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

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

In his eloquent and impressive reply—one of Dr. Magee's happiest speeches—the Bishop said:—

We know that Nonconformists have vied with Churchmen in eager hospitality, and I can assure you that without that we should have found it difficult to house the members of our Congress in Leicester. I can assure you we cordially accept that result. This *rapprochement* between Nonconformists and Churchmen, so happily expressed to-night and during the last four days, is no new thing in Leicester. Nearly seventy years ago one of the most eloquent orations ever made was spoken over the grave of an incumbent of this town by a great Christian orator, whose name is indissolubly connected with the religious history of Leicester—Dr. Robert Hall. Nearly seventy years have passed since Robert Hall expressed the grief of a Christian brother over the grave of Thomas Robertson, the minister of St. Mary's. Gladly, therefore, do we recognize the renewal of good feeling, the renewal of these deep principles of charity and mutual forbearance and mutual reflection, that then blossomed around that grave, and that are bearing fruit here to-night.

And here we must close this Article. We have not attempted to give a sketch of the proceedings of the Congress, but rather to show the drift of a few of the meetings which have especially attracted our own attention. Viewed as a whole, the Leicester gathering must be, we think, pronounced one of the most successful of all the Church Congresses. The Archbishop of York preached a very valuable opening sermon, and read a masterly Paper on the weakness and evils of Positivism. The Bishop of the Diocese made, as was expected, an admirable chairman, and fully kept up his reputation as an orator second to none. The attendance was large; the speeches as a rule were practical; there were no "scenes;" an earnestness and reverence of tone was unmistakable. We must add that while High Churchmen and Evangelicals held their own quietly, kindly, and firmly, at two or three gatherings Broad Churchmen were rampant and aggressive. The Ritualists made no way; an attempt by a section of them to silence Bishop Riley served only to show their weakness. The speech of Bishop Ryle on the Protestant Church of Mexico was excellent.

Reviews.

A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities. Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, D.C.L., LL.D., and SAMUEL CHEETHAM, M.A., Archdeacon of Southwark, and Professor of Pastoral Theology in King's College, London. Volume II. John Murray. 1880.

THE value of Dr. Smith's series of Dictionaries is so universally acknowledged that it would be a useless expenditure of time and labour to explain their general design, or to pronounce any eulogium upon the mode of its execution. We shall content ourselves, therefore, so far as any

general remarks may be deemed desirable, with the single observation that the high reputation which these Dictionaries have already achieved will not be impaired by a careful examination of the volumes of Christian Antiquities and of Biography, which have appeared under the able editorship of Archdeacon Cheetham and of Professor Wace,

It will be at once apparent that the office of the Reviewer, in respect of a work of so comprehensive a character as a Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, is somewhat different from that which devolves upon him in the discharge of his ordinary functions. It would be as unwise to attempt, as it would be impracticable to accomplish, the task of conveying to his readers, *seriatim*, any adequate idea of the character and value of the numerous and, in many cases, very elaborate articles which are contained in the volumes before us; and it would be an equally useless and invidious task to institute any comparison with a view to determine their respective merits. We desire our readers, therefore, to understand that in the selection which we are about to make out of a large number of articles which invite our consideration, we shall be guided rather by the subjects with which they deal than by the amount of learning and ability which is displayed in their treatment. Now we think that we shall not misapprehend or misrepresent the views of a large proportion of the readers of these pages if we assume that there are no articles which will present a stronger claim upon their consideration than those which deal with the constitution of the early Church and with the various functions of the Christian ministry. Much valuable information on these important subjects will be found under the respective heads of *Orders*, *Ordination*, and *Priest*. Whilst it is important to exercise caution in regard to general inferences drawn from the designations given to specific offices it is always a matter of interest and of importance to trace up such designations, when it is practicable, to the time when they were first employed. The volume now before us will be found of great service in the prosecution of this inquiry; and, unless we are greatly deceived, a careful examination of the articles which we have specified will strongly corroborate the inference which, in our judgment, a diligent investigation of the Apostolical Epistles is calculated to produce in every candid and reflecting mind—viz., that sacerdotalism, in the modern acceptation of the term, has no foundation whatever in the history and constitution of the primitive and Apostolic Church. We are well aware that the human mind is so formed that when any ideas have taken a strong and permanent hold upon it, it unconsciously discovers in language, the least calculated to convey such impressions, arguments in support of the theories which it has imbibed from other sources. Such has been pre-eminently the history of sacerdotalism in its rise and development in the Christian Church. In all ages of the world's history of which the records have been preserved, there appears to have been some idea existing in the minds of men of the necessity of expiation and propitiation by means of sacrifice. Nor have terms been wanting, so far as we are aware, in any language, by means of which such ideas have been expressed, nor is there any language in which more accurate expression has been given to those ideas than that in which the Apostolical epistles are written. The general absence, then, of such terms which we observe in those passages which relate to the Christian ministry is a fact which is deserving of our most serious attention. We do not forget, as we make this remark, that the words "altar" and "sacrifice" are both found in connection with Christian service; but the context in which they occur determines the sense in which they are employed. Whatever may be the precise meaning of Hebrews xiii. 10, the context clearly shows that the sacrifice which Christians are to offer by means of the altar, or of Him who suffered thereon, "is the

sacrifice of praise;" the sacrifice of praise, alike under the law and under the Gospel, being distinct from the sacrifice of expiation; whilst in the one and only passage in which the hieratical priesthood is ascribed to a Christian minister—viz., Romans xv. 16—the nature of that priesthood is distinctly explained as consisting, not in the presentation of any material offering on a material altar, but in the "offering up of the Gentiles" themselves as an acceptable sacrifice unto God, "being sanctified by the Holy Ghost."

The inference which we draw from the marked absence of sacrificial terms in regard to Christian worship in those places in which, on the supposition that sacerdotalism is the religion of the New Testament, we should naturally expect to find them, is strongly confirmed by the results of the closest and most accurate inquiry into the earliest records of ecclesiastical history. In the prosecution of these inquiries the volume before us will be found of much practical service, as embodying, with ample references to the sources from which it is derived, much information which has been obtained only as the result of long and patient inquiry in a field of investigation which is too commonly neglected.

A few illustrations must suffice. We turn, *e.g.*, to the article entitled *Holy Orders*. Here we learn that the word *ordo* was the earliest and most general Latin word which was used to denote the clergy as distinguished from the laity in common with that which, at a later period, became a distinctive dress of the clergy. This name appears to have been transferred from Roman civil life, in which it was an ordinary designation of a governing body of both a municipality and a *collegium*. And here it is important to show that at first the words *ordo* and *ordines* comprised not only Church officers, but also any "estate" of men or women in the Church. Thus, *e.g.*, St. Jerome speaks of the "faithful" and the "catechumens" as forming two of the five ecclesiastical "orders." At a much later period we find reference made by Rabanus to the three orders of *clerics*, *laics*, and *monks*, and even so late as in Bishop Leofric's Exeter Missal of the tenth century, we find not only *bishops*, *presbyters*, and *deacons*, but also *acolytes*, *exorcists*, *readers*, and *door-keepers* included under the general term *ordines*. So also in regard to the use of the word κλῆρος, *clerus*, whence the English word *clergy*. Mr. Hatch refers, in proof of the use of this word in the plural number as identical with the "flock" in the preceding verse, to 1 St. Peter v. 3. As evidence of the early, possibly the earliest, ecclesiastical use of the word, we admit the propriety of Mr. Hatch's reference; we think, however, that in a work such as that now under review, Mr. Hatch should not have omitted to inform his readers that the genuineness of the verse has been called in question, and that it is omitted in some of the critical editions of the New Testament. Not only, however, so late as the beginning of the fifth century, Mr. Hatch shows that laymen, as well as church officers, were included under the appellation of κλῆρος, but he observes that from the sixth century downwards "it appears to have become a custom in the Gallican churches to confer upon persons privileges and immunities of the clergy by giving them the tonsure without admitting them to any special office in a church;" and, "such persons," he observes further, "were called *clerici*." It appears further, from the evidence adduced by Mr. Hatch, that the distinction between various grades of orders was by no means uniform. Thus, *e.g.*, in the East we sometimes find bishops and presbyters classed together in distinction to deacons and other clerks, whilst, on the other hand (as we may observe, in passing, is the case in the title to the Latin version of our own Thirty-Second Article of Religion), we sometimes find *deacons* included amongst those who had sacred or priestly rank. We will only add, in reference to the article entitled "Holy

Orders," that Mr. Hatch's account of the external organization of the clergy and the original independence of each Church, and the gradual association of different churches into a single organization, is well deserving of careful consideration, whether all of his positions may or may not be sustained by adequate evidence.

Passing on from the important articles to which we have already referred to that of "Priest or Presbyter," for which we are indebted to the same contributor, we observe, with much satisfaction, the remarks which Mr. Hatch has made respecting the connection of the Christian Church with the Jewish synagogue. The following extracts will suffice to convey to our readers some general idea of the views which Mr. Hatch has propounded in this article.

Having first observed that the ἐκκλησία was not separated from the συναγωγὴ even in name, Mr. Hatch observes as follows:—

> It is natural to suppose that when the Jews who became Christians met in assemblies and formed communities which bore the accustomed names, they continued in their assemblies and communities the main features of the accustomed organization. And this, is in fact, the case. Presbyters are found from the first in the Judæo-Christian community at Jerusalem, at Ephesus, in the Churches of Asia Minor—which were organized by Barnabas and Saul—and in the Churches which are addressed by those of the apostles who were most conservative of Jewish usages, St. Peter and St. James. . . . . It is a fair inference that officers who bore the same name in analogous communities had analogous functions, and that the Christian, like the Jewish, Presbyters were officers primarily not of worship but of discipline.

Mr. Hatch observes further, that there is no evidence of the existence of the institution of *presbyters* "outside the limits of the Judæo-Christian communities;" and he adduces, in support of the presumption in favour of the non-existence of that institution, the fact that when St. Paul addressed Churches which were probably non-Jewish in character, as *e.g.*, the Churches of Philippi and Thessalonica, he designates the Church officers by other names, as ἐπίσκοποι (Phil. i. 1) and προϊστάμενοι (1 Thess. v. 12).

Mr. Hatch's remark upon the relations of presbyters to bishops appear to us to be deserving of serious consideration. He candidly admits the difficulty, or rather the impossibility, with the evidence which is at present available, of returning more than a tentative reply to the inquiry which he has proposed. He suggests, however, that as presbyters appear to have been clearly of Jewish origin, so bishops appear to have been of Gentile origin, and that as, in the first instance, the former presided over Jewish communities, so the latter presided over Gentile communities, and hence that, in process of time, as the distinction between Jewish and Gentile communities gradually faded away, the two sets of officers, discharging analogons functions, were regarded as possessing equivalent rank and authority. Those of our readers who are familiar with Bishop Lightfoot's admirable Dissertations, in his "Commentary on the Epistle to Philippians," will not need to be reminded that, to a very considerable extent, the views propounded by Mr. Hatch are in accordance with those which are maintained with so much learning and candour by the present Bishop of Durham.

The name of Professor Swainson affords a sufficient guarantee for the sound scholarship and laborious research of which we reap the results in the article entitled *Liturgy*. We recommend a careful perusal of this article with much confidence to our readers, whether they be already well versed in liturgical literature, or whether they have yet to become acquainted with the elements of a branch of theological study which, of late years, has deservedly attracted a more than ordinary amount of attention on the part of English Churchmen. It is difficult to make

selections from an article which is replete with varied information on so many points of great and increasing interest. Professor Swainson's remarks on the Ambrosian Liturgy of the Church of Milan are deserving of special notice. That Church, as he observes, appears to have been entirely independent of the Church of Rome until Gregory, in the year 593, attempted to exercise patriarchal privileges within the province. The manner in which the oblations were made in the Church of Milan is thus described:—"They were brought in, not by the deacon, but by ten aged men and as many women, and presented by them to the priest." Some of the most important points to which Professor Swainson calls attention in his account of the Ambrosian Liturgy, if the account of Muratori may be trusted, are that there was (1) no offering after consecration, (2) no prayer for those who had departed with the sign of faith, (3) no commemoration of the (Roman) martyrs, and (4) no ceremony of fraction before the Lord's prayer; all of which are contained in the rite as published by Pamelius.

In regard to the character of those Liturgies in which, as English churchmen we are most nearly concerned—viz., the Liturgies of the early British and Celtic churches—Professor Swainson observes that we are "in almost entire ignorance," but that it is "most probable that they resembled in some degree the uses of the churches in Gaul or Spain." An ancient document, originally published by Spelman, is said by Professor Stubbs to be silent on the Liturgy of Britain before the year 429, and its evidence, so far as it goes, is only to the effect that "the Irish Liturgy used by St. Patrick was neither Roman nor Gallican, but Alexandrian." Coming down to the time of Gildas—*i.e.*, to the following century—we find an assertion attributed to him that the Britons were opposed to the whole world and to the Romans in particular "in the mass." So long, moreover, as the Britons and Celts refused to observe the Roman Easter, they must, as Professor Swainson has observed, have refused to adopt the Roman ritual for the Eucharist, and as we know that the Roman Easter was not observed in Scotland or Ireland before the beginning of the eighth century, we are warranted in concluding that up to that period, at all events, their Eucharistic ritual must have been different from the Roman. We are aware that it has been inferred from phrases which are found in the writings of Gildas and of the biographers of St. Columba that the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist occupied a very prominent place in the liturgies and rituals of the Celtic Church. The phrases to which reference is made are such as the following: *sacra offerre; sacra consecrare mysteria; Christi corpus conficere; sacram oblationem consecrare; sacra celebrare mysteria,* but independently of the fact that some of these phrases do not vary from those which the followers of Calvin would not scruple to adopt, the most superficial acquaintance with the theological literature of the fourth and the following centuries ought to suffice as a safeguard against assigning a literal interpretation to language which undoubtedly was often used, and was designed to be understood, in a figurative signification. Equally unsatisfactory as it appears to us are the inferences which have been recently drawn[1] respecting "the position and attitude of the Celebrant," from casual references to the position of St. Columba as "standing at, or before the altar," and, also, respecting the choral services "at the altar" from the allusion of Gildas to "the musical voices of the young sweetly singing the praises of God." We find, however, in Adamnan's "Life of St. Columba," evidence of existence at Iona of a singular custom of joint consecration of

[1] See an Article on the Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church in the April number of the *Church Quarterly Review.*

the eucharistic elements by two priests, it being deemed the prerogative of bishops, or of individual priests specially selected, to consecrate singly. The extract is as follows:—

On one occasion a stranger from the province of Munster, who concealed through humility the fact that he was a bishop, was invited on the next Sunday by Columba to join with him in consecrating the body of Christ. . . . . Columba, on going to the altar, discovered his rank, and addressed him thus:—"Christ bless thee, brother, consecrate alone as a bishop; now we know that thou art of episcopal rank."[1]

The Article on "Marriage," for which we are indebted to Mr. Meyrick, is one of considerable research, and represents the results of extensive reading and investigation. It comprehends an inquiry into (1) the marriage laws of the first eight centuries of the Christian era; (2) the marriage ceremonies; and (3) the law of divorce. In regard to the interpretation of the much vexed direction given by St. Paul to Timothy and Titus, "the husband of one wife," Mr. Meyrick observes that that which is adopted by St. Chrysostom is, that persons were not to be selected for the ministry who were polygamists. He observes further:—

The thought underlying St. Chrysostom's interpretation is that, whereas polygamy was allowed by the Jews, and was still practised, as shown by the example of Herod, and proved by the testimony of Justin, it might have been the purpose of the apostle to allow a converted Jew who was a polygamist to live as a layman without repudiating his existing wives, but not to allow a man in such a position to be a presbyter.

In regard to the light in which marriage was regarded by the Church of the first eight centuries, Mr. Meyrick observes that there is no sign or hint of its being considered as a sacrament, and that although the term *sacramentum* is used by St. Augustine with respect to marriage, it is nowhere employed by him in the modern sense of the word *sacrament*. After a careful and comprehensive review of the documents and authorities of the early Church in regard to remarriage after divorce, Mr. Meyrick observes, that "while the remarriage of the guilty party was sternly and uncompromisingly condemned, there was no *consensus* on the question of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of the remarriage of the innocent party."

It would be easy to multiply our extracts and references, but we trust that we have already given our readers some fair specimens of the varied information which they may expect to find in the very valuable and elaborate volume which we heartily commend to the favourable consideration of that numerous class of readers for whom its pages are specially designed.

Healthy Life and Healthy Dwellings; a Guide to Personal and Domestic Hygiene. By GEORGE WILSON, M.A., M.D., C.M. Edin. London: J. & A. Churchill. 1880.

THE greater attention which has of late been directed to sanitary questions has led to the issue of a number of works of more or less merit purporting to deal with matters relating to health either generally or in detail, in a popular manner.

An enumeration of these would lead one to believe that the subject had been written out, but the truth is, that such a book as the present was still wanted, and we can with confidence recommend it as the best by far of its kind.

Dr. Wilson is the author of a "Handbook of Hygiene," intended for the

---

[1] The *Church Quarterly Review* for April, 1880, p. 73.

use of Medical Officers of Health, which, though not coming up to what such a work should be, has already reached a fourth edition. But viewed in relation to the purposes for which each has been written, we consider the present to be by far the more perfect of the two. In less than 300 pages it covers an extent of ground such as has never been attempted in a popular treatise, and so far from being superficial, it contains a surprising mass of facts and information. It is remarkably free from the faults of similar popular works; though eminently readable, it avoids the sentimentalism and would-be-rhetorical efforts which disfigure so many of its class. It is marked throughout by a sound scientific spirit, an absence of all hasty generalizations and abuse of statistics, in support of the writer's own particular views. This tone of moderation, without the least surrender of principle, is conspicuous in the discussion of the use of alcohol and tobacco and the fashions of female dress.

The First Chapter introduces the reader to the teachings of Vital Statistics, with special reference to preventible diseases and the awful waste, especially among the poor of our large cities, of infant life. We might take exception to his implicit acceptance of the so-called healthy and unhealthy districts of the Registrar-General as such, a fallacy which had been ably exposed by the late Dr. Rumsey; but as the work is addressed to private individuals rather than to physicians or statists we may let it pass.

Chapter II. contains a good summary of the principles of Human Physiology, and Chapter III. treats of the causes of disease, which he divides into—(*a*) those due to *hereditary influence*; (*b*) *self-induced, and social causes*, these comprising what have been called the "diseases of modern life;" and (*c*) *material, local, and communicable causes of disease*, as damp, impure air and water, unsound food and infection. Chapter IV., on food, is thoroughly sound and practical. It is mainly compiled from the works of Parkes, Letheby, and Ed. Smith, and discusses the (*a*) nutritive value, (*b*) choice, (*c*) and preparation of food, with (*d*) hints on diet in general, and on infant feeding.[1] Mothers in every class, and wives, especially in the middle and lower, would learn much from this chapter. Men, too, the hours and quantity of whose meals must be regulated by the inexorable demands of their several employments will find here much useful advice. Chapter V., on cleanliness and clothing, calls for no special remark beyond a protest against the practice of open air bathing *before breakfast*, even by the "vigorous and strong."[2] Chapter VI., on exercise, recreation, and training, deserves the attention of all, especially of such as have the care of the young, and of those who would aid in promoting the physical, and, through it, the moral well-being of the masses.

In Chapter VII., the author discusses the home and its surroundings, matters of vital importance in these days of rapid and dishonest building. The general principles of sanitary construction, and their application, so far as the occupier is concerned, are clearly explained. The best patterns of traps, closets, stoves, ventilators, &c., are named, and attention is directed to several points usually ignored, such as the shameful

[1] The mischievous, but too prevalent practice of rearing young children on *starch*, under the various names of corn flour, arrowroot, Ridge's food, &c., which infants are, for physiological reasons, incapable of assimilating, and which consequently induces diarrhœa, rickets and consumption is justly condemned.

[2] It is not so much to cramp, as commonly supposed, but to failure of the heart's action from the depressing influence of prolonged exposure to cold, we believe, that deaths while bathing are really due.

relegation of the servants' sleeping accommodation to ill-ventilated basements, or more often to dark low garrets, cold in winter, and oppressively hot in summer; the absorption and subsequent evolution of foul gases by the "water seal" of traps, the erosion of lead by sewer gas, and the ease with which gas-burners might be rendered efficient ventilators instead of being, as at present, powerful deteriorators of the air. The Chapter concludes with a short summary of the means of redress afforded to the householder by the law in the event of the landlord refusing to accede to the reasonable requests of the tenant. The last Chapter gives a history of epidemics from the Middle Ages, and a concise description of the several zymotic or infectious diseases. Their modes of origin are clearly stated, though we fail to see on what grounds he hopes we have done with cholera, unless through the increased vigilance of our port sanitary authorities, so successful in 1873.

Among the means by which smallpox and scarlatina are spread, he calls attention to the practice of tailors, dressmakers, &c., of putting out their work, though he omits the scarcely less dangers of the private laundry and mangle; the measures to be taken in the event of such diseases breaking out in the family or school; and directions for the subsequent disinfection of rooms, bedding, and clothing. We notice with special approval his warnings on the utter futility of exposing vessels of so-called disinfectants in the sick-room with a view to checking the extension of the disease, an end to be attained only by free ventilation and perfect isolation; the folly, nay, wickedness, of deliberately exposing children of tender age to the infection of measles (or even the mildest scarlatina) as to something in itself inevitable or in the course of Nature, and his recommendation that all cases of infectious disease should, in the absence of legislative compulsion, be voluntarily reported to the sanitary authority. While deprecating most strongly all attempts by the clergy (or their wives) to assume the functions of the physician, under a false notion of charity, the present writer—a medical man—would assure them that they might do good service by first acquiring and then disseminating the lessons contained in this book. The greatest ignorance of the laws of health prevails among all classes, but it is on the poor that the consequences press most heavily. In villages, the co-operation of the clergy and school teachers with the Medical Officer of Health, might work wonders. But it must be borne in mind that a fourth of all the deaths in a community, and three-fourths of those of infants, are absolutely preventable; that a large proportion of children among all classes are victims to the ignorance or errors of their parents; that the greater part of our diseases are the natural consequences of our acts—the penalties of the violation of God's physical laws, whether we choose to attach a moral character to them or not; and that prayers against plague and pestilence are a solemn mockery if unattended by sanitary amendment, as much so as the prayers of the drunkard who should persist in his sensual indulgence. This may seem strong language to those who have not studied the subject, but it is true. What a man sows he reaps, and there is now no more mystery in the origin of fevers than there is in the cultivation of mushrooms.

Chaucer. By ADOLPHUS W. WARD. "English Men of Letters" series. Macmillans. 1879.

THE "Chaucer Society," an outcome of the zealous study of the old English language and literature by a small band of scholars in England and Germany during the last ten or twenty years, has not merely collected and published the best and oldest texts of his poems, but has exhumed a

mass of facts and documents relating to his life, such as in the case of a private citizen who lived five hundred years ago is really surprising. Without the labours of this Society the present work, as its author frankly admits, could never have been written.

Mr. Ward begins with a review of the political and social aspect of the times, a period of transition between the old world life of the Middle Ages and the dawn of modern civilization. The union of Norman and Saxon into one people and the blending of their respective languages into our incomparable English was now complete, and with the creation of a House of Commons, composed of representatives of the people, the middle classes were becoming conscious of their own importance. But between 1360 and 1370, the defeat and disgrace which the English arms had sustained in France had dispelled the illusion of previous military success, and the distress of the people, crushed by taxation and decimated by a succession of epidemics, culminated in the peasant revolt of 1381. After its suppression, the desire of security and order led to reaction, but the masses, though silenced, were sullen, for their wrongs were not redressed. Chivalry which had been for preceding generations at once a culture and a religion, keeping alive in ages of lawlessness all that was noble and manly in man, pure and womanly in woman, was fast passing away; what was left was but an unreal sentiment, powerless in moral influence. The times were out of joint, and the moral leprosy was nowhere so conspicuous as in the Church. The monks and nuns aped the luxury, sports, and indulgences of the aristocracy, amassing vast wealth; the friars strove not unsuccessfully to retain their hold on the poor by pandering to their vices and ignorance; the secular clergy alone could show a few pure and pious men, but their poverty and humble birth, no less than the honesty of the better members, neutralized their influence for evil or for good. Yet amid the cares and unrest which pervaded all classes, we can recognize the childish love of play and show, so characteristic of an imperfect civilization. Frivolity and laxity of morals in the higher classes, ostentation in the middle, and boisterous sport in the lower, conjoined with a universal coarseness of language and absence of social decency or domestic comfort, such was the age in which Chaucer lived, and as such it is vividly reflected in all his works.

The second chapter, which forms the bulk of the work, is devoted to the story of Chaucer's life and the sources and dates of his numerous works. Into the details of his parentage and biography it is needless here to enter. We must, however, express our surprise that Mr. Ward should give his preference to the supposition that the heroine of the *Complaint of Pitè* was the Philippa whom he did marry, rather than the Lady Blanche whose marriage with John of Gaunt first, and whose death in 1369 finally destroyed his hopes of ever calling her his own. Nothing seems clearer, making all allowance for the romantic language of love-song, than that inequality of rank was the bar to the desired union. In the pathetic elegy on this lady, the *Book of the Duchesse*, written at the request of John, it is the poet's love and not the Duke's which inspires it, for the latter was utterly unworthy of her; his immorality was notorious, and indeed, as was shown in the *Lancet* recently, we have the testimony of his own physician that it was the immediate cause of his death.

On the decease of Blanche, Chaucer married his namesake (cousin?) Philippa Chaucer, but like too many poets he was not happy in his married life; her temper was bad, and might explain but cannot excuse his infidelity, which a document lately discovered has proved.

Mr. Ward traces the influence of the French poetry on the first half of our poet's literary career. At first Chaucer appears as a translator, or adapter of French models, not only as regards theme and language, but in their sceptical mocking tone with regard to woman in general. The original

Romaunt of the Rose is sketched and compared with Chaucer's abridged version. The influence of Italian literature, especially Boccaccio and Petrarca, and to a less degree Dante, is traced subsequently to his visits to that country, notably in his *Troilus and Cressida* and *Parliament of Fowls*, the latter a pretty allegory founded on the popular legend of the courtships of the birds on St. Valentine's Day, and adapted to the marriage of Anne of Bohemia, daughter of the Emperor Charles IV., to our King Richard II., after successive betrothals to a Prince of Bavaria and a Margrave of Meissen.

Then we have the development of Chaucer's own personality, essentially English, as seen in his *House of Fame*, a masterly satire on the motives, sometimes worthy, but more often unworthy, which prompt men to "seek the bubble reputation;" the *Legend of Good Women*, an attempt at an *amende honorable* for his former ungallant treatment of their sex in a series of stories of womanly and wifely fidelity, which, however, he had not either the leisure or the patience to complete, not having given more than nine of the nineteen he had promised, and these all taken from classic legends, mostly from Ovid; and lastly, in his greatest but unfinished work, the *Canterbury Tales*, of which we find a full analysis with prose abstracts of the best. His minor pieces, the *Ballad to King Richard*, *Envoy to Scogan*, the *Complaint to his Purse*, a serio-comic appeal to the new king, Henry IV., for money of which he was greatly in need, and which it appears he obtained through its means, are more lightly touched on. These notices of his books are interspersed with biographical details; and the author alludes to the influence of Chaucer on Spenser, and the imitations, or rather parodies, of his works by Pope and Dryden, which are ably treated by Mr. Stopford Brooke in his Primer of English Literature. With regard to the "Parson's Tale" Mr. Ward admits that it is mutilated, but he hesitates to go the same length as Mr. Simon, or, like the German scholar, to submit it to a process of verification, and to determine how much is really genuine.

The last chapter on the characteristics of Chaucer will repay perusal; the religious character of Chaucer is fairly handled. Mr. Ward shows, from the "Man of Law's Tale" and the Treatise on the *Astrolabe*, that though justly incredulous of the false science of the day, and a foe to superstition and priestcraft, he had a firm belief in the historic truth of the Bible and the doctrines of Christianity, whatever practical influence they may have had on his life. Of few of his contemporaries could so much be said, and we would fain judge him leniently, attributing his faults to the age in which he lived, and hoping that the evangelical doctrine of repentance and faith in the Redeemer, so clearly set forth in the indisputably genuine portions of the "Parson's Tale," were the consolation of his dark declining years.

For the rest, the quaint and consciously anachronistic treatment of subjects sacred and profane, his apprehension of character, his irrepressible humour, his kindly satire, and the music of his verse, are all pointed out; but on laying down the book, we feel that though this part of the work is honest, laborious, and scholarly, there is a lack of that indescribable poetic feeling which a man may have without being himself a writer of poetry, but which is essential to a true and hearty sympathy between the critic and the poet, to a keen enjoyment of his writings, and without which the most praiseworthy efforts are powerless to elicit such pleasure in the reader. Mr. Ward's style, too, we must confess, is not always agreeable. While on the whole favouring the severe and sometimes strained simplicity of a recent school, which has arisen as a protest

against the Johnsonian edition of the last, and the penny-a-lining of the present generation, his constructions are often awkward and his sentences halting and needlessly involved.

Early History of the Athanasian Creed. With an Appendix containing Four Ancient Commentaries. By G. D. W. OMMANNEY, M.A., Vicar of Draycot, Somerset. Rivingtons. 1880.

MR. OMMANNEY may justly claim credit for much careful and laborious research, and for the examination of many documents which appear to have escaped, either partially or entirely, the observations of previous investigators. It may fairly be doubted, however, whether the result of his inquiries can be regarded as a sufficient remuneration for the time and labour which have been bestowed upon them. We will assume, for the sake of argument, not only that Mr. Ommanney has succeeded in proving that Professor Swainson was mistaken in the dates which he has assigned to certain documents, but also that the Creed commonly ascribed to St. Athanasius *may* have been composed as early as the middle of the fifth century; and, farther, that Vincent of Lerins *may* have been its author. Our inquiry is, Would the establishment of either, or of both of these theories materially affect our judgment as to the value of the Creed, or as to its adaptation for recital in the public services of the Church? We are disposed to answer this inquiry in the negative. Whether the Creed, in its present form, be a production of the fifth century, or of the eighth, we should still receive its dogmatic statements, when rightly interpreted, not on the score of their antiquity, but because "they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture" (8th Art. of Religion). Our opinion respecting the expediency or inexpediency of putting into the mouths of an ordinary congregation language which must be utterly unintelligible to the greater part of them, would not be affected in the remotest degree by the conclusions which we might have adopted as to the age in which the *Quicunque vult* was originally formulated, or as to that in which it underwent certain modifications.

So far, however, as we have examined Mr. Ommanney's arguments, we confess our inability to see how they justify his conclusions. We will adduce one or two instances by way of illustration. One of Mr. Ommanney's strongest arguments in favour of the early date of the Creed in question is derived from that of the most ancient Commentaries which were written upon it. The earliest of the Commentaries to which our author refers is that which is commonly attributed to Venantius Fortunatus. Now if Mr. Ommanney has succeeded in proving that this Commentary was written in "the commencement of the seventh century" (p. 274), it will at once be conceded that Professor Swainson is mistaken in assigning the composition of the Creed to a much later period. But what is the nature of the proof to which Mr. Ommanney appeals? Why, unless we have altogether mistaken our author's chain of reasoning, his conclusion appears to rest mainly, if not exclusively, upon the alleged fact that there is nothing in that Commentary which "can be shown to be borrowed from any source subsequent to the sixth century."

Lest, however, we should unintentionally have misrepresented the character of Mr. Ommanney's argument in this instance, we will refer to that which is based upon the dates which he ascribed to the Oratorian and Bouhier Commentaries on the Athanasian Creed—viz., the beginning of the eighth century, and a somewhat later period in that century, respectively. It is obvious in this, as in the preceding case, that if the Oratorian and Bouhier Commentaries can be proved to have been composed during

any part of the *eighth* century, the Creed in which they were composed must be assigned to a period earlier than the *ninth* century. But, again, we refer back to Mr. Ommanney's arguments and conclusions as to the time at which these Commentaries were composed, in regard to which he speaks of "the fuller light" which we have "to guide us to their dates" (p. 27). In the first place we are somewhat surprised to find it alleged, as an argument in favour of the early date of the Bouhier Commentary, that it is ascribed to St. Augustine (p. 28)—a fact which disposes Mr. Ommanney to draw from it the conclusion that it is the product of the eighth century, but which may possibly fail to produce a like result upon the minds of others. But Mr. Ommanney does not rely upon this "external evidence" only. He has "internal evidence" also on which his conclusions are based. Both this and the Oratorian Commentary "contain language evidently borrowed from the definitions of the Sixth Œcumenical Council which was terminated in September, A.D. 681. "And this circumstance," Mr. Ommanney argues, "which is a conclusive proof that neither of them existed prior to that date, is also a probable proof, to say the least, that neither of them originated very much later." We freely admit the former of these conclusions. Our readers will probably agree with us that the latter is not equally apparent.

We have noted other portions of this work which appear to us to contain assumptions and conclusions resting on very insufficient evidence. But we forbear from adducing further illustrations of the justice of the criticism which we have pronounced upon Mr. Ommanney's arguments, and we conclude this brief notice of his contribution to the controversy on the date of the Athanasian Creed, on the one hand by a cheerful acknowledgment of the good faith and the laborious research of the writer, on the other hand, by the expression of our conviction that Professor Swainson will reasonably demand the production of some more convincing arguments before he is led to any material modification of the conclusions at which he has arrived upon the subject of discussion.

Croker's Boswell, and Boswell. Studies in the "Life of Johnson." By PERCY FITZGERALD, M.A., F.S.A. Chapman and Hall, 1880.

BOSWELL'S "Life of Johnson" will always keep its own peculiar charms, and really able criticisms upon it will always be welcomed by literary students. The work before us, "Studies" in Boswell's Johnson, is divided into two parts; the first discusses Boswell as edited by Croker, and the second Boswell's work as he wrote and left it.

In the first place, Mr. Fitzgerald sets himself to show that "one of the best edited books in the English language," as the *Quarterly Review* styled "Croker's Boswell," exhibits an elaborate system of defacement and mutilation; the interpolations are bewildering, while the text is freely altered and many omissions are made. Mr. Fitzgerald points out, however, that after faults and blemishes are duly admitted, "Croker's Boswell" remains a most remarkable monument of industry, research, and information of a very interesting kind. Mr. Croker undoubtedly possessed stores of curious learning; from survivors of the Johnstonian era he collected valuable information; and he was an eminent political *littérateur*. The forthcoming edition of his work, it may be hoped, may be cleared of its blemishes.

On the opening pages of this book we meet with Mr. Disraeli's portrait of the Right. Hon. John Wilson Croker as drawn in the novel "Coningsby." Mr. Fitzgerald proceeds to give an account of the well known encounter between Macaulay and Croker—"so unbecoming an episode in the lives

of both." Croker's style cannot be defended; but it is not pleasant to read Macaulay's words: "*See whether I do not dust that varlet's jacket for him in the next number of the* Blue and Yellow. *I detest him more than cold boiled veal.*" Certainly the criticisms of our day are, in some respects at all events, vastly improved; there is everywhere courtesy if not charity. Into the quarrel between the Whig and Tory critics we have no intention of entering. Macaulay's *Edinburgh* Essay is, no doubt, familiar to most members of the general reader class; and it is wonderfully clever. For ourselves, we have no desire to discuss either the style or the literary power of the Essay, with additions, and Croker's replies. Upon one point, however, an interesting classical allusion, we may quote Macaulay's criticism and Croker's defence.

Mr. Macaulay says on the *θνητοι φιλοι*—

Mr Croker has favoured us with some Greek of his own. "At the altar," says Dr. Johnson, "I recommended my *θ. φ.*" "These letters," says the editor (which Dr. Strachan seems not to have understood), "probably mean *θνητοι φιλοι—departed friends.*" Johnson was not a first-rate Greek scholar; but he knew more Greek than most boys do when they leave school; and no schoolboy could venture to use the word *θνητοι* in the sense which Mr. Croker ascribes to it without imminent danger of a flogging.

The answer in *Blackwood's Magazine*, known to be Mr. Croker's own work, runs thus:—

The question is not here about classical Greek, but what Johnson meant by the *cipher θ. φ.* Mr. Croker's solution is not only ingenious, but, we think, absolutely certain: it means "*departed friends,*" beyond all doubt. See, in Dr. Strahan's book, under "Easter Sunday, 1781," an instance of the same kind—"I commended (*in prayer*) my *θ. friends.*" The Reviewer, with notable caution, omits to tell us which of the derivatives of *θανατος* and *θνησκω he* would have chosen; but we think with Mr. Croker, that none was more likely to have occurred to Johnson's mind than *θνητοι*, because it is *good Greek*, and is, moreover, a word we find him quoting on another occasion, in which he deplores the loss of a friend. *Good Greek* we say, in defiance of the menaced flogging; for we have authority that we suppose even the Reviewer may bow to.

What does the Reviewer think of the well-known passage in the *Supplices* of Euripides, cited even in Hederic?—

βᾶθι, καὶ ἀντίασον——,
Τέκνων τε θνητῶν κόμισαι δέμας.—V. 275,

where *Τεκνων θνητων* is used in the same sense as *Τεκνων θανοντων*, v. 12 and 85; *Τεκνων φθίμενων*, v. 60; and *Τέκνων κατθανοντων*, v. 103!

Suppose it had been—

φιλων τε θνητῶν.

The Edinburgh Reviewer seems inclined to revive his old reputation for *Greek!* He thought he was safely sneering at Mr. Croker, and he unexpectedly finds himself *correcting* Euripides.

On the reply by Croker, Macaulay afterwards added a note:—

An attempt was made to vindicate this blunder by quoting a grossly corrupt passage from the *Ικετιδες* of Euripides. The true reading, as every scholar knows, is *τεκνων τεθνεωτων*. Indeed, without this emendation it would not be easy to construe the words, even if *θνατῶν* could bear the meaning which Mr. Croker assigns to it.

I myself, says Mr. Fitzgerald, would offer a conjecture which seems more plausible. "My *θ Φ . . .*" was "my *θετα φιλα*," *i.e.*, "my beloved Tetty," the *t* becoming *th* as in Elizabeth, her name. The objection from "my *θ* friends" would be slight. As all Johnson's diaries were hard to decipher and transcribe, it ran probably "my *θ* friend."