686, and it has gone through many editions since, and deservedly. The sixth edition lies before me: "Printed for B. Dod, Bookseller to the Society for

Promoting Christian Knowledge, at the Bible and Key in Ave-Mary-Lane, 1751." This valuable work is in the form of a commentary, or extension (for it is all in question and answer) of the Church Catechism, and consists of six parts: i. Of the Gospel Covenant; ii. Of the Articles of our Faith; iii. Of the Gospel Obedience; iv. Of the Duty of Prayer; v. Of the Sacraments; vi. Of Confirmation. Though the greater part of it is occupied with general teaching, it is also in part controversial. For example, when he has to deal with "Repentance," he writes:

Q. What is the next thing required in order to a true Repentance?

A. Confession of sin. Not that God has any need of being informed by us of what we have done amiss: but to the end that we may thereby both raise in ourselves a greater shame and sorrow for our evil doings; and give the greater glory to God by a solemn humbling of ourselves in confession before Him.

Q. Is such a Confession necessary to our Forgiveness?

A. So necessary that we have no promise of any pardon without it: Prov. xxviii. 13, *He that covereth his sins shall not prosper, but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy.* 1 John i. 8, 9, *If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.*

Q. To whom is our Confession to be made?

A. Always to God; and in some certain cases to man also.

Q. What are those cases in which we ought to confess our sins to man as well as to God?

A. They are especially these three: (1) In case we have offended or injured our neighbour; and upon that account need to obtain his pardon as well as God's. (2) If by any open and notorious transgression we shall happen to have either deserved, or it may be, to have fallen under the censures of the Church; and so confession to the Church is necessary to restore us to the peace of it. Or (3) if we shall have any private reason that may move us to acquaint any person with our sins; for Advice, for Prayer, for Absolution; or for any other the like spiritual advantage, which cannot be had without it.

Q. What think you of that Confession (commonly called *Auricular Confession*) which the Church of Rome requires as necessary to forgiveness?

A. I look upon it as a great and dangerous Imposition that has no warrant from the Holy Scriptures; but is a Rock and

Snare to the consciences of good men; and may be apt to encourage those who are evil inclined to commit sin; whilst by the Absolution which is so readily given them thereupon (and the efficacy of which is so highly magnified in that Church) they are taught to entertain a much less opinion both of the heinousness and danger of their evil doings and of the easiness of obtaining the forgiveness of them, than either the Scripture warrants or their own interest should prompt them to admit of.

So all through; by question and answer the sufficiency of Holy Scripture is declared, and the distinctive doctrines of Romanism rejected. Thus, in the extension on the article of the Creed on the Catholic Church, we have:

Q. Do you look upon the Church of England to be a true part of the Catholic Church?

A. It certainly is: inasmuch as it possesses the true Catholic faith, delivered in the Holy Scriptures, and drawn up in the Creeds of the Church, and by the most ancient Councils acknowledged to be sufficient to denominate those who professed according thereunto, to be truly Catholic Christians; and also holds communion with all such churches as profess the same faith; and as far forth, as they do so.

Q. What is your opinion of the Church of Rome in this particular?

A. That she is both schismatical and heretical: schismatical in cutting off all others from her communion who will not profess her errors and submit to her usurped authority; heretical in professing such doctrines as quite destroy the foundations of Christianity, and are inconsistent with that truth which she herself pretends to maintain.

These are fair specimens; the same controversial attitude marks the whole book, but by no means to the exclusion of a lucid and full explanation of Christian doctrine. After he became Bishop of Lincoln, he republished it with a prefatory address to the clergy of the diocese, in which he gives a full account of the value of catechetical instruction, and of the care which has been taken in the past to promote it. "As by the Sermon in the Morning," he writes, "those who are of riper years and better knowledge in the Gospel of Christ, are edified and instructed; so by teaching and expounding the Catechism in the Afternoon, the younger and more ignorant (who are not yet capable of profiting by Sermons) are informed and trained up with such a sort of learning as is suitable to their age and capacities. And yet, alas! how has this

prudent and useful method been slighted by many and neglected by more. And instead of these catechetical instructions a second Sermon has been introduced in the afternoon, and a new sort of teachers set up, under as new a character, of Lecturers, to preach it; and that, oftentimes, not so much to the real benefit as to the fancies and inclinations of those by whom they are to be paid for it. I cannot say that this is altogether contrary to our present Establishment, because the last Act of Uniformity has given directions for the licensing and allowing of them; but sure I am it is a manifest encroachment upon our good old constitutions, which knew no such persons nor made any provision for them. And the result has been that the Afternoon Sermon has almost quite thrown out the much better and more profitable exercise of Catechising, which has both the Laws of the Realm and the Canons of the Church on its side, whereas the other has neither. And therefore if the One must be allowed, I think the Other, at least, should not be omitted."

In 1688 Wake was appointed preacher of Gray's Inn, in spite of the opposition of James II. At the Revolution he was made Chaplain in Ordinary to William and Mary, and Deputy Clerk of the Closet. Next year he was made a Canon of his old college of Christ Church, and in 1693 Rector of St. James's, Piccadilly (there is a portrait of him in the vestry). In 1703 he became Dean of Exeter, and much against his will—for there is a protest of his against it among the Additional MSS. of the British Museum—he had to resign his canonry at Christ Church. His reason was that that canonry gave him opportunities of carrying on his studies in his University. He continued to hold the rectory of St. James's till 1706. On October 21, 1705, he was consecrated Bishop of Lincoln, in succession to Gardiner. On the death of Tenison (December, 1715) he was translated to Canterbury.

During the years we have been recording, Wake published some books of great and permanent value. Of his work on the Catechism, which also includes within it a reply to Bossuet's attack on Protestantism, we have spoken already. His edition of the Apostolic Fathers held a high place in our English theology till Bishop Lightfoot's superseded it. It was published in 1693, and is still frequently to be met with. A cheap edition of it was published by William Hone in 1820, not with honest purpose. That clever pamphleteer gathered together a number of early heretical legendary gospels, and added Wake's Apostolic Fathers to them, so making up what he called "the Apocryphal New Testament." The addition of Wake's prefaces was a throwing dust in men's eyes, for it pretended to make him thereby responsible for the

rest of the volume, which contained very objectionable matter. However, it wrought no harm, for the "Apocryphal Gospels" did the Canonical Gospels the service afforded by the mighty contrast, and the rest—the part taken from Wake—was of very great service in the light it threw on the history of the early Church. It may be added here that Hone, who was always not only a most industrious but earnest man, became a deeply religious one, and died a full believer in the Christian faith.

Of Wake's other great work I have had occasion to speak in the course of the life of Tenison. It is his answer to Atterbury's "Rights, Powers and Privileges of Convocation." Against it Wake published the great volume which now lies before me, entitled "The State of the Church and Clergy of England in their Councils, Synods, Convocations, Conventions, and other Public Assemblies; historically deduced from the Conversion of the Saxons to the Present Times. With a large Appendix of Original Documents." This is a large folio of 870 pages besides 17 pages of preface, and is very learned, thoughtful, and calm. On which side in the controversy the right lay, opinion probably still remains divided, and for the same reason which we have touched upon in political matters. The destruction of feudalism, and the despotism of the Tudors which followed it, left a legacy of strife and contention between Kings and Parliaments, which had to be settled by the course of events, and was so settled by the State wisdom of William III. Still greater was the difficulty raised by the establishment of the Church of England on the principle of independence of Rome. The Church had to feel its way under new conditions, and it is impossible for any honest, any earnest man not to sympathize with the two parties, each of which felt that it had right on its side, the Catholic and the Protestant. The strife between them was for victory; the good hand of God was leading them, and is leading us still, to recognise the truth which underlies each. Warburton, who was no friend to Convocation, favoured his friend Atterbury's views. Atterbury, he said, went on *principles*, Wake on *precedents*. And though for a while Wake's views were accepted by the nation and Church at large, as most conducive to the public peace and order, yet at all events to-day the Convocation of the Church claims rights which he would have questioned. We shall, however, see more of this when we survey the history of Wake's primacy.

W. BENHAM.

(*To be continued.*)

ART. II.—THE PROTESTANTISM OF OUR GREAT
ENGLISH DIVINES.

IV. BISHOP COSIN.

NO one has been more frequently quoted during the last thirty years as favourable to Medievalist tendencies than Bishop Cosin. The reason of this is that in the year 1855 Dr. Barrow, Principal of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, having been invited to edit for the Anglo-Catholic Library the final volume of Cosin's works, inserted into it some notes on the Prayer-Book which he designated as "First Series of Notes." But these notes were not Cosin's. Their existence had long been known. They were written in an interleaved Prayer-Book which fell into the hands of Hickes the Nonjuror in 1707. Hickes made every effort to discover who was the compiler of them, but was unsuccessful. Internal evidence, however, showed that the compiler was the author of five sermons which Cosin had not and could not have written, as at the date of the compilation he was either a layman or had only just been ordained. The notes were supposed to have been based to some extent on some lectures of Bishop Overall, and therefore, though they were not printed, several copies of them were made by hand. One of these copies was by Archbishop Sancroft, and to his copy he prefixed a statement that he had transcribed them "out of Mr. Hayward's book, of Coton." Mr. Hayward of Coton was a nephew of Bishop Overall, and is thus proved almost with certainty to be the compiler, though he might have been only the owner, of the book. Cosin had nothing whatever to do with them, but in his library, which he bequeathed to Durham, there was a copy of the book, which Dr. Barrow found while seeking for material for the volume that he was editing. In consequence of this the idea suggested itself to Dr. Barrow, who was unaware of Sancroft's statement, that these notes might be Cosin's. He examined the handwriting, but they were written in a large hand, whereas Cosin's well-known handwriting is very small. He examined the tone and tendency, but they were very different from, and "in marked contrast to," those of a later series of notes acknowledged to be Cosin's. Still, the Bishop's handwriting might have changed as he grew older, and his principles might possibly have changed too, owing to irritation at his son having become a Romanist. So Dr. Barrow determined that they were Cosin's compilation, and published them as such. There are some valuable passages in the series, but on the whole they are far more favourable to pre-Reformation doctrines and practices than the Bishop's

genuine works, and further, being a compilation, they contain long extracts from the Jesuit Maldonatus, the originals of which are honestly given by Dr. Barrow at the bottom of the paper. These passages have again and again been quoted, not as Maldonatus', but as Cosin's, and used to prove that Roman doctrine (e.g., the propitiatory character of the sacrifice of the Eucharist) was tenable in the Church of England because held by Bishop Cosin, who took so active a part in the final revision of the Prayer-Book. When "Bishop Cosin" is referred to as authorizing anything medieval, the reader may feel sure that it is the "First Series of Notes" that is appealed to—i.e., Pseudo-Cosin.

The following extracts from the Bishop's genuine writings will show how thoroughly Protestant he was in his rejection of all Papal doctrine, and how he declined to see any opposition between the term "Protestant" and "Catholic" when each was properly understood.

The Church of Rome's New Articles of Faith.

In the preface to his *Scholastical History of the Laws of Holy Scripture* the Bishop enumerates them as follows:

1. A new additional canon of Scripture, first made in their late Council of Trent.
2. The Church of Rome the mother and mistress of all other Churches.
3. The Pope of Rome monarch, or head, of the universal visible Church, Vicar, or deputy, of Christ.
4. Scriptures to be expounded according to the sense of the Roman Church.
5. Seven Sacraments, neither more nor less, instituted by Christ Himself.
6. Transubstantiation, and a prayer and propitiatory sacrifice in the Mass offered up by the Priest for the sins of the quick and dead.
7. Private Masses and Communion in one kind.
8. Purgatory and Masses for the dead.
9. Invocation of saints.
10. Worship of relics and images.
11. Indulgences.
12. The Roman decrees to be received as the Catholic faith.

These are "their traditions, wherein now consisteth the very life and being of their peculiar and proper religion, that differeth from ours and the true Catholic religion of every Church and every age before them," which, having been confirmed by Pope Pius IV.'s Bull, are "made so many new articles of faith." "But all these new traditions, as they have no ground in Scripture, so have they as little testimony of

antiquity to be brought for them, out of both which we prescribe against them all. For it is but a vain pretence of antiquity, and a mere abusing of the world, when they go about to make simple people believe that all which they profess and believe hath the consent of all ages for them, and that all the ancient fathers and Bishops of the Church never taught nor believed otherwise than they do now" (p. xxiv).

Differences between Rome and England.

"We that profess the Catholic faith and religion in the Church of England do not agree with the Roman Catholics in anything whereunto they now endeavour to convert us. But we totally differ from them in these points:

"1. The Church of Rome mother and mistress of all other Churches.

"2. The Pope of Rome Vicar-General of Christ.

"3. The Canons of the Synod of Trent to be received as matters of Catholic faith.

"4. Seven true and proper Sacraments instituted by Christ.

"5. That the priests offer up our Saviour in the Mass, as a real, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead.

"6. Transubstantiation.

"7. Communion under one kind.

"8. That there is a Purgatory after this life in which the souls of the dead are punished, and from whence they are fetched out by the prayers and offerings of the living.

"9. Invocation of saints.

"10. Worship of relics.

"11. Worship of images.

"12. Indulgences, as they are now practised in the Church of Rome both for the living and the dead.

"13. Ceremonies, such as are spittle and salt at Baptism, the five crosses upon the Altar and Sacrament of the Eucharist, the holding of that Sacrament over the priest's head to be adored, the exposing of it in their churches to be worshipped by the people, the circumgestation and carrying of it abroad in procession upon their *Corpus Christi* Day, and to their sick for the same, the oil and chrism in Confirmation, the anointing of the ears, the eyes and noses, the hands and reins of those that are ready to die, the giving of an empty chalice and paten to those that are to be ordained priests, and many others of this nature now in use with them.

"14. Ecclesiastical observations and constitutions, such as are their laws of forbidding all priests to marry, the appointing several orders of monks, friars and nuns in the Church, the service of God in an unknown tongue, the saying of a number

of *Ave Marias* by tale upon their chaplets, the sprinkling of themselves and the dead bodies with holy water as operative and effectual for the remission of venial sins, the distinctions of meats to be held for true fasting, the religious consecration and incensing of images, the baptizing of bells, the dedicating of divers holidays for the immaculate conception and the bodily assumption of the blessed Virgin, and for *Corpus Christi*, or transubstantiation of the Sacrament, the making of the Apocryphal books to be as canonical as any of the rest of the Holy and undoubted Scriptures, the keeping of these Scriptures from the free use and reading of the people, the approving of their own Latin translation only, and divers other matters of the like nature.

“All which we hold, some to be pernicious, some unnecessary, many false and many fond, and none of them to be imposed upon any Church or any Christians, as the Roman Catholics do upon all Christians and all Churches whatsoever, for matters needful to be approved for eternal salvation” (Paper written for the Countess of Peterborough).

Romish Intolerance.

“The Roman Catholics

“1. Say and believe that we are all damned, as by the Articles of their new Creed they are bound to believe.

“2. They call us heretics.

“3. They excommunicate us.

“4. Not long since they bound us, both alive and dead, at their stakes, and when the edicts of princes restrain them not, they do so still, as by their own laws they have obliged themselves to do, which laws, if civil respects suspend them not for the time, they can put in execution at an hour's warning when they please.

“5. They will allow us no other burial for our dead than the burial of a dog, accounting their churches and their churchyards to be polluted if any of our people be there put into a grave, and whoever it be among them (be it a son that shall bury his father, or a wife her husband) that die in our religion, if they venture to make a grave there, and put the dead corpse either of a father, of a husband, or other the like into it, they are bound to scrape up that corpse again with their own fingers, and carry it away to be buried in a ditch or a dunghill, or where else they can find room for it. Prince and peasant are herein alike; if they be not Roman Catholics, they shall be used no better” (Paper: “On the State of Us who adhere to the Church of England”).

Repudiation of Roman Superstitions.

“The strange, new and unreasonable doctrines and practices which in the lapse of time had crept into our Church by inadvertence, or had been wilfully introduced by Romish guile, have been reformed and brought into accordance with the Word of God in lawfully-assembled synods and in Parliament.

“We have no unwritten faith, as Rome has, and admit no innovations of any sort in religion, for we have put aside the vain traditions of men and newborn dogmas, unsupported by Holy Scripture and by antiquity, and we rest in the one Catholic truth, faith and religion, as handed down to us from the first ages.

“We do not bow down before a picture, or a gaudily-dressed image.

“We do not worship we know not what in relics, hosts and images.

“We do not hold Divine Service in a language not understood of the people.

“We do not invoke those in whom we do not believe (Rom. x. 14).

“We do not mutilate the Holy Eucharist, and lose one half of it.

“We do not recognise the Roman Church as the mother or mistress of all other Churches, or of our own.

“We have utterly cut off from our Church, as unhealthy excrescences on the ancient faith, the figments of transubstantiation, purgatory, human merits, the reiteration of the sacrifice of Christ offered daily by the priests for the quick and dead, the Divine authority of the Roman Bishop over all Churches throughout the world, the decrees of the Papal Councils, and the anathemas of the Synod of Trent, which Pope Pius IV. was audacious enough to order to be received as Articles of Faith under penalty of the loss of eternal salvation. Thus we have restored our Church to its native beauty and health” (“*Regni Angliæ Religio Catholica: Prisca, casta, defæcata,*” vii.).

The Reformation.

“Those men who do now so busily endeavour to seduce the sons and daughters of the Church of England from the grounds and truth of our religion, which is no other than that which we have received from Christ and His Universal Church, termed, nevertheless, by them a new Church and a new religion, which began in the days of King Henry VIII. (which is as true as if they should say a sick person began then to live when he

recovered from the disease and distemper that was before upon him, for we are the same Church still—as *he* the same person—that we were before, though in a better state and health of our souls, in a greater soundness and purity of religion than indeed we were before when they had to do with it and infected us), these men, I say, who untruly term us novelists, are in truth themselves the greatest novelists of any in the world besides” (“Canon of Holy Scripture,” xxxi.).

“It is clear from all this that we have introduced no new religion into the world or into the Church. On our principles none such could be introduced, but the faith must remain in its completeness, and unaltered. It is also clear that we retain in all essentials the Christian and Catholic faith, which existed formerly, by which we, as well as our ancestors, were brought into the bosom of the Church, and which alone could save us. For abuses, corruptions, and erroneous doctrines, whether introduced by ignorance and evil days, by zeal which was not according to knowledge, or too frequently by the avarice and ambition of men, are no parts of true religion, and no more belong to the essence or body of the Church than the warts and tumours which grow upon a man’s body are parts of his body. When these excrescences are removed, a body is not changed into another, but remains the same, only restored to its previous health and natural fair appearance. The sum of the matter is this: All that could be plainly and certainly proved by the testimony and consent of Holy Scripture and of ecclesiastical traditions in the first ages in subordination to Scripture has been retained; the rest has fallen by its own weakness, and has been deliberately rejected by our ancestors. As to rites and innocent ceremonies, we have retained and instituted such as seem to conduce best to decency and order” (“Regni Angliæ Religio,” viii.).

“We have put away many of the idle ceremonies with which our Church was overloaded, but we have retained and still observe those which we know to have been handed down from the Apostles, and some others also which it seemed would not harm the Church or injure religion, whilst we have clean rejected all which are contrary to Scripture and unworthy of sober men” (*ibid.*, xiv.).

Foreign Protestants.

“In heart and affection we enjoy constant union with all other Churches on the earth which bear the title of Christian, and profess the Catholic faith and religion, though our actual union may be prevented by distance, or misunderstanding, or persecution, and dispersion of the faithful. We desire this to

be particularly understood as referring to the Protestant Churches, and we are prepared to exhibit our Christian love when a fair occasion offers, and we earnestly desire and demand a reciprocal feeling on their part" (*ibid.*).

"The reformed Churches allow us not only to bury our dead among theirs in the churchyard which they have purchased and peculiarly set apart for that purpose, but they give us leave also to use our own office and order of burial (at least, they hinder us not to do it if the Roman Catholics permit it), and to set up our monuments and inscriptions over the graves, hereby professing unity with us, both alive and dead. In all which regards we ought no less to acknowledge them, and to make no schism between our Churches and theirs, however we approve not some defects that may be seen among them" ("The State of Us who adhere to the Church of England").

"I know it is the interest of the Pope and the Jesuits with other of the like faction to cry down the *jus divinum* of Episcopacy, and as I never was, so by the grace of God I shall never be, of that faction, but the question only is whether there be such an absolute necessity and precept in that *jus divinum* in all places and at all times as where it cannot be put in practice, then in such a case of necessity the ordination of a presbyter by a college of presbyters (though altogether against the ancient and apostolical canons for which they are to answer) shall be utterly void and invalid to all effects whatsoever. I could tell you of Bishop Overall's judgment herein, who was so great a patron of antiquity and the Church of England as any Bishop or priest that ever lived in it, and was wont to say, 'Though we are not to lessen the *jus divinum* of Episcopacy where it is established and may be had, yet we must take heed that we do not, for want of Episcopacy where it cannot be had, cry down and destroy all the reformed Churches abroad, both in Germany, France, and other places, and say they have neither ministers nor Sacraments, that all is void and null that they do'" (Letter to Gunning).

Holy Scripture.

"Till some few men (of the Latin Church only) met lately together at Trent, the new canon, in such terms as they have devised it, was never heard of" ("Canon of Scripture," iv.).

"Adhering to the ancient Catholic Faith and doctrine of the Church, we cannot admit or approve any such new decree as it has lately pleased the Masters of the Council of Trent to make; who have not only obruded these books (the Apocrypha) upon their own people, to be received as true and

authentic parts of the Ancient Testament, but have likewise damned all the world besides that will not recede from the universal conclusion of the Christian Church" (*ibid.*, xix.).

Form of Ordination.

"He (Father Robinson) desired to know: 1. Whether our priests or ministers had any power to consecrate the Sacrament of the Altar, and by what words that power was given them in our form of ordination. 2. Whether they had any power to offer the Sacrifice of the Altar, and by what words that power, likewise, was with us conferred upon them. I told him that, excluding their pretended and vain sense of transubstantiating the bread and wine, of a true and proper Altar, and of a real sacrificing of the Body of Christ, all which we rejected as unsound and uncatholic doctrine, we had both the one and the other power given us—that is, a power to bless the elements, and of common bread and wine to make them become sacred symbols, or the Sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ; which was as certainly given to the faithful as the Sacrament itself was received by them; and a power to offer the sacrifice of the Eucharist, which is a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, made in the name of the Church for the sacrifice that Christ made of Himself and offered upon the altar of His Cross once for all." ("Concerning Ordination.")

"A power to consecrate the Sacrament, and to make a memorial of the Sacrifice, we grant him (Father Paul); a power to transubstantiate and really to sacrifice Christ upon the altar for the quick and dead we shall never grant him, that being a new doctrine which the Catholic Church never taught us" ("Concerning the Ordination of Priests").

Transubstantiation.

"Hence it is plain that the gangrene of transubstantiation had not yet (at the end of the tenth century) eaten into the Churches of the Christian world, but that sound doctrine was everywhere retained about the Body and Blood of the Lord, and His true, but spiritual and mystical, not carnal, presence, together with the symbols of Bread and Wine, which were regarded as remaining in their own substance after consecration" ("Historia Transubstantiationis").

"As soon as ever Transubstantiation was established, a foundation was laid for a number of superstitions and errors, which God-fearing men could not sanction or endure; and among the believers in Transubstantiation themselves there grew up a forest of questions, inextricable and portentous,

with which the schoolmen occupied themselves to such a degree that it may be truly affirmed that a perfectly new and monstrous theology, unheard of by all the ancients, and the adoration of the Host then took its birth. . . . But who can believe that our Lord Christ willed to institute a presence of His most holy Body in His Church of such a nature that He Himself or His Body could be given into the hands of unbelieving Jews and Turks, or could be swallowed by dogs and mice, or cast into the fire, or burnt, or used for magical incantation? I cannot go on. I shudder at what I have already quoted" (*ibid.*).

"For the same purpose (because some men thought the words might otherwise have imported Transubstantiation) were the words in the Form of Consecration altered from *fiat nobis corpus et sanguis Domini* to what they now are. In like sort, because the very term of offering and sacrifice, though well used of old, and in a far different meaning from that sense wherein the Papists use them, seemed nevertheless to sound their meaning, and therefore to give offence, it is altered into another expression of 'Christ's precious death' only" ("Notes on the Prayer-Book:" Genuine Series).

The Mass.

"The word 'Mass' was used by the ancients in the Latin Church with quite a different meaning than that which now prevails among the Papists. But the old Latins used the expression: 'Go, it is Mass;' that is, 'dismissal,' and hence all the sacred acts were called by the one name 'Mass,' from a single act, and that the last of all. But the word 'Mass,' as it is now used by the Papists for a true and proper sacrifice of Christ offered every time to God the Father for the living and the dead, is nowhere found among the ancients. And for this reason the very word 'Mass,' in its new, not in its ancient, signification, is rejected by the English Church, which desired to abolish that wrong opinion about the sacrifice of the Mass" (*ibid.*).

"He sits for ever at the right hand of God. And therefore Christ can be no more offered, as the doctors and priests of the Roman party fancy Him to be, and plainly think that every time they say Mass they offer up and sacrifice Christ anew, as properly and truly as He offered up Himself in His sacrifice upon the cross. And this is one of the points of doctrine, and the chief one, whereof the Popish Mass consisted, abrogated and reformed here by the Church of England according to the express Word of God. . . . Without shedding of His blood, and killing Him over again, no proper sacrifice

can be made of Him; which yet in their Masses the Roman priests pretend every day to do" (*ibid.*).

"A true, real, proper and propitiatory sacrificing of Christ every time the Sacrament is celebrated, which is the Popish doctrine, and which cannot be done without killing of Christ so often again, we hold not; believing it to be a false and blasphemous doctrine; founding ourselves upon the Apostles' doctrine that Christ was sacrificed but once, and that He dieth no more" (*ibid.*).

Elevation.

"The priest was appointed by the first liturgy, set forth in the second year of King Edward VI., to take the bread and cup into his hands (which is still observed among us); but he was not appointed to make any elevation of them as the new Roman Catholics do at their Mass, when the priest, saying *Hoc est corpus Meum*, suddenly lifts up the wafer over his head and afterwards the chalice, that the people may all fall down upon their knees and worship them, which rite neither we nor any of the Reformed or Protestant Churches observe, but, in regard of the peril of idolatry, have wholly omitted. Besides, it is but a novelty as the Roman priests now use it, for in the ancient fathers we do not read of any such custom, and when afterwards this rite of elevation came into the Church, it was not a lifting up of the bread and wine as soon as they were sacramentally hallowed over the priest's head, nor were the people then appointed to fall down and adore them as the very Body and Blood of Christ held up between the priest's fingers and set down again upon the table, which is more than any priest of them all can do, but this only was the order or custom of the Church: After the elements were consecrated the priest and the deacon together held them in their hands and showed them to the people, whom at the same time they admonished and invited to approach and communicate thereof, saying to them *Προσέλθετε, Sancta sanctis, si quis dignus sit, accedat et participet*. And other elevation and ostension than this they had none" (Note on the Prayer-Book, based on Calixtus).

Adoration.

"In all which there is not a word tending to the people's adoration of that bread and that cup; this being a late device of the new Roman Catholics after they had brought in their novelty of Transubstantiation" (*ibid.*).

One Kind.

“In this (affirming that it is enough to salvation to receive Christ's Body and Blood under one kind and form) they are not Catholics that affirm it, for the Catholic Church of Christ ever holds it necessary to follow Christ's institution and to obey His precept, which precept they wilfully neglect and break that do not only hold it sufficient to communicate under one kind, but have also made a law to punish others for heretics—that is, to burn and damn them that hold it their duty to keep Christ's order, and to communicate under both. And this have the Roman Catholics done in their late Council of Constance and in their late Synod of Trent, wherein they have not only departed from their own ancient piety and practice, but likewise from the public and universal order of the whole Catholic Church of Christ for many ages before and since (themselves only excepted), as may, if need be, be made evident by many and clear evidences against them” (Letter about communicating in one kind).

Remembrance.

“Do this in remembrance of Me”—that is, of Christ put to death, and sacrificed for us upon the Cross, which is the sacrifice that He truly and perfectly once made, and whereof we only make a commemoration or a representation, *toties quoties*, as often as we celebrate this His Sacrament and observe the precept which He gave us about it” (Note on the office of the Holy Communion).

Objective Presence.

“Because that Body and Blood is neither sensibly present, nor otherwise at all present, but only to them that are duly prepared to receive them and in the very act of receiving them and the consecrated elements together to which they are sacramentally in that act united, the adoration is then and there given to Christ Himself, neither is, nor ought to be, directed to any external sensible object, such as are the blessed elements” (*ibid.*).

Reservation.

“Of the bread and wine which the priest consecrated for the Sacrament, if he be careful, as he ought to be, to consecrate no more than will suffice to be distributed unto the communicants, none will remain” (*ibid.*).

Frequency in Communicating.

“The Eucharist is religiously and reverently celebrated by us on the greater festivals, and on the first Sunday of every

month. If any desire it oftener, and are worthy to be communicants, it may and ought to be celebrated at other times also—Sundays, festivals, or week-days” (“*Regni Angliæ Religio*,” xvii.).

Non-communicating Attendance.

“After this (the prayer for the Church Militant) those that are not about to communicate are dismissed” (*ibid.*).

The Church's Sacrifice of Praise.

“When all have communicated, the Lord's Prayer is said by the priest and people. This is accompanied by the Church's solemn Eucharist or sacrifice of praise offered to God in commemoration of the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ once offered on the cross” (*ibid.*).

Malachi i. 10.

“The prophecy of Malachi concerning the Church under the New Testament, ‘My name is great among the Gentiles, and they shall offer (or sacrifice) unto Me a pure oblation,’ applied by the doctors of the Roman Church to their proper sacrifice, as they call it, of the Mass, is interpreted and applied by the ancient fathers sometimes in general to all the acts of our Christian religion, and sometimes in particular to the Eucharist—that is, the act of our praise and thanksgiving for the sacrifice of Christ once made for us upon the cross, as here we use in the Church of England” (Note on the office of the Holy Communion).

Seven Sacraments.

“The Papal invention that there are neither more nor less than seven sacraments properly so called, and that that must be held as part of the Catholic faith, was certainly unknown to the ancient Church and unheard of. For if it had been received formerly in the Church some one of the Fathers would have expressed it in his writing, but not one out of so many has confirmed by his authority the sevenfold number of the Sacraments. That opinion did not prevail before Hugo de St. Victor and Peter Lombard, and there is no Council earlier than that of Florence in which this sevenfold number was sanctioned, A.D. 1439. These are the fine monuments of antiquity by which this cause is defended by the Papists against our Church” (*ibid.*).

Purgatory.

“Of bringing souls out of purgatory, or relieving them in their pains there, they (the Liturgies) say nothing at all, for

they knew of no such matter, neither did the Church of old teach the people to believe it" (*ibid.*).

Saint Worship.

"We come to another impiety, the impiety of some Christians, I mean the Papists, that are ready to persuade some of you to their own errors, and say that this (*Non habebis Deos alios præter me*) is none of God's commandment, and that I know not what or how many saints may be worshipped and prayed to as well as He. . . . It were infinite to number up all, but I trow this is sufficient to show their vanity, their impiety, their manifest contempt and breach of this precept, when they have so many gods to run to, so many helpers to trust to, besides One. And let no man deceive you, they that hold of this religion they hold of a wrong one, and one that will deceive them all at last" (Sermon X.).

Confirmation.

"The Romanists impose no hands, but hold them up and over the child, so the ancient use was abolished, and the new fashions brought in without any example of the Apostles or the primitive Church" (Notes on the order of Confirmation).

"Confirmation is by the Church of Rome, that now is corrupted with many errors and novelties in religion, held to be a Sacrament; but we, who by the grace of God are numbered among the Reformed Churches, whereof this Church of England is, both for doctrine and discipline, the most eminent and the most pure, the most agreeable to Scripture and antiquity of all others, we hold it to be none, and yet we hold it to be a sacred and a solemn action of religion" ("On Confirmation").

"Confirmation is ministered by the Bishop; prayers and imposition of hands are alone used, and none of the idle rites which in late times have been invented by superstitious men" ("Regni Angliæ Religio").

His Profession of Faith.

"Moreover, I do profess with holy asseveration and from my very heart that I am now, and have ever been from my youth, altogether free and averse from the corruptions and impertinent, new-fangled and papistical (so commonly called) superstitions and doctrines, and new super-additions to the ancient and primitive religion and faith of the most commended, so orthodox and Catholic Church, long since introduced, contrary to the Holy Scripture and the rules and customs of the ancient fathers" ("Last Will and Testament").

Can any who favour Romish doctrines or practices derive sanction from Bishop Cosin? F. MEYRICK.

ART. III.—THE USE AND MISUSE OF RITUAL IN CHRISTIAN WORSHIP.

PART III.—*concluded.*

III. **B**UT there is another cause assigned to account for the absence of ritual precepts in the New Testament.

The Early Church was largely composed of converted Jews. These Jews were, of course, familiar with the use of much attractive ceremonial in the worship of their Temple. These men would naturally understand that, as the Christian Church was the true continuation of the ancient Church of their Fathers, so the Temple worship in its glory should be continued in greater glory under the New Testament; and if the offering of typical sacrifices was suitably accompanied in the former dispensation with special ceremonies, with elaborate rites and gorgeous vestments, much more should the offering of the one true sacrifice of propitiation be accompanied by all that could serve to make its ritual surroundings exceedingly magnificent.¹

Is there anything which fairly can be urged, or ought to be urged, as against the force of this plea?

Clearly all that has been argued as against the claim of Divine and Apostolic authority for the ritual of the Christian Church avails against this plea so far as it avails to show that the force of the argument was unheeded and unrecognised by Apostles and Apostolic Christians.

But it is open to the pleader still to ask the question:—If it were so, that in the first ages of the Christian Church the truth of this matter was unheeded or too little regarded, are we sure that this did not result from the pressure of circumstances, and, in fact, that early Christians were not in error in not recognising what was suitable for the sacrificial service of the Church, and thus failing, in the matter of ritual, to give to the Lord the honour due unto His name?

The answer to this question is to be found in the inspired teaching of the New Testament, unfolding in the light the

¹ Professor Perrone, after appealing to the sacrificial ceremonies enjoined by God Himself under the law (including such matters as the form of the altar, the vestments of the priests, the number of the lights, the burning of incense "aliaque id genus plurima," all for one main purpose, viz., "Dei cultus et honor"), adds: "Quanto igitur magis ad Sacrificium nostrum legali quovis Sacrificio sanctius et excellentius commendandum, Ejusque augendam venerationem decuit certas aliquas ceremonias ab Ecclesia præscribi, ut maxima, qua fieri posset, exteriori solemnitate et religionis significatione perageretur?" ("Prælectiones Theologicæ," vol. iii., cap. iv., prop. iii., p. 277; Paris, 1856).

teaching of the Old in the dark, and showing the essential difference between the two dispensations. Typical shadows of a work which *had to be* accomplished—shadows for *sight*—were suitably accompanied with what was glorious for sight to behold. We want not shadows for sight in the midst of the glories revealed for our faith.

The glory of the New Testament is in the great work of which it is said: "IT IS DONE." The glory of that work is to be beheld, not by the eye of sight, but of faith. It would be a very degrading of its glory indeed to think that it could be added to by any ritual objects of sight, or any cunning device of the art or devotion of man.

Heaven is open; the veil is rent. The sacrifice of the Son of God has done its work. "*It is finished.*"

Is this claim of ritual splendour made because of the honour due to the Sacrifice of the Mass? It is sad indeed to read such words as these: "Our Communion Office is, and will continue to be, the Mass in masquerade till it is performed with the externals accustomed to be used in the rest of the Western Church, and prescribed by the Ornaments Rubric of the Book of Common Prayer" ("Lord's Day and Holy Eucharist," p. 33).

Let Christian common-sense be asked to view such claims for gorgeous ritual to accompany the offering of the sacrifice of the New Covenant, the continual offering of Christ as a propitiatory sacrifice, a sacrifice for sins, in the same view with a truly inspired saying, which stands as a word of instruction and warning as to the true essential difference between the Old Covenant and the New: "By one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified. Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us, for after that He had said before, This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord: I will put My laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them. AND [He addeth] their sins and iniquities will I remember no more. Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin [*or offering for sin is no longer*]" (Heb. x. 14-18).

And if then, in the view of Christian common-sense, all these causes alleged to account for the phenomenon we are considering are found to fail of their purpose, what shall we say? Must we confess that it remains an unaccountable fact, the cause of which can never be known? Assuredly not, when there is one cause which suffices to account for all these facts, and fully to explain the attitude of Apostles, and the teachings of Apostolic men, and the views of early Christian writers. If, then, it is asked, What is that cause which can thus act as a solvent of so many difficulties and present

a clear and consistent view of the whole matter we are considering? then the answer may be very simply given: All these matters of ritual and ceremonial are comparatively of no moment in view of the stupendous miracles of grace revealed in the Gospel of Christ.

Let this answer be well considered, well examined, well put to the test. There is no fear of its being put to shame in the fair judgment of Christian common-sense.

It was said, "*comparatively* of no moment." What is meant by this comparison? Ritual is of no moment in comparison of what?

A very few words in answer to this question—which is most important—may suitably be added in conclusion.

The whole answer may very well be summed up in two short words: (1) COME and (2) Go.

1. The first word, "*to COME*," means to obey the call of a personal God speaking to the ear of a personal soul. Will any say that there is no such call in the Word of God? Will any deny that the Word of God resounds with its echo? If this is so, how supreme the importance of obedience to this voice! Shall we wonder that, even in the days of Divinely ordered ceremonial, even under a dispensation of ritual, this *coming*, this seeking God's face, made all such positive precepts, highly important though they then were, to sink into comparative insignificance?¹

And in this *coming* is a *returning*. It is not only for the benefit of Dumah that the Lord's watchman of the night has to publish the word: "If ye will inquire, inquire ye; return, come" (Isa. xxi. 12). "If thou wilt return, O Israel, saith the Lord, unto Me shalt thou return" (Jer. iv. 1, R.V.)² This coming with *return* testifies to us that the returning comers are God's own outcasts, sinners outcast unto death, outcast in righteous judgment, the children of God's wrath and condemnation. Hear the words of the Psalmist—of Moses, the man of God: "Thou turnest man to destruction; again Thou sayest, Return, ye children of men" (Ps. xc. 3). What a Divine marvel that *these* should be invited to come, even to

¹ See Dean Payne Smith, in "Speaker's Commentary," on Jer. vii. 21-23, with the additional note on pp. 376, 377.

² Shear Jashub (*the remnant shall return*) is the prophetic name of One who was for a *sign* and a *wonder* (a mystery, a typical foreshowing) of the great miracle of mercy in the New Testament. So the year of jubilee (proclaimed on the Day of Atonement)—a prophetic type of "the acceptable year of the Lord"—was fulfilled in the mission of Christ. And it was the Divine command: "In the year of jubilee ye shall return every man into his possession." (See Dean Payne Smith in "Speaker's Commentary," vol. v., pp. 93, 216). This is the "return" of God's "bringing again." (See Kay on Ps. lxxviii. 22, p. 213.)

return from their outcasting to the God who has cast them out, that from the far-off land of the great enemy the voice should be heard: "Come, and let us return unto the Lord: for He hath torn, and He will heal us; He hath smitten, and He will bind us up"! (Hos. vi. 1).

Ritual, the most solemn and impressive, can be no worship in the New Covenant without this; but this, without ceremonial, leads the hearts of converted men to that which is true worship indeed. The Father is seeking such to worship Him. These are the true worshippers, who (whether with more or less of outward signs and helps to devout adoration) worship the Father in spirit and in truth.

The voice from heaven to God's outcasts is, "Return, ye backsliding children, and I will heal your backslidings"; and the answer of obedience, the only true heart-answer to that call "Return," is this, "Behold, we come unto Thee; for Thou art the Lord our God" (Jer. iii. 22).

But in this *coming* of return is that which is full of Divine marvels, miracles of grace. It is a coming home to contemplate a Divine revelation of wonders, which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath entered into the heart of man to conceive. And therefore the call to *come* is coupled with a call to behold, "Come and see." See what? Come and see a MAN who knows what is in man—a Man who can tell to every man all things that ever he did—who can testify to all men of the evil, the spiritual death, within, and the need of a new life for every soul of man; and yet a Man of sorrows, who can grieve, and weep, and sob for the woes of the children of men, for the weariness and the griefs which have come upon man in his righteous outcasting, making men, through fear of death, to be all their lifetime subject to bondage. "Come and see" Him of whom Jehovah saith, "Behold My Servant, whom I uphold; Mine Elect, in whom My soul delighteth" (Isa. xlii. 1).

God's outcasts are as water spilt upon the ground, which cannot be gathered up again. Yet doth God, in Divine wisdom, devise means that His banished be not expelled (outcast) from Him (2 Sam. xiv. 14). It is part of His glory to be "a God of deliverances" (Ps. lxxviii. 20, R.V.). To Him "belong the issues from death" (*ibid.*; *διέξοδοι* LXX.). He can *bring again* from the land of the enemy, even from the holding of Hades. He has said, "I will *bring again* from the depths of the sea" (ver. 22).

A rabbinical story tells us of some Jewish ladies who, being carried captives by Titus to Rome, said one to another the words of this promise, "I will bring again," and then threw themselves into the sea (see Kay on Ps. lxxviii. 22, p. 213).

We are not to be understood as expressing approval of the application when we say that we have evidence here of the true interpretation of a word, which is as one of the rays of the Divine glory issuing forth from the name of our God.

It is this God of wondrous deliverances, this God whose glory it is to *bring again*—it is He whose voice says to His banished, to His outcasts, "Return, come," "Come again, ye children of men" (Ps. xc. 3).

And so our call is to see much more than the person, much more than the very incarnate Son of God. We are to come and behold the work which He came into the world to do, and to come and see that *He has DONE IT* (Ps. xxii. 31; Isa. xlv. 23).

Done WHAT? Done that which has burst the gates of hell, which has taken out of the way all that stood in the way of the sinner's return to the God of his salvation, taken away all the wrath and condemnation; done that which enables a righteous God, the God of recompenses, the God of truth, the God of judgment, to call to the poor wandering outcast and say, "Come"—"Come, for all things are now ready." "I have blotted out as a thick cloud thy transgressions, and as a cloud thy sins: return unto Me, for I have redeemed thee" (Isa. xlv. 22).

In connection with the subject we are considering, it is impossible too strongly to insist upon the reality of this personal return to a personal God—the true return of the individual soul "reconciled to God by the death of His Son"—the soul's return at the voice of the Saviour, who says, "Come unto Me"—the soul's true return to hear the word of the Father's loving and joyful welcome, "This My son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found." If we would have a Church fortified against the misuse of ritual, our eyes must be upon Him who says: "I will give them an heart to know Me, that I am the Lord: and they shall be My people, and I will be their God: for they shall return unto Me with their whole heart" (Jer. xxiv. 7).

2. And now we cannot wonder that this *coming*, this coming of *return*, this coming *to see*, should be followed by a "GO."

Mark what God expects to follow the revelation of His wondrous works, when men have been brought to see and know, and consider and understand together, "that the hand of the Lord hath done this, and the Holy One of Israel hath created it" (Isa. xli. 20). Mark how He speaks by His prophet: "Thou hast heard, See all this [see all His fore-ordained purpose of mercy and salvation fulfilled], and will ye

not declare it?" (Isa. xlvi. 6).¹ It is a word which may well remind us of the narrative we have in the seventh chapter of the second Book of Kings. We cannot fail to remember the words of the lepers, "We do not well: this day is a day of good tidings, and we hold our peace" (ver. 9). Those men were beholding the wondrous deliverance which the Lord had wrought, and enjoying its results, and keeping the good news to themselves when it concerned multitudes. They were *seeing all this* and not *declaring* it. The very voice of conscience within them told them that in this they were doing not well. Can it be well for us to *come, return, and see all this, and not declare it?* Harken to the words for God's delivered captives: "Go ye forth of Babylon, flee ye from the Chaldeans, with a voice of singing *declare ye, tell this, utter it, even to the end of the earth; say ye, The Lord hath redeemed His servant Jacob*" (Isa. xlvi. 20). Mark how continually the view of the wondrous work of God's redeeming love is followed by an outburst of praise, which is to make all creation vocal with adoration: "Sing, O ye heavens, for the Lord hath done it: shout, ye lower parts of the earth: break forth into singing, ye mountains, O forest, and every tree therein: for the Lord hath redeemed Jacob, and glorified Himself in Israel" (Isa. xlv. 23). Shall we wonder, then, that for us there is a word "go"? "How shall they preach, except they be sent? As it is written: How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the Gospel of Peace, that bring glad tidings of good things" (Rom. xi. 15), of him "that publisheth salvation" (Isa. lii. 7). Shall we marvel that those who have *come, returned, and seen* should be called to hear and obey the risen Saviour's word: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the good tidings to every creature"?

And shall we wonder that, in view of this grand commission for a lost world of perishing, outcast sinners, regulations of ritual sink into comparative insignificance? Never let it be said or thought that this go has little or nothing to do with our subject. I once was at a missionary meeting (it was, perhaps, nearly fifty years ago), where an eloquent advocate of the cause, in his desire to secure increased support for the work, pressed strongly on his audience the *cost* of Christian missions when rightly conducted. He expressed himself (as nearly as I can remember) after this sort: "Our work must not be supposed to be merely like delivering a message. A tinker on a tub," he said, "can do that."² Our great end

¹ Compare Isa. lxvi. 18, 19: "They shall *come, and see My glory. . . . And I will send . . . and they shall declare My glory among the Gentiles.*" Compare also Isa. xii. 4 and xlii. 10, 12.

² With this may be compared the argument of an essay entitled

must ever be in planting a Church in heathen lands to teach the natives to worship God; and by costly ceremonial and gorgeous ritual we must teach them that God's worship is a thing of grandeur and glory. For this we must show magnificence in our churches, artistic display in our services, and that which is imposing in all our arrangements. And all this is a very different thing from supplying a tub for the tinker. All this means what is really costly and expensive, and we

"The Missionary Aspect of Ritualism," which appeared in *The Church and the World*, published in 1866. In this it was stated to be "an axiom in liturgiology that no public worship is really deserving its name unless it be histrionic" (p. 37, third edition). Claiming "that ritualism is the natural complement of a written liturgy," Dr. Littledale urged that "the dramatic aspect of Common Prayer be manifested" (p. 42), and maintained that "in the case of all missions . . . the successful ones have invariably used the aid of ceremonial observances" (p. 42). Among other examples adduced, attention is directed to the history of the conversion of Pomerania, where the first missionary made his attempt "merely as a preacher, and that, too, in the garb of a mendicant, without any ritualism to back his efforts." The result (we are told) was that "his poverty was derided and his sermons unheeded." He was followed by S. Otto, of Bamberg, who "entered Pomerania with a gorgeous retinue of priests and soldiers, and preached his first sermon to the assembled multitudes, not in the garb of a beggar, but in the splendid vestments of his episcopal rank," and so "triumphed over his enemies" (p. 47).

The writer adds: "It is needless to dwell on the pitiful history of respectable Anglican missions to the heathen. . . . In every case a purely subjective religion, fatally weighted with the most anti-missionary and anti-Christian of dogmas—the Lutheran doctrine of justification—has been offered to men who needed to be taught by externals to rise gradually into the conception of spiritual life; and with rejection of these externals came too often practical disbelief in the verities they are meant to typify" (p. 49).

A notable and instructive example of the method recommended—fighting the enemies "with their own weapons," with "much pomp" and "ceremonial observance" (p. 47)—may be seen in Canon Jenkins' work "The Jesuits in China." See especially pp. 20, 22, 27, 32, 52, 71, 85.

But specially should be compared the following words of a Jesuit missionary to the American Indians: "I now took in hand the dancers, and taught them all such dances as occur in comedies. It is of the *greatest importance* to attract unbelievers in this way with things of this nature, and by the *splendid ceremonies* of the Church to create an internal inclination in favour of the Christian religion, on which account small booths are beautifully decorated on all festival days after vespers, and before High Mass dances are conducted in the Church where all are assembled" (Father Charlevoix, as quoted in Griesinger's "History of Jesuits," E.T., third edition, p. 143).

The reader may also be referred to the democratic Griesinger's "History," Book II., chap. i., especially pp. 90, 91, 94, 103, 112.

See also Nicolini's "History of the Jesuits," pp. 110-112, 115, 116, 121, 131.

should be willing to show that we accept all this as that which we know will not be to us as that which costs us nothing."

Let it be well understood that (except in the matter of the tinker and the tub) what has been here set down makes no pretension to be anything like a verbatim report of the argument of a highly respected speaker. It is quite possible that it may present a somewhat exaggerated representation of the substance of a very able and eloquent address. Let it be said also that there is no intention of denying that there may, perhaps, have been somewhat of truth to be learned from the speaker's criticisms of what he regarded, no doubt, as some mistaken missionary methods. "*Fas est et ab hoste doceri.*" And here the critic's purpose, we may be sure, was not hostile.

Nevertheless, I have often remembered that meeting and that speech. And as often as I have recalled it to mind, a question has always suggested itself which refuses to be suppressed. It is the question which I ask the reader to submit to the judgment of Christian common-sense. The question is this: Is it possible to conceive the Apostle Paul making such a speech as that? Would any one of the Apostles who had received their Lord's commission to "GO" have used such an argument? Can you believe that any one of those who had been sent to "declare" the glad tidings of redemption could have made such an appeal to such a motive?

In view of the Divine miracle of grace which they had to proclaim—in view of what they knew by experience of the message of the Gospel of Peace—even of its ability in all its simplicity to prove itself the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth—in view of this, can anyone be persuaded to believe that the Apostles of Christ would have asked for the outflow of wealth to make a magnificent display among the heathen of the ritual and ceremonial of the worship of Christians?

St. Paul had occasion, incidentally, in writing to the Corinthians, to speak in the same breath of the claims of God's ministers both in the old dispensation and in the new. His argument would naturally have led him to set forth their offices in their closest possible resemblance. But he must needs describe them by their prominent features. There is much which Christian common-sense may learn, and can hardly fail to learn from his words: "Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? And they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar. Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel"

(1 Cor. ix. 13, 14). The priests of the law are set before us as doing their work, as those who are set by God's command, to stand in holy vestments in the courts of the Temple, offering their daily sacrifices to God. They are as men who have heard the word "STAND": "Stand daily ministering and offering continually the same sacrifices which can never take away sins" (Heb. x. 11). It was to these sacrifices that belonged the rites and ceremonies of Temple-worship. And what is the nearest approach to this command when we turn to the Apostle's view of the ministers of the New Covenant? They are as men who have heard the words "go." Their prominent work is set before us simply in the words "they that preach the Gospel." It is the Gospel which tells of the Lord who by one offering hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified. Is there no testimony here to the supreme importance for us of the truth of the Gospel, of the comparative unimportance of ritual in the Christian Church? What a contrast between the voice which would say, "Christ has died; therefore let us offer to God the sacrifice of His Son, and adorn the sacrifice with costly and gorgeous ceremonial," and the voice which would say, "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law. Oh that men would therefore praise the Lord for His goodness, and declare the wonders that He doeth for the children of men!"

Again, we remember how the same Apostle declares, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel." We may be sure there is no dishonouring of baptism in this word. God forbid that we should think it! The Apostle does not fail to recognise the sacred relation of this Sacrament to the word which had to be "declared." He never forgets its true position as the covenant seal of the grace of the Gospel, of the free justification which we have in the blood of Christ. He tells us himself how he had himself heard and obeyed the word—"Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord" (Acts xxii. 16). Nevertheless, Christian common-sense cannot fail to see that there is here a placing of this holy Sacrament in a position of a certain subordination (in some sense) to the word of "declaring," to the grand commission "go." And if even this sacred ordinance, which by Christ's own command is to accompany the *going* and the *preaching*—if even this is seen to be subordinate and subservient to the Gospel of salvation, to the glorious "declaring," shall we hesitate to acknowledge the comparative unimportance of ritual observances which were never commanded at all?

In view of these inspired words, let us turn back for a moment and ask again—Can we conceive such a missionary

speech as that which I once heard coming from the heart or from the lips of an Apostle of Christ? I am content to leave the answer to be given by the verdict of Christian common-sense.

Let England and England's Church awake to hear the voice which says "come" and "go." Let us *come* to behold the wonders of redeeming love, to know the blessings which come of the truth and the power of the Gospel of Christ. And then let us *go* to proclaim the glad news of an opened heaven, of the Saviour's finished work, and of His call to the lost to "return—come."

That "go" has something in it for us all. It has a meaning for those who are called to stay. The mission-work of our Church should be *our* work. We should account it *our own*. We should think of it as *our own*. We should make it *our own*. We should support it as *our own*. We should work for it as *our own*. And, above all, we should continually pray for it as *our own*.

Would that it could be said of the Church of England as it is said of the "Unitas Fratrum," the Moravian Brotherhood: "The whole Church is one missionary society. The converts abroad outnumber the home Church by three to one, and one conviction pervades the whole, that 'to be a Christian and to carry on foreign missions are inseparable things.'" Surely, the Saviour's word cannot mean nothing for those who know His voice. Let there be an obedient listening to the Word which says "go."

And in our obedience to that "go," let there be more of onward movement, less, possibly, of what is stationary and pastoral, even in our mission-fields. Might not our very mission-work, perhaps, be rather more suggestive of the speed of urgency, of the urgency of that which, in the supreme importance of its tidings, requireth haste? Never forgetting the need of episcopal (not prelatical) supervision, might not more responsibility be given sometimes to a native pastorate? Nay, might not the hearts of the new-born natives who have truly *come to see* be more often moved with longing, and encouraged in the desire to *declare and go*?¹

¹ Since writing the above I have met with the following extract from a sermon of Canon Hoare's preached before the Church Missionary Society in 1871: "*Let the convert churches be aroused to a sense of their responsibility. Let them all become centres from which truth may radiate; let them . . . be sending forth their native evangelists to penetrate where the European never reaches . . . and no one can calculate to what an extent or with what rapidity the great work may be extended, if only God accompany it with His blessing*" (Stock's "Hist. of C.M.S.," vol. ii., pp. 387, 388).

Mrs. J. F. Bishop testifies concerning Chinese Christians: "A large

Whether this be so or not, let us see in that "go" an urgency ever pointing to regions beyond; and then, while there will be no failure of real care that all things should be done decently and in order, there will be seen the comparative unimportance of what belongs to outward ceremonial in our worship, then the true use and the misuse of ritual will hardly need to be insisted on, then our dangers from sacerdotal ceremonialism will cease to trouble, and our deluding ritualism will die of atrophy.

N. DIMOCK.



ART. IV.—THE LATE D. L. MOODY AS A PREACHER.

A GREAT preacher has recently passed from amongst us. Indeed, if the greatness of a preacher is to be measured by his capacity of attracting crowds to listen to his message, the candid historian will have to assign to D. L. Moody the very foremost place. More human ears have doubtless been reached by this simple and almost unlettered man than by any of the most gifted orators of ancient or modern times. And there is something surely very encouraging to us Christians, amidst the prevalence of unbelief and indifferentism all around us, in the fact that the man who in the nineteenth century has been able to catch the ear of the public more effectually than any other man was not a great statesman, nor a social reformer, nor even a temperance orator, but a simple, honest, earnest preacher of the Gospel.

It seems to me unquestionable that this man must have preached to a larger number of his fellow-men than any other preacher that ever lived. What other man during these nineteen centuries has continued to address day by day for a period covering more than a quarter of a century evening congregations varying in size from five thousand to fifteen thousand, and afternoon congregations varying from two thousand to five? What other man can have preached to

number of these converts are earnest and successful propagandists, and the very large increase in the number of Christians during the last five years is mainly owing to the zeal, earnestness, and devotion of Christian converts" ("Yangtze Valley and Beyond," p. 521). She mentions that in Che-kiang the number of converts through the work of Chinese is estimated at 80 per cent. of the whole. And she expresses the opinion that "if China is to be Christianized, or even largely leavened by Christianity, it must inevitably be by native agency under foreign instruction and guidance" (*ibid.*), adding (p. 522): "It is in the earnest enthusiasm of the Chinese converts for the propagation of the faith that the great hope for China lies."

between two and three millions of auditors each year for some twenty-six years, and to an aggregate of auditors not falling short of the entire population of the United States at the last census?

But true greatness in a preacher must be estimated by something more trustworthy than mere outward success in collecting crowds. The object of all preaching is to induce real spiritual results; and the mere popular preacher who attracts a crowd by his gifts of rhetoric, but, having done so, sends them away very much as they came, scarcely deserves to be called a great preacher. Here we are dealing, however, with facts that are beyond the reach of human statistics, though they may be duly tabulated in those "archives of eternity" which even science tells us must exist, although it may be only God can read their mysterious hieroglyphics. Yet, measured even by this standard, at once the highest and the truest, it would seem difficult to avoid the conclusion that this preacher's place must be in the foremost rank. When one thinks of the hundreds that week by week used to seek for spiritual help and counsel, as the result of his preaching; when one considers the long lists, containing usually some thousands of names, that he used to leave behind him, at each place visited, so that those who had been conversed with might receive all possible help from their own pastors; or when one reflects on the number of earnest working Christians up and down through the land, foremost to-day in every good work, who look back upon one of his visits as the turning-point in their lives, it will not be surprising if we find ourselves wondering whether there ever has been a more successful soul-winner than D. L. Moody was.

If, again, we estimate the greatness of a preacher by his command over the attention of his audience, and his capacity of printing his thoughts on the minds and hearts of his hearers, this man of plain and homely speech has surely had but few rivals. One of the most impressive things in those marvellous gatherings, the like of which, I suppose, we are scarcely likely to behold in our time again, was the sight from the platform of that sea of eager upturned faces, every eye fixed and every mind apparently attent, catching all the speaker's points, and delighting in his illustrations, smiling at the smart or humorous passages in his discourses, and not unfrequently responding to his pathos with their tears. Surely few preachers have ever been so successful in maintaining from beginning to end that complete rapport between speaker and hearers on which all must feel the value of a public utterance to a great extent depends.

If we sought for any further proof of Moody's greatness as

a preacher, we might find it in his marvellous capacity of reaching hearers of every social grade and of all degrees of intelligence. I remember a piteous appeal to my sympathies made by a friend of mine, who was a country parson, long years ago. "Just imagine the difficulties of my position as a preacher," he exclaimed: "there is Squire — sitting in the big pew in the transept, who was a high wrangler at Cambridge. In the opposite transept Squire —, who is an Oxford double-first; and there is Mr. —, who is also a first-class man; and all the rest are the very densest clod-hoppers." Judging from what he actually did, I can't help thinking that in his place D. L. Moody would have solved this problem. In spite of his lack of education, and the extreme simplicity of his style, he seemed to attract the rich quite as much as the poor; and he stirred the West End of London as it has never been stirred either before or since. In his famous campaign of '75 he used first to preach at Bow Hall in the East at half-past seven, and then drive across London to preach to the "upper ten" at Her Majesty's Opera House at nine. The scene in the Haymarket at this time baffles description. It was literally blocked with the carriages of the aristocracy and the plutocracy of the land; and the struggle for admission was perhaps even more severe in the West than in the East. Not unfrequently some of the leading men of the time might be seen in his audience, and such men as Gladstone, Cairns, and Dean Stanley felt and acknowledged his power. Yet, I suppose there hardly ever fell from his lips a word that the humblest of his hearers did not understand; nor could any of them have gone away feeling that the message was intended for "the toffs," and not for "the like of us."

That there must have been something unique in preaching that attracted all sorts and conditions of men to this extraordinary extent goes without saying; but it is much more difficult to explain what it was that rendered it so unique. Again and again I have been asked what I considered to be the secret of Moody's amazing power and success as a preacher; but I don't think that I have ever felt that any answer I may have given was at all complete, or expressed the whole truth on this point. No doubt it was not one characteristic, but a rare combination of characteristics, that rendered his preaching the success it was; and it is because it seems to me that there is a good deal to be learnt from the consideration of these characteristics that I am writing this paper. It is impossible to imitate him, and it would be most undesirable to attempt to do so; yet surely we may gain something from the consideration of those features in his ministry which seemed specially to contribute to its success; nay, it is possible that

the examination of these may induce some more or less useful modification of our own modes of procedure.

In illustration of this possibility, I feel tempted to repeat a good story that I heard some years ago from a prominent Wesleyan preacher. He told me that there was a certain minister in their connexion whose supreme ambition, during the earlier years of his ministry, was to imitate Morley Punshon. We all know that Mr. Punshon was a man of genius, and stood in the very front rank amongst the orators of his time. His somewhat florid style was his own, and he used it to excellent purpose, as the remarkable results of his work in Canada testify to-day. But it is one thing to be a Morley Punshon, and quite another thing to attempt to imitate him. This worthy man took enormous pains to make his imitation a success, but somehow the thing would not, as we say, "come off." He wrote out his sermons in full, polished up his periods, weighed and balanced his sentences, and laboriously committed his carefully-prepared compositions to memory. But it would not do. He felt more like a school-boy giving a recitation, and giving it very badly, than a messenger of Christ pleading with men. With all his industrious efforts his ministry was a grievous failure. He could not even succeed in filling his chapel, and spiritual results there seemed none.

In the year 1884 Mr. Moody paid a visit to this country, and this unsuccessful labourer was eager to see and hear one whose ministry in its apparent results contrasted so favourably with his own. On his return his wife was keen to know what he thought of the great preacher. "Preacher!" he exclaimed, "why, he doesn't preach at all! He just stands there on the platform and talks to the people, as I might talk to you. And there they sit listening to him, feeling that he means every word he says, until before you know what's happening the work is done, and any number of them are won for Christ. I tell you what it is, wife: I've done with the Morley Punshon business. From this time forward I'm going to talk to the people out of the fulness of my heart, by God's help, just as Moody does, and I don't see why God should not bless me as He blesses him." And the sequel was indeed wonderful. The very next Sunday the work began in his own chapel, and some six years later, when my informant had this talk with me, this man had been the means of starting some fifteen distinct "mission causes," as they are called, amongst the poorest and the lowest, in each of which a definite evangelizing work was at that time going forward, and hundreds of souls were being won for God.

In considering D. L. Moody as a preacher, and the remark-

able work effected by his preaching, it may be as well to begin by referring to his spiritual qualifications. No one could know him without recognising his sterling Christian character and his high moral tone; but he was not, I should say, one of those men (their number is but small) whom you cannot meet without being impressed with the influence of their personal holiness. The spiritual qualification in which he seemed to me to excel was faith, and to this the success of his work was no doubt very largely to be attributed. His faith was that of a little child rather than that of a reasoning man. Its strength and simplicity were all the more wonderful because he had been brought up under Unitarian influences, and because his intellect, although not carefully trained, was of that robust and observant type which doubt most naturally assails. He was by no means naturally credulous or disposed to bow to authority, and yet probably few men of intelligence have ever accepted the Bible with a more simple, and even uncritical, faith. Perhaps this was rendered all the easier in his case by the constant witness which his own work bore to the power of the simple Gospel message as he delivered it. In this he ever reposed the most absolute confidence. He took it for granted that God would confirm His own word with spiritual signs following, and so far from being surprised at success, as some preachers seem to be, nothing would have surprised him more than even the appearance of failure.

No doubt this strong and definite faith obtained its reward in the presence of much spiritual power in his preaching. This is a thing that no man can define, or even describe, yet I feel sure that no spiritually-minded man could go through one of Moody's missions, as I have done, without being conscious of a distinct spiritual influence pervading his ministrations, and often making its presence felt in a very unmistakable way. But this divine unction in one form or another is the condition of all true success in preaching, and therefore it is unnecessary to enlarge on this point in considering what was distinctive in Moody as a preacher.

Nor is it necessary to say much about another condition of success which is equally indispensable, and which he possessed in no ordinary degree—earnestness. This much, however, I would like to say while touching on this point, that, while some men are in earnest, but don't seem to be, and others seem to be in earnest, but are not, no small part of the influence which Moody exercised as a preacher was due to the fact that he seemed to be in earnest *because he was*. I should say that it would have hardly been possible even for the most sceptical cynic to doubt Moody's earnestness, and any such doubt, if possible, would have been refuted by the

witness of his whole career. The man who, when hardly more than a boy, threw up a commercial position in which he was making a thousand a year to face all the hardships, and even privations, of his early life as a Christian worker, and the tremendous labours of his later years, left no honest observer any excuse for doubting either his sincerity or his earnestness. But the point that I desire to lay stress upon is that no such acquaintance with his career was necessary in order to dispose people to believe in his earnestness; it would have been distinctly difficult for any ordinary hearer to do anything else. The natural and almost conversational style, both of speech and utterance, the absence of any attempt at oratorical effect, the tears that sometimes, though not frequently, rose in his eyes, and the suppressed emotion that often betrayed itself in the very tones of the voice, even the expression of his countenance and the flash of his eye, and, indeed, sometimes the startling stamp of his foot, all alike seemed suggestive of intense reality and of an earnestness that flowed from a heart on fire with love for human souls. It might, indeed, have been said of him as of Bunyan's statue in the house of the Interpreter: "He stood as if he pleaded with men."

His intense earnestness and sincerity no doubt had much to do with that which was perhaps his most distinguishing characteristic as a preacher. He always meant business, and, because this was so, his utterances were always distinguished by a singular simplicity and directness of speech. The simplest could always understand him, while the most thoughtful would generally find something to interest them in his fresh and vivid presentation of Divine truth. It did not seem *in him* to beat about the bush, or to wrap up his ideas in a cloud of words. He left the impression on his hearers that he had a message to deliver, and he delivered it in such a way that you forgot the messenger in the message. He did not flourish his hammer about, but brought it right down on the head of the nail, and sent it home to the head with all the nervous energy of a mighty hard-hitter. He was not himself a thinker, nor had he studied systematic theology. Unlike his great predecessor Finney, he dealt but little in doctrinal definitions, yet had he so clear a head that a sophism had no chance with him, and his fund of never-failing common-sense seemed to supply him with weapons more forcible in dealing with the crowd than the careful reasoning of the dialectician. The thing that struck you most about the man was, as I have said, that he "meant business." He did not stand on that platform to ventilate a theory or to air his rhetoric. From first to last he was an advocate with a case to

win; it was Christ's case and the soul's case, and for this the verdict of mind and heart and will were confidently demanded.

Next to his directness of aim, I think, I should name what was its outward and visible sign—his absolute naturalness of manner and delivery. He preached just as he talked, only that he spoke louder. He had no preaching tone, no religious intonation. He was *himself* whether on the platform or off it, and I doubt whether he could have been affected, if he had tried. He spoke very rapidly, especially when he had thoroughly warmed to his subject; for, as he himself put it, a man can do his two hundred words a minute when his heart is full, yet he generally managed to make himself fairly well heard. He used but little action, but when he did it seemed to be perfectly spontaneous, and quite as natural as everything else about him. To some of my readers this habit of being natural may seem a small thing, but my own observation would lead me to an opposite conclusion. Alas! how often have I known an otherwise effective ministry spoilt by an unnatural and affected delivery.

Then there was his marvellous capacity of illustration, which had been developed by a habit of industrious observation and painstaking collection. With all his originality, he was never above making a proper and perfectly legitimate use of other people's materials. If he heard a good thing said, down it went on the inside of an old envelope, and when the day's work was over it would be duly consigned to one of those larger envelopes, which, like Joseph's store cities, treasured the fat of the land. In his resting times these would be considered, and any that seemed serviceable would be woven into the tissue of fresh sermons. He was a great believer in the power of illustration; and I am sure that he was right in this feeling. Just before he began his wonderful mission to the aristocracy of London, I chanced to say to him one day, as we were sitting in the garden together, "Moody, how will your stories go down with these refined and educated West-End folk?" He paused for a moment, and then replied with his usual decision, "I don't know about the stories; but, mind you, 'lustrations will tell with any class of society, from prince to peasant." And the event proved that he was right about the illustrations, and that I was wrong in suggesting doubt about the stories. For Moody's stories were, like himself, unique; his power of telling a story and of pressing it into the service of his subject, when told, has probably never been excelled, and very rarely equalled.

Closely akin to this was his capacity of clothing an antique incident in the garments of to-day, so that his hearers forgot

that it belonged to the first century, and only saw it as if it were quite at home in the nineteenth. His inimitable description of Zaccheus' reparation was perhaps the choicest example of this that I recall; but it was only one amongst many. I give it from memory, and possibly my version of it may differ from reports that may have appeared in print. It carries, however, its own credentials with it in the fact that, after a quarter of a century, it still lingers in my memory. I should indeed be flattering myself if I were to suppose that I could have "evolved from my inner consciousness" anything so vivid and racy. But as I give it from memory, I will not use quotation marks:

I can just picture to myself Zaccheus coming down to his office the day after his conversion. "Now," says he to one of his clerks, "you overhaul the books with me while the other clerk draws up the cheques." They haven't been going into it very long before the clerk says, "There's something wrong here, sir. This gentleman's been overcharged considerable." "I know it," says Zaccheus; "I can remember there was something wrong there; how much do you make it?" "A matter of sixty pounds, sir," says the clerk. "Is that so? Well," says he to the other clerk, "you draw out a cheque." "For how much, sir," says the other, "sixty pounds?" "Why, no—for two hundred and forty pounds. It's fourfold, don't you remember?" The cheques are all drawn out before the morning's over, and in the afternoon I fancy I see one of those clerks going his rounds with his pocket full of them. He calls at the house of the first gentleman named, and happens to meet him at the door. "May I speak to you, sir, for a moment?" says he; "I come from Zaccheus' office on a matter of business." "From Zaccheus! The old usurer! Hasn't he got enough out of me yet?" "I've brought you some money from him this time, sir." "Brought me some money! What! from Zaccheus! Come inside. Now sit down. What's all this you've got to tell me about Zaccheus sending me money?" "Well, you see, sir, Zaccheus has been overhauling his books, and he finds he has overcharged you considerable." "I know he has, the old rascal; there's no mistake about that!" "Well, you see, sir, that being the case, he is desirous to make restitution. He finds that he has overcharged you about sixty pounds, and so he sends you this;" and he hands him the cheque. "Two hundred and forty pounds! What's the meaning of this?" "Why, you see, sir, it's four times sixty. The truth is, Zaccheus is restoring it to you fourfold." "You mean to tell me this is really from Zaccheus, the publican?" "I do, sir; there's no mistake about that." "What's the

matter with the man? Is he going to die?" "No, sir; so far as I know, he is in very good health." "Is he gone off his head, poor chap?" (Here the preacher tapped his forehead suggestively.) "No, sir; to the best of my belief he's still of sound mind." "Well, but how do you account for it? Whatever has taken the man?" "Well, sir, it appears that Zaccheus has been what you may call 'converted.'" "'Converted,' is he? Well, from this time forth I believe in conversion." "Yes, sir, they tell me that he was converted *suddenly* yesterday, when Jesus of Nazareth was passing by." "*Suddenly*, was he? From this day I believe in sudden conversions!" "They *do* say that he was converted up a tree." "Is that so? No conversions like conversions up a tree!"

As one reads it, perhaps one feels that the last two sentences had better have been omitted, as they savour, perhaps, a little too much of the burlesque. Indeed, I cannot absolutely vouch for them; they may have been an accretion, inevitably suggested by what had gone before. But I am quite sure that if, for a moment, carried away by his realism, Moody allowed the smiles of his hearers to develop into actual laughter, he would have pulled them together again in another moment, with some forceful words of application that would go home all the more powerfully just because an instant before he had allowed them to unbend so freely.

But what a new and real thing from that moment forward would the conversion of Zaccheus be to that great audience, composed, no doubt, largely of the lower commercial class; where, perhaps, temptations to fraud and deception are most severely felt, and where the renouncing of the "hidden things of darkness" needs to be pressed in the most practical and forceful way. The fastidious critic may complain that the story has been robbed of its classic dignity, and is vulgarized in its new setting. But such a critic needs to be reminded that the incident was not an old-world story at the time when it transpired, but a very modern fact, and that it had its own setting, which was neither classical nor dignified, but rather commonplace, and even sordid. It is the triumph of grace that elevates the tale above the commonplace or the vulgar, whether its setting be of the nineteenth century or the first. But the average man of the nineteenth century will be all the more impressed with this when it is presented to him in its modern setting.

No doubt the very defects in Moody's education, for which he was himself in no way to blame, rendered this sort of treatment of sacred subjects more possible to him than it would have been to a more highly-educated man; but this consideration, while it must forbid any slavish imitation of

his style, does not detract from the value of the lesson taught us by the undoubted success of his homely presentations of that which we are all too apt to regard as the antique. Bible incidents in their moral aspects are both ancient and modern, and he who only thinks of them as ancient misses half their value. It is the gift of the true "seer," who will ever be a man of his time, to see the present in the past, and thus to make the past live in the present.

No description of this great preacher would do him justice that did not refer both to his humour and also to the exceeding tenderness of his pathos. He was naturally full of fun; no man ever enjoyed a good story more, or laughed more heartily at a real joke. His humour, like everything else about him, was perfectly natural, and in his sermons I never remember its jarring in the least degree on my spiritual sensibilities, nor do I ever remember its leading his hearers aside from the main issue, or weakening an impression already made. Other preachers of the very first rank have within my own observation fallen into this snare, and one has grieved over the witticism which has dissipated a spiritual impression. But Moody was always too practical to commit this error. He never seemed to forget that he was doing business for eternity, and while his use of humour relieved for a moment the tension of one's feeling, it was only that the mind and heart might be brought back to the point, and seize it with all the firmer grip. It enhanced the interest of the message without diminishing its impressiveness.

And then, if he sometimes provoked a smile, he also knew, as few have known, how to touch the heart and bring the tear to the eye. His own intensely sympathetic nature enabled him to feel the full pathos of his stories in each fresh recital, however often he might have told them before, and, with that strange magnetic influence which he possessed in no ordinary degree, he seemed to transmit his emotions to his audience. He always seemed to me to keep the emotional element in its right place, however, and I don't think that even unfriendly critics could have called him an emotional preacher. When the conscience has been roused and the judgment has been enlightened, the appeal to the emotions is often really a help to the struggling will that wants to take the decisive step, but feels the paralyzing check of hostile influences. The tidal wave of stirred emotion sweeps the ship across the bar, but only when the prow is turned in the right direction. Mr. Moody never mistook mere sentiment for conviction, or hysterical emotion for spiritual decision; but he had learnt what Aristotle teaches, that mere cold, intellectual conviction does not sufficiently stir the soul to

induce decisive moral action, and to enable it to throw off the *vis inertia* which holds so many down.

Much more might doubtless be said about the singular gifts of this remarkable man, but let this suffice. I will only add that, with all his remarkable gifts and his unprecedented success in his own line of work, I have hardly ever known a more utterly modest man. I could never detect any signs of elation in him, even in his palmiest days, and I believe it was the same to the end. Surely one cannot think of the close of that unique career without recalling the words of the Hebrew prophet: "They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever."

W. HAY M. H. AITKEN.



ART. V.—HOSPITALS AND NATIONAL GRATITUDE.

A FRIEND of mine was talking to me the other day about his life in a great Northern city, and he said that whenever he felt put out, or worried, or cross, or vexed, or depressed, because things had not been going on as he wished, he went into one or other of the great hospitals, and what he saw there always sent him home calm, refreshed, and contented. He saw men and women racked with pain, weakened with fever, separated from their homes and all that was dearest to them by the terrible stroke of disease, unable to earn their living, and reduced to the greatest prostration, yet all of them quiet, patient, and uncomplaining, grateful for the attentions they received, trustful in the skill of physician and nurse, and hopeful that by God's mercy they would soon be restored to their friends and callings. The sight of so much privation and misery so cheerfully borne made him ashamed of being disturbed and petulant at the little daily accidental troubles of life, so infinitely less in their importance than the real tragedies which were gathered in the hospital ward. And the glimpse of the blessed and holy work of the hospital, all the able minds devoted to the alleviation of pain and the cure of illness, all the gentle hands soothing the long hours of weariness and waiting, made him realize that there were things to be done in life far nobler and more soul-satisfying than the details of business, and he understood how small and passing were the trifles that had annoyed him, and how great and eternal was the work of mercy and doing good.

And even if you cannot all pay visits to hospitals, like my

friend, yet it is not difficult to picture to yourself the beauty and glory of their work. At any moment you can remember that there are in the hospitals of London no less than 7,000 patients occupying beds, and being treated with all the tenderness and skill that kindness of heart and long study and experience can provide. Think of it! At any moment of the year always the 7,000, with their pale, wistful faces and their weakened bodies. The individuals come and go, they get better and return home, but others are waiting anxiously to take their places. Always the 7,000. They are the people whom you have been meeting about the streets—the men on the scaffolds, the builders, bricklayers, and artisans who erect your houses, the engineers and plate-layers who see to your travelling, assembled from all the toiling millions of London, or their wives and daughters, disabled by accident or sickness, and taken from the homes where they were needed. Think of it! At any moment in the year 7,000 homes from which father or mother or one of the bread-winners has been carried away, to give them a chance of recovering their life. What a never-ending mass of sorrow and suffering!

And there is another fact that will impress your mind if you will try and follow it. The number of all, both in-patients and out-patients, who are treated by the hospitals and dispensaries of London during the year reaches the enormous total of 1,788,564. That is equal to two and a half Manchesters and Salfords, or three Liverpools. You can gather from that how enormous the work is, and how it needs the active, hearty co-operation of everybody. By putting it in another way it sounds, if possible, even more tremendous. For the surgical cases were 818,000; the medical, or those arising from diseases of lungs, heart, and stomach, were 616,000; eye affections were 122,000; there were 113,000 children treated; the women who came with special diseases were 77,000; the cases of throat and ear were 48,000; the cases of skin disease were 43,000; consumption provided 31,000, paralysis 16,000; and there were 14,000 cases of fever. It is well, I think, when we are reminding ourselves about this great Christian duty of healing the sick, that we should have, at any rate, some kind of idea of the gigantic amount of suffering with which in this enormous city we have to deal, and try to make our efforts proportionate.

I would ask you to remember that the population of London is increasing annually by at least 50,000, and that the increase is chiefly amongst the poorer classes, the very men and women who depend for their health on the hospitals and dispensaries. And in the meantime the hospitals do not increase. It is true

that two years ago, by the generosity of the Corporation of the City of London and of one of the City companies, a ward long empty was opened in St. Thomas's; but St. Thomas's, alas! still has other empty wards, and every hospital has to lament the deplorable fact of scores of empty beds from want of funds. Every hospital except the few that are endowed has great difficulty every year in making up its balance-sheet. The pressure comes from the increasing numbers requiring treatment both for a lengthened stay and as outdoor patients, and the pressure increases every year.

It is not creditable to us that the collections in our churches for this Christlike work, the sign of a heart that is touched by Christian love, the test that will be applied to each at the awful Day of Judgment, reaches so small a sum. Even in the very best years our church and chapel collections do not rise above £38,000, and that is indeed a trifling amount when distributed among two or three thousand places of worship of all denominations. It is to private gifts that the fund owes any general increase in any particular year. One year when we got £60,000, nearly £22,000 consisted of private gifts. Last year, when we got £53,000, over £15,000 was from the like private generosity. Our Sunday collections are only 1½d. per head of the whole 5,000,000 of people who form the population of the Metropolitan area. It is a ridiculous and contemptible proportion; it is a grave accusation against the pretended Christianity of London; it will be a very formidable accusation against us in the day of reckoning. "I was sick," our Lord will say in that day; "one million seven hundred and eighty-eight thousand five hundred and sixty sick persons in a year represented Me in point of illness and disease in one year in that great city of yours. Did ye visit Me?" "Lord," London would have to reply, "we visited Thee to the extent of three-halfpence per head of our population." It is quite clear that most of us are making a mere pretence of giving. We give something that we do not feel at all.

And yet what causes of thankfulness we have this year! Do you remember the dark days of January and February, when repulse followed repulse, and deaths, slaughter and capture were frequent and humiliating, and the commanders seemed to be labouring heavily without much hope, and we began to doubt whether the rulers of the country realized the tremendous task they had in hand, and sorrow was coming in quick and sharp succession to many a home, and wise men were wondering whether the turn for Britain's weakness had not at length arrived, as the turn had come in old days for that of Athens, Rome, and Spain, and most of the foreign nations were deriding us with a genuine hatred, and gleefully

predicting our rapid decline and fall? And then do you remember how the nation turned itself to humbleness and prayer, and repented of the days of superciliousness and overweening confidence, and became serious and strenuous, and strengthened the hands of its rulers; and the citizens of London led the way, and, under the apt and vigorous hand of the Chief Magistrate, set a prompt and patriotic example which was followed by the whole Empire? Do you remember how we were comforted when Canada vied with Australia, and New Zealand with Natal and Cape Colony, in coming to the aid of the Mother-Country in perplexities and difficulties that were not of her own seeking? Do you remember how the reservists came forward to a man, and left their homes, and took their places in the ranks; and not only the reservists, but the veterans, at the personal request of the Queen, to the number of 35,000 or 40,000? Above all, do you remember how the great soldier of many victories—and not only that, but the great Christian gentleman—with an unstained record, although his heart was broken for the loss of his only son, went out to repair our misfortunes? Do you remember how quietly and unostentatiously he worked, and never spoke of his plans till they were carried out into fact? First there came the relief of Kimberley; and while we were still rejoicing and wondering, there was the swift stroke of Paardeberg, and the surrender of a formidable General and his army; then came the triumphant occupation of Bloemfontein, the capital of one of the invading Republics; then it became possible for Ladysmith to be rescued; next came the easy occupation of Johannesburg, followed by the glorious deliverance of the heroic garrison of Mafeking; and by that time our ebullitions of joy were so exuberant that we had hardly enough enthusiasm left for the occupation of Pretoria, the capital of the original aggressor. The vast number of prisoners, which has been such a foul disgrace to a mighty Empire invaded by two Republics of peasant farmers, have for the most part been released. Since then victory has followed after victory, sure and swift, and the end is in view. Was ever situation better described than in the inspired words of the 107th Psalm?—

“ Such as sit in darkness and in the shadow of death,
Being fast bound in misery and iron;
Because they rebelled against the word of God,
And contemned the counsel of the Most High,
Therefore He brought down their heart with labour;
They fell down, and there was none to help.
Then cried they unto the Lord in their trouble,
And He saved them out of their distresses.
He brought them out of darkness and the shadow of death,
And brake their bonds in sunder.

Fools because of their transgressions,
And because of their iniquities, are afflicted.
Then they cry unto the Lord in their trouble,
And He saveth them out of their distresses.
He sent His word and healed them,
And delivered them from their destruction.
Oh that men would praise the Lord for His goodness,
And for His wonderful works to the children of men!
And let them sacrifice the sacrifices of thanksgiving,
And declare His works with rejoicing!"

Is there not, then, abundant reason for thankfulness? I know that the heart of this country has been unusually stirred to generosity. The Lord Mayor's Mansion House Fund for the sufferers by the war is rapidly approaching a million. The Indian Famine Fund is over a quarter of a million. There was the fund for Ottawa, the fund for the evicted colonists, the fund for the families of officers, smaller funds of every description. Multitudes of kindly acts have been done in private. All this is as it should be, and we may reasonably be proud of our people. But, oh! how hard it would be if those who are suffering at home just as heroically, in silence and obscurity, should for that reason appeal in vain this memorable year! Think of the 7,000 who are in the beds of the hospital this moment; think of the 7,000 who are waiting to succeed them, and again another and another in endless succession. Think of the 1,788,000 yearly needing the healing hand! No brilliant correspondent chronicles their woes; no countless multitudes read telegrams twice a day to learn about their troubles, their bearing, their patient, uncomplaining deaths. No crowds rejoice when they are released and cured. Yet they are always with us, and their calamities are terribly real. Bitter sorrow is carried into more humble homes by daily illness and casualty than by everything that has happened in the war. More deaths occur in a year in London through accidents than have been recorded in the whole war through bullet and shell. To these things our hearts should always be open, but more especially in this year of great liberality and unwonted enthusiasm.

For you should remember that the story of the war and the efficiency of our hospitals are intimately bound up together. Never was an army sent out from our shores so admirably equipped in all respects as the great host that has been fighting the cause of liberty in South Africa, and that through the brilliant ability and foresight of our able Commander-in-Chief, Lord Wolseley, and his staff. But on no department of that equipment can we look with such unmitigated satisfaction as on the hospital arrangements. Think of the scenes in old days, before the chloroform of Sir James Simpson or the

antiseptic treatment of Lord Lister! The scenes of butchery in the surgeons' tent after the battle were worse than the terrors of the battle itself—shrieks, groans, hasty amputations, agonizing deaths. Now all is calm and peaceful, and the soldier-lad, as he loses his limb, dreams of mother and home. Then fever, pyæmia and gangrene swept through the field-hospital like a pestilence: now the recovery of the wounded seems almost miraculous. The change is all owing to the great system which you are to-day asked to support, in which skill is acquired and discoveries made. Defects in the practical application of the system are obviously owing to the enormous difficulties of transport along a single line of 1,500 miles, constantly broken and blocked.

I ask all, then, let it not be said of this glorious year that the people of London excelled themselves in enthusiasm for their soldiers, and poured forth money with unstinted hand, but neglected the victims of disease and injury and the pressure of civilization at home.

One, at any rate, intends to give more than ever. One philanthropist has already given £10,000, and will give more if we can raise the fund to £100,000. That is what we ought to do—a victory we non-combatants at home can readily achieve, if we only be as self-sacrificing as those who have come forward to fight the battles of the Queen.

If you think with pity of the mother in her lonely cottage, weeping for her boy who fell at Colenso or Magersfontein or Spion Kop or Paardeberg, think with thankfulness of some other mother, no less loving, no less poor, with son or husband restored to her by the skill of some great house of mercy in London.

By the recovery of those whom you love at the front, by the glorious memory of those whom God has called to Himself, by the successes which He has granted us, by your thankfulness for all His goodness to this nation, by your loyalty to this great city, by your philanthropic zeal for its Christian institutions, by your desire that this memorable year should suffer no blot, by your unspeakable gratitude for the skill of surgeon and physician in rescuing you and your beloved at home from sickness and death, by your love for your Master, to whose Divine heart the cause of the sick and suffering was very dear, I urge all Christians to determine by His grace to double their offering this year! Let the great flame of enthusiasm which has warmed the hearts of our people through and through embrace not only the victims of the African struggle, but those also at our own doors, whose pangs and griefs are as great, but who have no trumpet-tongued renown to make their necessities known.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

Reviews.



Eighteen Centuries of the Orthodox Greek Church. By the Rev. A. H. HORE, Trinity College, Oxford. London and Oxford: James Parker and Co., 1899.

MR. HORE is already favourably known to the members of our Church by his brief but valuable histories of the Anglican Church, and of the Catholic Church at large. He has laid us under an additional burden of gratitude by his present book. It was not so long ago that our clergy knew very little indeed about that vast body of eighty millions of Christians who inhabit the East of Europe and parts of the West of Asia, and who, unfortunately, hold no communion with any portion of the Western Church. It is a question whether very much is known of our fellow-Christians in the East even now, but since the appearance of Mr. Hore's book ignorance of their history at least will be inexcusable. The chief defect in his book for the ordinary uninstructed reader is the absence of any information, except what may be gleaned by the way, about the rites and doctrines of the Orthodox Church. If Mr. Hore is fortunate enough to reach a second edition—and there seems no reason why he should not do so—he will doubtless supply that defect. Meanwhile, Mr. Blackmore, the translator of Mouravieff's "History of the Russian Church," has also translated its Catechisms into English, in a companion volume called "The Doctrine of the Russian Church," for anyone who needs information on the point.

General Kiréeff, a distinguished Russian layman who takes a deep interest in theological questions, especially those which refer to the reunion of the Churches, has, in a recent review of Mr. Hore's book in the *Revue Internationale de Théologie*, characterized it as the most important step toward the reunion of East and West which has taken place since their separation. And so it may prove, if English Churchmen will but familiarize themselves with its contents; for it does not, as the title would lead us to suppose, confine itself to the history of the *Greek* Orthodox Church, but gives a succinct and clear history of the Russian Church also. General Kiréeff remarks on the blessing it would be for humanity if those rival Powers, Russia and England, could be brought to a mutual understanding; and he points out how much an *entente cordiale* between the Churches would react on the political attitude of the two nations.

Mr. Hore also gives a brief sketch of the Nestorian and Jacobite offshoots from the Eastern Church, which, once so powerful, are now so down-trodden and oppressed; and, while he rightly regards reunion with the East as impossible as yet, he brings the history of the overtures toward more friendly relations between the Anglican and Orthodox Churches down to the year 1898. He has referred to the memorable Bonn Conference in 1875, in which a very great stride was made toward

reunion by the famous formula of concord drawn up by Dr. Von Döllinger, and accepted by the representatives of the various Churches there represented. He has, however, forgotten to mention the more recent Reunion Conferences, promoted by the Old Catholics, held in 1892, 1894 and 1897, at Lucerne, Rotterdam and Vienna, in which representatives of the Orthodox, Old Catholic and Anglican Churches were present. He has also neglected to mention the *Revue Internationale de Théologie*, a publication started after the Lucerne Conference in 1892, which is devoted to the cause of reunion, and which has inserted articles from members of the Orthodox and Anglican Churches, in the German, French and English languages, as well as many learned and valuable contributions from members of the Old Catholic bodies. It is obvious what a great opportunity such a publication affords for mutual discussion and explanation between members of the long-severed communities. Mr. Hore, however, has not failed to notice the important event of the consecration, in 1898, by the Bishop of Salisbury, of the Anglican Church at Jerusalem, attended by two delegates of the Œcumenical Patriarch, as well as by a vast crowd of persons of the most various nationalities, Eastern and Western alike. His failure to notice the other important facts of which mention has just been made is due, no doubt, to the unfortunate absence of interest in them which, until quite lately, has characterized our Church.

J. J. L.

A History of Greece. By Professor J. B. BURY, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D.
With 210 illustrations and 7 separate maps. Macmillan. Pp. xxiii,
909. Price 8s. 6d.

This brilliant and entirely satisfactory work will, if we mistake not, do for the history of Greece what Green's "Short History" has done for the history of our own land. It will practically supersede all other histories for ordinary purposes, though, of course, students must still have recourse to the standard works of Holm, Thirlwall and Grote for detailed information on special points. Professor Bury's work is not a compilation, but a serious contribution to our knowledge of the period with which it deals. The history is scientific in the best sense; it is based on first-hand acquaintance with the original authorities; it is written with an eye to historical perspective; and it eschews side-issues.

Despite the scientific character of this work, we have found that it is easier to pick up the book than to lay it aside. Professor Bury has not forgotten that for a history to be valuable it need not be dull. Literature and art, philosophy and religion, are only touched on when they directly illustrate, or come into close connection with, the political history. As specimens of Professor Bury's skill in dealing with such matters, his remarks on the Sophists, on the growth of the imperial idea under Pericles and its bearing on art, on Euripides and the comic drama, or on the Socratic method, may be consulted.

At the end of the book are arranged a number of illustrative notes.

These are arranged conveniently for immediate reference. The plan is a good one: we are thereby at once enabled to hunt up the sources of any statement made by the writer in the body of the work. An excellent index closes the work. We have said nothing of the numerous illustrations in the volume. Generally, they are good, though occasionally a clearer impression might have been looked for. The reproductions, however, of ancient coins are nearly always pleasing.

One omission we note in Professor Bury's book—that is, any just appreciation of the work done by that great scholar Bishop Thirlwall in his "History of Greece."

E. H. BLAKENEY.

Short Notices.

The White Robe of Churches. By Dean SPENCE. Dent and Co. Pp. 348. Price 7s. 6d. net.

THIS is an account of the revival of ecclesiastical architecture in the eleventh century. The title is taken from a writer of that age, who says, "The world, startled from its death sleep, put on its white robe of churches." The Dean lives in the spirit of his exquisite cathedral, and in his own fascinating style has treated every phase of the building, and its characteristics and history. He has brought parallels, illustrations, and comparisons from many sources, and has made the whole subject live in a most interesting manner.

The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah. Dr. EDERSHEIM. Longman and Co. 2 vols. Pp. 695 and 826. Price 12s.

This is the tenth impression of the learned author's famous work. When first published the price was 2 guineas; it is now reduced to 12s. Dr. Edersheim speaks, of course, with special interest, as one who, once a Jew, is now an earnest Christian. The appendices are of great importance, dealing with such subjects as the pseudepigraphic writings, Philo of Alexandria, Jewish history from Alexander to Herod, and many other cognate subjects.

The Romance of our Ancient Churches. By SARAH WILSON. Constable and Co. Pp. 184. Price 6s.

This work treats of parish churches much in the same way as the Dean of Gloucester has treated the cathedral. It deals with lady chapels, galilees, lych-gates, preaching crosses, orientation, sundials, different styles of triforia, clerestories, piscinæ, aumbries, etc., crypts, brasses, and all other special features of church architecture. The illustrations, nearly two hundred in number, are by Alex. Ansted, and are of great beauty.

The English Dioceses. By the Rev. GEOFFREY HILL. Elliot Stock. Pp. 414.

The outlines of ecclesiastical history in the British Islands are strongly illustrated by the changes in diocesan organization. All the chapters are interesting, particularly perhaps, just now, that on suffragan bishoprics. The book is a mine of ecclesiastical information.

The Epistles of the New Testament. By Dr. HAYMAN. A. and C. Black. Pp. 563. Price 3s. 6d.

The learned writer has translated the Epistles of the New Testament into popular and current idiom. On one page he has printed the authorized version, and on the other the modern equivalent. The book will probably be found very serviceable and instructive for family class notices.

The Beautiful Lie of Rome. By R. LE GALLIENNE. Simpkin, Marshall. Price 1s.

[A reprint of the last edition of this valuable work in its unabridged form.]

A very striking indictment of the Roman Catholic Church, by a well-known literary man.



The Month.

THE outlook in China generally is grave indeed. The news from Peking is appalling, for it is not at all improbable, despite rumours to the contrary, that every European there has been cruelly done to death. So much for the schemes of political and terrestrial aggrandizement in which "occidentals" have been indulging during the past half decade! One factor they have consistently left out of their busy calculations—China herself. And they profess themselves surprised and horrified because the "Dragon," after being harried and insulted in innumerable ways, turns round and savagely rends its foes. Yet the result is, after all, but the natural consequence of the gold-lust which seems to infect the white races of to-day. One of the worst signs of all is the universal shriek on the part of the newspapers for a bloody vengeance. The action of the newspapers in stirring up this anti-Christian spirit is most reprehensible. Punishment ought to be meted out, of course, to those who are at the bottom of this bad business; but what is now being asked for is something more than this. We trust, however, that the British Government will, while acting promptly, countenance no such acts of reprisal as have been suggested. Two blacks do not make one white.

The news from South Africa is disappointing. We have now 200,000 men locked up there; the Boer forces cannot exceed 20,000 at the most, yet we seem unable to checkmate them. De Wet, with his little army of irregulars, is here, there, and everywhere, and has completely foiled, so far, every effort to catch him.

A splendid little piece of work has been accomplished in West Africa. Colonel Willcocks has been able to relieve Kumasi, and the Governor, Sir F. Hodgson, and his wife, who broke out of the beleaguered city a short while ago, have reached Cape Coast Castle.

Suffragan-Bishop Earle has been appointed to the Deanery of Exeter in succession to the late Dean Cowie. The Dean-designate is seventy-two years of age. The post was refused by Professor Sanday, to whom Lord Salisbury (so we understand) first offered it.

In the Lords, on July 16, there was an interesting discussion on the Church crisis, introduced by Lord Portsmouth calling attention to the continued lawlessness in the Church of England, and asking the Prime Minister whether he was prepared to give effect to the resolution of the House of Commons passed on May 10, 1899. The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Earl of Cranbrook, Lord Salisbury, Lord Halifax, and the Bishop of Winchester addressed the House on the subject. The Archbishop pleaded for "more time" for the Bishops, and he was supported by the Prime Minister, who earnestly deprecated any resort to legal procedure to compel the obedience of recalcitrant clergy to the law. This strikes us as a somewhat peculiar line to take; we doubt if it will appeal to the electors in the coming elections.

Mr. Edwin Freshfield, as chairman of the City Churches Preservation Society, has issued a memorandum in regard to the Bill for amending the Union of Benefices Act, 1860, which has now passed the third reading in the House of Lords. He points out what has been the effect of the Act in the City. Of the seventy-four churches left after the fire, three were pulled down under special Acts of Parliament, twenty-one have been pulled down under the Union of Benefices Act, and one has been granted to the Welsh congregation in London. As far as Mr. Freshfield knows, every union of benefices under this Act, with one exception, has been accompanied by the destruction of a church. On the question of extending the Act to England generally, Mr. Freshfield urges that there is no analogy between the City and the country, where, as a rule, the sites of the churches would hardly be worth the cost of demolishing the fabrics. The condition of the country clergy is much in need of consideration, and Mr. Freshfield suggests that what is wanted could be arrived at by an extension of the Pluralities Act.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY. — On Thursday afternoon, July 12, a special meeting of the committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society was held to welcome the new President, the Marquis of Northampton. The chairman of the committee, Mr. Caleb R. Kemp, presided.

APPEALS AND BEQUESTS.

The Dean of York writes to the *Times* in reference to the organ in York Minster: "Some time ago it was found necessary to consult Sir Walter Parratt, organist to the Queen, the choirmaster of St. George's Chapel, Windsor, who made an examination of the instrument. He pronounced it to be in 'a thoroughly unsound condition,' and deprecated any money being laid out in partial repair. The organ has, however, so rapidly deteriorated during the last few weeks that it has been found necessary to expend £50 to render it available for the daily services. But further dilapidations have already occurred, and without entire reconstruction the final collapse of the instrument cannot long be delayed. I venture, therefore, to appeal to all to assist me to raise the necessary sum of £4,000 for the restoration of this fine organ, in order to maintain the beauty of the services in one of the grandest cathedral churches in England. A committee has been formed to assist me to collect sums, both large and small, throughout the three Ridings of Yorkshire, and all contributions will be acknowledged by the hon. secretary, the Chapter Clerk, York."

Under the will of the late Miss Emily Frances Dalton, of Leicester, who died on January 3, leaving property of the value of £80,828, a large number of charities and religious societies benefit. Amongst the latter are the following: Leicester Church Extension Society, £2,000; Leicester Lay Agency and Scripture Readers' Society, £200; Church Missionary Society, £500; Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, £500; British and Foreign Bible Society, £500; Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, £5,000; National Lifeboat Institution, £3,000; Dr. Barnardo's Homes for Destitute Children, £1,000; and the Gordon Boys' Home, West End, Chobham, £10,000. Subject to legacies to executors and others amounting to £1,510, the residue of the property was left to the Gordon Boys' Home.

An appeal is being made on behalf of the work of the London Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews, to which we call the kind attention of our readers. The Society supports no fewer than fifty missionary stations and employs upwards of 220 missionary agents. Funds are urgently needed to clear off present liabilities, owing to past progress, and to enable the Society to enter open doors and to send missionaries to preach the Gospel of Christ to Israel, "now numbering eleven millions." Remittances for these objects may be sent to the Society's secretary, the Rev. W. T. Gidney, 16, Lincoln's Inn Fields, W.C.

The *Mission World* publishes a return of the income for the past year of the various missionary societies. The following are some of the totals, exclusive of Bible, tract, school, and similar societies: Church Missionary Society (including £80,619 of centenary fund), £404,905; Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, £136,846; London Missionary Society, £157,910; Wesleyan Missionary Society, £133,787; China Inland Mission, £53,197; Moravian Missions (whole income, £79,940), British contribution, £15,090; Church of Scotland Foreign Mission, including Women's Missions, Jews, Colonial, etc., £58,696; Free Church of Scotland Foreign Mission, including Women's Missions, Jews, Colonial, etc., £129,015; Universities Mission, £37,549; London Society for Missions to the Jews, £40,342; British Society for Missions to the Jews, £6,430; Mildmay Jewish Mission, £8,800; Barbican Jewish Mission (including £3,500 special building fund), £4,846; "Regions Beyond" Missionary Union, £23,640; Church of England Zenana Missionary Society, £67,669; Zenana Bible and Medical Mission, £22,282.

The Joint Committee of Lords and Commons appointed to consider the working of Queen Anne's Bounty Board has now been constituted as follows: Lord Cross, the Bishop of London, Lord Aberdeen, Lord Ashcombe, Lord Barnard, Mr. F. D. Smith, Mr. Stuart Wortley, Mr. Humphreys Owen, Mr. Stevenson, and Sir William Anson.

The Dean of Rochester has again attacked the English Church Union in the columns of the *Times*. He says, and justly: "It does not represent the English Church, and it does not promote union." Obedience to the powers that be is, as the Dean remarks, the first essential of fruitful union.

At the annual meeting of the Anglo-Continental Society, held in the Church House last week, the Rev. H. J. White, the secretary, reported that some statistics relating to the strength of the Old Catholics had at last become available. In Germany there were 90 churches or communities, with 60 clergy and about 60,000 members; and in Switzerland 40 parishes, 58 clergy, and 50,000 members. In Austria there had been at the end of last year 8 churches, besides three in course of erection, with 12 clergy and 15,500 members, of whom 1,600 had joined during the year, and by the middle of May over 1,000 more had joined.

The trustees of Christ Church, Chislehurst, have offered the living, vacant by the death of the Rev. W. Fleming, to the Rev. W. E. Burroughs, central secretary of the Church Missionary Society, who has accepted the same. Mr. Burroughs will resign his present post as soon as adequate arrangements can be made for the transference of his duties.

“The Australian Commonwealth Bill has received the Queen’s assent, and it is announced that the first Governor is to be Lord Hopetoun, who acted as Governor of Victoria some few years ago. Lord Hopetoun’s knowledge of Australia and his tact and personal popularity warrant the hope that a wise selection has been made for the high office of Governor of the newest of the nations of the world. He will have need of tact and wisdom, for, though union has been attained, there still remain delicate susceptibilities, to use no stronger term. A certain jealousy—which unfortunately is not without its counterpart in the ecclesiastical sphere, as we learn from our Australian correspondent to-day—exists between the different colonies, and in particular between New South Wales and Victoria, as to the seat of Government, and a temporary compromise has been arranged by which the Governor is to reside at Sydney, whilst, under the new constitution, the Federal Parliament will sit at Melbourne until the future capital is selected. That capital, it is laid down, is to be situated in New South Wales, but is not to be Sydney, or within a hundred miles of Sydney. Union, we hope, will in time allay susceptibilities, as well ecclesiastical as civil.”—*Guardian*.

LITERARY NOTES.

We understand that the publication of the *Story of Dr. Pusey’s Life* by Messrs. Longman has been postponed until the autumn.

The Religious Tract Society have undertaken, at the request of the Publication Committee of the Ecumenical Conference of Foreign Missions, to publish the official report of the great meetings held in New York from April 21 to May 2, 1900.

“*The Dictionary of National Biography*, now complete, has afforded a remarkable instance of a gigantic literary undertaking carried out with ideal punctuality and uninterrupted success. The task which Mr. Leslie Stephen began and Mr. Sidney Lee continued was no light one, and it was only rendered possible by the liberality of the publisher (Mr. Smith, of the firm of Messrs. Smith and Elder), who well knew that such a work could never be anything but unremunerative, and that on a large scale. To control an army of contributors, to insure scrupulous accuracy, to carry out the rule of ‘no flowers,’ and to bring out a volume quarterly for sixteen years without a hitch—this is a great achievement, and well deserves the recognition which it has obtained. The dictionary will long remain a monument of English scholarship, as it is a thesaurus of the memories of all Englishmen who have any title to fame. We are glad to remember that, though the Dictionary of Biography may be the greatest, it is not the only disinterested literary undertaking which is being conducted on a large scale. The Oxford ‘Dictionary of the English Lan-

guage' is almost equally deserving of the epithet 'prodigious'; and the 'Victoria County History of England,' of which we gave a preliminary notice a few weeks ago, will aim at doing for English archæology and topography what its predecessors have done and are doing for English (or must we say British?) biography and for the English language."—*Guardian.*

NEW BOOKS, ETC.

New Testament Handbooks: (1) *The Synoptic Gospels.* By C. LOVELL CARY. (2) *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle.* By JAMES DRUMMOND, M.A., LL.D., Litt.D. Price 7s. 6d. each. Putnam's Sons.

Church Problems: A View of Modern Anglicanism. By various writers. Edited by the Rev. H. H. HENSON. Price 12s. net. London: J. Murray.

Christianity and Paganism (in the fourth and fifth centuries). By E. N. BENNETT, M.A. Price 2s. 6d. net. London: Rivingtons.

The "Overland" to China. By A. R. COLQUHOUN. Price 16s. Harper Bros.

First Principles. By HERBERT SPENCER. Sixth edition, finally revised. Price 16s. Williams and Norgate.

St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. Translated, with a brief analysis, by the Rev. W. G. RUTHERFORD, LL.D. Price 3s. Macmillan.

The Life of Lives: being further Studies in the Life of Christ. By Dean FARRAR. Price 16s. Cassell and Co.

