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

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

to a righteous Judge of his own acts; and yet there are, as may be seen in these four examples, and as will be seen still more plainly in other instances that I shall give, laws which produce the several results. The truth as to Social Science and free will seems to be this—man individually is a free agent; man collectively is the creature of circumstances. I do not, of course, mean to say that the individual is wholly uninfluenced by the circumstances that surround him, but the influence in any one case is so small that his will is practically free. It is time now that I should state plainly the social law to which I have more than once made allusion. Two words will suffice. TENDENCIES TELL. In all social phenomena, however many may be the laws involved, this one is sure to be in operation. It may, therefore, fitly be distinguished by this first place, and be called the first law of Social Science. It is very much the same as the law in physics, that every cause produces an effect.

It will not wholly escape observation that the second example which I have given is not only an illustration of the action of this law, but is a proof of the advantage of acting according to its teaching.

The immense practical importance of this law to us as Churchmen, as well as some striking illustrations of its working in such efforts as the establishment of coffee-houses, &c., I leave for a subsequent paper. Also, pursuing the same historical method of my own progress, I shall be able to mention other laws which are no less remarkable than this one for their utility and for their extreme simplicity and beauty.

As to this one—Tendencies tell—I venture to say, that the careful observance of it on the one hand, or the neglect of it on the other, is the primary cause of all the successes and of all the failures in human undertakings that ever have occurred or ever will.

WILLIAM OGLE.

Reviews.

Authorized or Revised? Sermons on some of the Texts in which the Revised Version differs from the Authorized. By C. J. VAUGHAN, D.D., Dean of Llandaff and Master of the Temple. Pp. 330. Macmillan & Co. 1882.

A NEW volume of sermons by Dr. Vaughan is always welcome. Of earnest, devout, and thoughtful Christians not a few, probably, scarcely ever read a sermon. There is no doubt whatever that a large proportion of published sermons fail to find readers, and prove financially unsuccessful. They contain no teaching thoughts, it is said, and the language is conventional; a whole discourse is not worth a page of Blunt

or Cecil. Yet really good sermons, of more than one type, are largely read with interest and profit. The eloquent Baptist preacher of Manchester, Dr. Maclaren, writes for a much greater circle than that of his own congregation. Canon Clayton's "Parochial Sermons," rich in wholesome teachings, have been widely read. Many others might be named. Dean Vaughan's sermons, like all his writings, reveal thought and labour; their literary finish, indeed, is as remarkable as their earnestness and force; and his style, no doubt, has peculiar charms for "cultured" readers. Nevertheless, as a sermon-writer, he never forgets the solemn responsibilities of his work. Hence, his sermons never read like essays; the tone is spiritual; and many passages, though the eloquence is simple and quiet, are in the best sense of the word impressive. Their circulation shows that they are eminently readable; and it is probable that the present volume will be as widely welcomed, as earnestly, gratefully studied, as its predecessors.

About the Revised Version, when considered as claiming to oust or supersede the Authorized Version, we are not able to go quite as far as the honoured author of the sermons before us. The question of the Greek text, as we judge, is extremely serious, and it is not ripe for settlement. Again, on not a few important renderings—to say nothing of changes which are not important—if the question be asked, Authorized or Revised? our own answer, we must confess, will unhesitatingly be, Authorized. On many of the points which he has touched we have in THE CHURCHMAN expressed our opinion; and we are glad to find ourselves, as a rule, in complete agreement with so accurate and judicious a scholar.

In his first sermon, "Personality of the Gospel," the Dean defends the New Version, 1 Tim. iii. 16—"great is the mystery of godliness; *He who* was manifested in the flesh . . . . " The alteration was made, he says, "on evidence which convinces all but a few who will keep at all costs a favourite argument." For ourselves, we may confess we were loth to assent to the alteration; but the evidence against the Authorized Version, patiently and without prejudice considered, seems overwhelming. At allevents, it has satisfied such conservative scholars of the highest rank as Bishop C. Wordsworth and Dr. Scrivener. There is no difficulty, grammatical or otherwise, in the rendering "*mystery . . . . He who.*" The Dean's remarks on the Personality of our religion may well be quoted. He says:—

> There be many that say, The Gospel is a *thing*—a good thing, a pious thing, a moral and even a rational thing—a thing which would make us all better men, if we walked in its precepts. There be many that say *more* than this—The Gospel is a revelation, a revelation of truth and doctrine—telling us of God manifest in the flesh, with many great inferences and momentous consequences—embodied in Creeds, formularies, and Catechisms—let us earnestly contend for the faith once for all delivered.
>
> But the Revised Version of the New Testament says *this* to us—and if it were its only change, it would have been worth ten years of labour—The mystery of godliness, the revealed secret which has in it "reverence," the right feeling and attitude of the soul towards God, its Author and Object of being, is a Person—Incarnate, justified, attested, heralded, believed, glorified—a Person whom to know is life, whom to serve is freedom. He is not a doctrine, nor a book, nor a Creed, nor a Church—He is a Person. Do you hear Him speak? Do you speak to Him? . . . .

Dr. Vaughan's discourse on St. John v. 35-40, is excellent. That the Authorized Version "a burning and a shining light" is grammatically incorrect no scholar will deny; it is also exegetically incomplete. Whether the Revised Version, "Ye search the Scriptures . . . ." is, all things considered, better than the Authorized Version, "Search . . . ."

seems doubtful; but this discourse admirably unfolds the lessons of the indicative rendering.

The Dean's defence of the new renderings in what Traill called "the Lord's Prayer" (John xvii.), is by far the fullest and most persuasive which we have seen. The exposition of verse 2, for instance, "*that whatsoever* (all that thing which) *Thou hast given Him, to them He should give eternal life*," is fresh, forcible, and suggestive. Nor is the rebuke administered to critics of a certain class, or rather of two classes, at all uncalled for. Anyhow, those who hold high views of Inspiration, cannot consistently sympathize with objections to this or that exact rendering which, when examined, are simply objections (1) that the rendering is unfamiliar, (2) that the language seems not so musical. The Greek text of verse 2, says the Dean, has unquestionably the singular neuter and the masculine plural combined in the manner represented by the Revised Version:—

Every one admits that there is a difficulty in reproducing this in English. Not more of harshness than there is in the Greek—but still a harshness. The fastidious ear, the facile tongue, the superficial mind, to which all must at any cost be made smooth and level, naturally cry out against the literal translation. They like better the Authorized Version, which sacrifices one-half the saying, to make the rhythm pleasing and the general idea transparent. Even those who are capable of construing the original profess to be actually perplexed and puzzled by the new rendering. So impatient are men of a moment's pause in their cursory survey of Divine truth. I will dare to say that the intricacy is in the thought—is in the Divine Prayer and the Divine Inspiration. . . . . The two thoughts—the body and its members, the Church and the Christian, "the bride of the Lamb" and the "great multitude that no man can number,"—are in the Prayer of the Lord, are in the Greek original; is it not worth something, some sacrifice (if it must be) of smoothness and commonness, and pellucid transparency, to retain both in "the tongue wherein we were born?

On verse 11, Authorized Version, "keep through Thine own Name those whom Thou . . . ." Revised Version, "keep them in *Thy Name which* Thou hast given me," the Dean's remarks are full of interest. Together with this comment may be read his exposition of "in [not *at*] the name of Jesus," the second chapter of Philippians ii., the tenth verse. His remarks on the whole passage of that chapter, verses 5–10, teaching the humiliation and exaltation of Christ, are clear and cogent. The Authorized Version, "thought it not robbery . . . ." we have long felt, ignores the ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκ. . . —the emphatic *but*.[1] In other respects, indeed, the Revised Version is more precise and pointed.

In his sermon on St. John v. 44, (receive *glory* one of another) the Dean brings out the meaning of "honour" as distinguished from "glory." St. Paul says "Render honour to whom honour is due"; and St. Peter says "Honour all men." St. Paul never said, "Give glory to whom glory is due;" nor St. Peter "Give glory to all men."[2]

Honour is respect—the recognition of the claim of position, or of the claim of character, or of that humanity itself which was made in God's likeness, to our regard and consideration as such. We see the difference when we read of the impious flattery paid to a worthless king, who was instantly smitten by the angel because he gave not God the glory. . . . . The word of the Lord is true, that much of that which men give to, and expect from, one another, is, being

[1] "Being (originally) in the form of God, he did not count it . . . . . but emptied. . . . ." Whether "prize" is the best word may be doubted.

[2] The word δόξα is, for precise translators, a rather difficult word; and we should have been glad if the Dean had made some allusion to St. Luke xiv. 10—"Then shalt thou have *glory* in the presence of all that sit at meat with thee" (CHURCHMAN, p. 378).

examined, not honour, but glory. It is the ascription of an excellence of some sort, not derived but inherent, to the being which was created, the being which has sinned, the being which must die.

The construction in the original, we may remark, is worthy of note. "How can *you* (ὑμεῖς) believe, *seeing that* ye receive . . and seek not. . ." The transition from the participle to the tense gives force. The other portion of the verse ought to be translated, as Dean Vaughan points out, "the glory that cometh from *the only God* (τοῦ μόνου Θεοῦ) ye seek not." There is but one Person who has light to emit, who has excellence to manifest.

In the sermon "Enough and to spare," the Dean defends the rendering of St. John vi. 12, "gather up *the broken pieces which remain over;*" "broken pieces" instead of "fragments,"—not a gratuitous innovation, but a real improvement, as we pointed out last year (CHURCHMAN, vol. iv. p. 375). The Dean's remarks, throughout, are excellent. "The 'broken pieces,'" he says, "are not crumbs or leavings at all—they are the portions dispensed by the creative hand of Christ, as He furnished from the invincible store the separate supplies for the individual guests." Thus,

> "*Gather up the broken pieces*" calls attention to the generosity of grace, and bids us take notice of the boundless stores upon which we may draw without stint or limit in all the exigencies and emergencies of the inward and outward being. See, it says to us, how the Lord, having five thousand hungry men before Him, with five barley loaves and two small fishes as His only visible starting-point, was not perplexed and not straitened in furnishing forth His tables, but had twelve hampers full left over, when all had partaken—not of waste fragments, and not of coarse, unhewn material, but of definite portions, nicely and neatly broken, ready for the use of tens and hundreds more if they had been there to want, to ask, and to receive. "Gather up the superfluous portions," that you may learn to estimate aright the omnipotent hand, and to appreciate the superhuman grace and love which moves it.

On several other passages in these deeply interesting sermons we should gladly have made a brief comment; but our space is exhausted. The book is a valuable one; and we trust, with the Master's blessing, it may do great good service.

As to type and paper the volume is charming.

The Friendship of God; and other Meditations upon Holy Scripture. By the late Rev. HENRY WRIGHT, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's, Hon. Sec. of the C. M. S., and Minister of St. John's Chapel, Hampstead. Pp. 350. Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington.

"HAVING been requested by the family of my late beloved friend, Henry Wright, to edit a memorial volume of his manuscript sermons, I sought and obtained permission to make a selection of two or three from the many touching notices which appeared at the time of his death."

We have quoted the opening sentence of the Rev. E. H. Bickersteth's editorial preface in the volume before us. The first of the biographical notices thus referred to was written by the Rev. Walter Abbott, Vicar of Paddington; it embodies much of a valuable paper in the *Church Missionary Intelligencer* of September, 1880. The third extract is from a letter written by the Editor himself, Mr. Bickersteth, giving personal reminiscences of his intercourse with Mr. Wright during the years 1872–80, at Hampstead; and to this charming letter is appended an *In Memoriam*, by the same polished pen, which opens thus:—

And has the Master call'd thee to His rest,
O man, greatly beloved and rested on,
As husband, father, pastor, kinsman, friend,
A leader of the heralds of the cross,
In the ripe fulness of thy strength ?

At the time when he was so suddenly taken away we desired to have a biographical notice of Henry Wright in THE CHURCHMAN, a magazine in which, as he told us, he took great interest.[1] But from one or other circumstance no arrangement was successful; and it has been to us a disappointment and regret that a worthy *In Memoriam* has not appeared in THE CHURCHMAN. We very gladly, therefore, take the opportunity which the present volume affords us; and of the "singularly felicitous biographical" notice written by Mr. Abbot[2] we transfer to our own columns the leading passages.

Henry Wright was the second son of the late Francis Wright, of Osmaston, Ashbourne, a man who will long be remembered in the Midland Counties for his Christian character and Christian munificence.

He was born January 14, 1833. Very early did he realize that he was the child of God and the servant of Jesus Christ, and it was the great wish of his boyhood to live the life and do the work of a Missionary of the Cross in a foreign land. A fever contracted during a visit to the Holy Land, and which for some time left its mark upon him, prevented the fulfilment of this wish; his mission was to be in England. After graduating in 1856, at Balliol College, Oxford, he was ordained in December, 1857, by the late Bishop Lonsdale, of Lichfield, to the chaplaincy of the Butterley Iron Works, of which his father was the chief proprietor. In the same year he married the fourth daughter of the Hon. A. L. Melville, Branston Hall, Lincoln.

After his marriage and ordination, he settled down at the Grange, Swanwick, and threw himself with all his natural sympathy and ardour into the great work which had to be accomplished, not only among the rough open-hearted foundry-men of Butterley, but also among the population of nearly 2,000 colliers, "framework knitters," "stockingers" (as they are called), of the adjoining hamlet of Swanwick.

Swanwick in itself, and as it then was, would hardly be deemed an "attractive sphere" or "a desirable position." It was a place to which no man would have dreamt of going, except from an earnest desire to win souls to God. That, however, was Henry Wright's one covetousness, according to the beautiful thought of Quesnel—"the covetousness of gaining souls to Christ." . . . .

Mr. Wright was not to spend the whole of his ministerial life in Swanwick. In 1867, he quitted the people to whom he first had gone,

---

[1] One fact we venture to mention in regard to THE CHURCHMAN. Mr. Wright wrote to us expressing his entire agreement with the observations in the preface to our first volume as to the lines on which a periodical representing the Evangelical School of the Church should be conducted. Mr. Bickersteth truly remarks (p. xxiii.) "there was a wonderful large-heartedness about him."

[2] Mr. Wright passed away on Friday, August 13. Mr. Abbott's sermon was preached at Coniston Parish Church, Sunday, August 15. When the sermon —an admirable one—was published (at the request of the bereaved) Mr. Abbott prefixed "the short outline of a life which, illuminated by the Spirit of God, has left a very bright track behind."

and by whom he was so greatly beloved, in order to succeed to the vacant rectory of St. Nicholas, Nottingham. In that parish of 4,400 persons, he laboured for five years with much blessing, exercising a solid influence, not only over his own flock, but over the whole town of Nottingham. . . . .

It is instructive to notice the grounds of this remarkable influence. Mr. Wright was possessed of few popular gifts; he was not an eloquent preacher, unless, indeed, eloquence be, as it has been termed, the "power of persuasion." He was a careful but not a fluent or a ready speaker; he had, indeed, his own peculiar gifts, a calm judgment, capacity for work, and considerable powers of organization, but they were not popular gifts.

His influence was the result of (*a*) definite and scriptural opinions. He believed firmly and preached fearlessly the great truths contained in the articles of the Church of England. Attached by strong conviction to what are called Evangelical principles, he was nevertheless too candid and large minded to be a partisan. Clear and distinctive in his views, he lived as every man should live, above the party to which he belonged. He called no man master—one was his master—even Christ. There was, however, no question about his principles, and in the proclamation of those principles under an abiding sense of the presence of the Spirit of God he commended himself "to every man's *conscience*."

(*b*) Mr. Wright's chief influence was the influence of character. Men who understood little and cared less for dogmatic teaching discerned no gulf between his principles and his practice. . . . .

It was in 1872 that he was appointed to the position than which there is, perhaps, *none* more honourable, and none more arduous in the English Church, that of Hon. Clerical Secretary to the Church Missionary Society. . . . .

Mr. Wright seemed marked out for the post about to be vacant; and there were many to testify to his personal qualifications as a man of rare spiritual character and devoted attachment to the evangelical principles of the Society. Ultimately Mr. Venn wrote and sounded him. Two letters came from him in reply; and both Mr. Venn and Lord Chichester instantly said that the man who could write those letters was the man for the Church Missionary Society. This interesting circumstance was mentioned by the venerable President himself at the committee meeting August 17.

Mr. Wright accordingly came to Salisbury Square. His work here, during the past eight years, was of the most varied and multifarious character. . . . .

It was after twelve months of toil and unusual anxiety that Mr. Wright, accompanied by Mrs. Wright and his eleven children, went for his summer holiday to the English Lakes, making Coniston his resting-place. There was, however, but little rest from the work to which he had devoted his life. Each morning until the day of his death he continued his correspondence with the missionaries of the Society. The Sunday succeeding his arrival at Coniston he walked to Brathay and back, a distance of sixteen miles, in order to preach for the Church Missionary Society. The next Sunday he preached also at Keswick for the same great work. This was his last Sunday upon earth. Early on the morning of Friday, August 13, whilst bathing from a boat in Coniston Lake, either from a seizure of cramp, or from the sudden shock to a system already overwrought, he was in a few minutes deprived of all physical power. He sank—he fell asleep in the deep waters of Coniston. He who believes in God will not be misled by appearances at the last, or falsely conclude such is the *end*—the untimely end—of one who lived for Christ and His Church. The life of the servant of God knows no

death. "Whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die" (John xi. 26).

It is enough to know that his hour had come—his work was done. The Master called for him; the waters heard and released him; his spirit was uncaged; God's messengers bore him hence.

> In the grey of morning,
> They bore his soul away
> Beyond the prison bars,
> Beyond the fading stars,
> To the brightness of the day,

to the rest which remaineth for the people of God; to the immediate presence of Him Whose he was, and Whom he served.

Of the sermons contained in the memorial volume of such a man we need say but little. We have read them with interest and satisfaction, and most heartily recommend them. The first sermon, "The Friendship of God" (Job xxii. 21), gives the title to the volume; like the rest, it is clear and faithful, the meditation of a holy, happy, heavenly mind. One other discourse we may mention, "Go Forward," preached to the boys of Marlborough School. Would to God the boys of our great schools oftener listened to such words!

The Revised Version of the first three Gospels considered in its bearings upon the Record of our Lord's words and of incidents on His Life. By F. C. Cook, M.A. Pp. 250. Murray.

WE have read this book with interest. Its criticisms are of the highest value, as might be expected in such a work by such a theologian.

In his "preliminary considerations" Canon Cook refers to Dr. Scrivener's position, in regard to what Mr. McClellan termed the Egyptian bondage. Dr. Scrivener has hitherto been recognized, both in England and on the Continent, as the leading representative of English critical scholarship; and he attaches due weight to the oldest MSS., assigning the first place to B; but he invariably maintains the claims of the earliest Fathers and versions, and allows very considerable weight to the mass of cursives when they support a majority of uncials, especially when, as is frequently the case, those which generally agree with B or ℵ present a different reading. Canon Cook remarks on the fact, which is now admitted, that Dr. Scrivener maintains the chief, if not all the positions which he has long and consistently defended. He did not acquiesce in the decisions of his colleagues in the Committee of Revisers. He certainly cannot give to B the authority which Dr. Hort, in his "Introduction," has claimed for it. On these points, however, we shall soon be well informed. A new edition of Dr. Scrivener's "Introduction," we are glad to hear, is about to be published.

In defining his own position, Canon Cook says:—

> . . . . this I maintain, and hold to be an indisputable position, that when the earliest Fathers, up to the end of the third century, cite passages and texts which, in their judgment, and in the estimation of their contemporaries, whether orthodox or not, have important bearings upon the teaching or the integrity of Holy Scripture, their authority outweighs, in some cases infinitely outweighs, the adverse testimony of the MSS.—none earlier than the middle of the fourth century—on which modern critics rely for their most serious innovations.
>
> I will here give but one instance. It is of the utmost importance, both as

regards the teaching of Scripture and the evidence for its central fact, and also as regards the principles of bibilical criticism. I refer to the close of St. Mark's Gospel.[1] For its genuineness we have the express and most decisive testimony of Irenæus (see p. 38), the highest authority on such a question, not to speak of Justin Martyr[2] and other early Fathers, the testimony, in other words, of Christendom in its earliest representatives, supported by every ancient Version, even those in which this Gospel is most incompletely preserved, and, with three exceptions, by the absolute totality of MSS., uncial and cursive. Against it the margin tells us that the passage is omitted by the two oldest MSS., a statement which ought to have been modified by the fact that ONE only (ℵ) obliterates all traces of its existence, while the other, B, that which the Revisers hold to be by far the more trustworthy, leaves a blank, contrary to its invariable use—a circumstance which proves beyond all question the existence of such a close in the original document.

The eminent author's observations on the value of ℵ and B are extremely valuable; the chapter, interesting all through, has several new points of importance. It is too often overlooked that these manuscripts are admitted to have been written at a time when the Arian heresy preponderated, and when the great critical scholar of the Church was deeply affected by that heresy.

We thoroughly agree with Canon Cook's remark upon the punctuation of Rom. ix. 5 in the Greek text of Westcott and Hort, and the marginal note of R. V. The note of Dr. Gifford, in the *Speaker's Commentary* is indeed "admirable." "I should have scarcely thought it credible," says the Canon, "in face of the unanswered and unanswerable arguments there urged, that English divines would venture to have given their sanction to one of the most pernicious and indefensible innovations of rationalistic criticism."

Canon Cook quotes the CHURCHMAN, together with the *Guardian*, and the *Church Quarterly*, as testifying to the Revisers' freedom from doctrinal prepossession, and he then quotes an assertion from the Unitarian reviser, Dr. Vance Smith, ("Revised Texts and Margins," p. 45) which certainly calls for some notice at the hands of both Churchmen and Nonconformists. We agree with the distinguished critic as regards one unsatisfactory statement in Canon Kennedy's "Ely Lectures," recently reviewed in the CHURCHMAN. The Church of England maintains that the "decrees of Nicæa and Constantinople" may be proved by most certain warrant of Holy Writ.

Reminiscences, chiefly of Oriel College and the Oxford Movement. By the Rev. T. MOZLEY, M.A. Two vols. Longmans, Green & Co.

OF these volumes we had intended to give a rather lengthy review, particularly with reference to Oxford; but, owing to circumstances which, upon consideration, we cannot regret, our notice must be brief.

The volumes contain many amusing anecdotes. We quote the following as to the contrast between S. and H. Wilberforce (vol. i., p. 124):—

Many years after that period, when Henry had gone over to Rome, the two brothers, Samuel and Henry, gave a singular illustration of their respective

---

[1] For a fuller account of the evidence, and of Dr. Hort's defence of the mutilation, see further on, p. 120 seq. [This note, of course, is Canon Cook's. But it may here be remarked that the Canon's argument as to the mutilation is in our judgment unanswerable.—Ed. CHURCHMAN.]

[2] Westcott and Hort put a (?) before Justin Martyr, and Dr. Hort attempts to show that his testimony is doubtful. It could not well be clearer.

shares in the wisdom of the world. They made a trip to Paris. Immediately after they had left their hotel to return home, there came an invitation to the Tuileries. It was telegraphed down the line, and brought them back to Paris, when they spent an evening at the Tuileries, and had a long talk with the Emperor. The Archbishop of Amiens was there, and engaged them to a reception at his palace, offering them beds. It was a very grand affair; a splendid suite of rooms, brilliantly lighted, and all the good people of Amiens. The bedchambers and the beds were magnificent. Putting things together, and possibly remembering *Timeo Danaos*, the Anglican Bishop came to the conclusion that his bed had probably not been slept in for some time or aired either. So he stretched himself down upon the coverlid in full canonicals, had a good night, and was all the better for it. Henry could not think it possible a Roman archbishop would do him a mischief, and fearlessly, or at least hopefully, entered between the sheets. He caught a very bad cold, and was ill for some time after.

Mr. Mozley writes further (p. 126):—

Henry Wilberforce occasionally went to public meetings for which he had received the usual circular invitation, and was frequently late. He was sure that, had he been in time, he would have been asked to take part in the proceedings, and as he was never without something to say, he was sorry to find himself in a crowd of listeners, perhaps disappointed listeners. He noticed, however, that his brother Samuel, though quite as liable to be behind time as himself, nevertheless was always on the platform, and always a speaker. How could this be? Samuel explained it straight. He was perfectly sure that he had something to say, that the people would be glad to hear it, and that it would be good for them. He was also quite certain of having some acquaintance on the platform. So immediately on entering the room he scanned the platform, caught somebody's eye, kept his own eye steadily fixed upon his acquaintance, and began a slow movement in advance, never remitted an instant till he found himself on the platform. The people, finding their toes in danger, looked round, and seeing somebody looking hard and pressing onwards, always made way for him. By-and-by there would be a voice from the platform, "Please allow Mr. Wilberforce to come this way," or "Please make way for Mr. Wilberforce." Such a movement of course requires great confidence, not to say self-appreciation, but anybody who is honestly and seriously resolved to do good must sometimes put a little force on circumstances.

Mr. Mozley's style, from a purely literary critic, deserves unstinted praise; and his work, as a whole, is eminently readable. Nearly all readers, probably, of the type worldly and cultured, will enjoy the book as bright and clever. But thoughtful and unprejudiced readers who desire to understand the springs and the bearings of the Oxford movement, will obtain but little aid from Mr. Mozley's pages; and those who set the highest value on spiritual-mindedness (we expressly use this term), will find in Mr. Mozley's witty, *quasi* H. Walpole narratives, much that they dislike.

The work is open to four objections. First, the reminiscences are not always reliable; from forgetfulness or personal feeling, in matters of fact, the author has sometimes seriously blundered. Second, the book, with its spicy stories and personal remarks, is an innovation on the recognized proprieties of biography and autobiography. Third, his account of the state of religion in the country fifty years ago is not only, historically speaking, inaccurate and incomplete, but it is warped by prejudice. Fourth, his criticism of the Church is carping and unjust, while of his references to Romanism many merit sharp rebuke at the hands of her dutiful and loyal sons.

That for making these objections, "Evangelical" narrowness, or party spirit, ought not to be blamed, we might easily show by quotations from the *Quarterly Review*, the *John Bull*, the *Guardian*, as well as from

letters in the *Times*,[1] *Spectator*, and the *Guardian*. But we will make only brief quotations.

(1.) To say nothing of unimportant inaccuracies, we may quote from the *Guardian* two or three sentences as to gossipy stories :—

> Many of [Mr. Mozley's] anecdotes are obviously only the reflections of the current talk of the day. . . . . They are gossip and nothing more. And we are the more bound to bear this in mind, since Mr. Mozley himself truly describes a good deal of his writing, when he says, "Perhaps I shall even be found to come under the old description of those that remember the evil more easily than the good." It is not a pleasant charge to lie under. But he takes it lightly. "Be it so," is all he has to say.

(2). The *Quarterly* remarks that the book is full of stories which may be well repeated to intimate friends in the discreet confidence of conversation, but which should not be made public property during the lifetime of the persons concerned. The *Guardian* says :—

> There are many things which a wise or considerate or kindly man will abstain from saying even if he knows them to be true. Cardinal Newman, to whom Mr. Mozley sent the titles of his chapters before they were published, reminded him "that even where the persons named in my headings were no longer here, there were survivors and friends whose feelings had to be respected." It was a reminder to which Mr. Mozley has paid little heed. He is perfectly reckless in this respect, telling his stories and pronouncing his sentences without the smallest regard to the reputations he may injure or the feelings he may lacerate, and often—as we have seen—without taking much trouble to find out whether his stories are true or false.

(3). The *Quarterly*, having quoted Mr. Mozley's impressions of the system inculcated by Evangelical preachers, forcibly remarks :—

> Considering that Newman, as we have seen, was for years, and almost up to this very time, closely allied with the Evangelicals, it is difficult to believe that this can be anything like an adequate account of them.

(4). The *Quarterly* speaks of the "skilful special pleading" in Mr. Mozley's concluding pages. The *Guardian*, speaking of Mr. Mozley as an editor and newspaper writer, says :—

> But the work lasted only two years, from 1841 to 1843. The crisis was approaching, and Mr. Mozley himself, like the rest of his companions as well as his great leader, had to choose between England and Rome. As far as we can see, he chose neither. He sketches out a most *bizarre* theology, which seems to consist in showing that there is a good deal to be said for the Roman system—though he cannot accept it—and heaping a good deal of ridicule upon the English Church—though he does not see his way to leaving it. But this frame of mind was evidently incompatible with the editorship of the "British Critic." He threw it up, and the publication itself came to an end, to be replaced later on by the "Christian Remembrancer." But it is not a little surprising to find him, apparently without a moment's interval, engaging in another undertaking[2] which most persons would think not very congenial to an anxious and unsettled inquirer. This is his own account of it :—
>
> "At the same time there came to me, through my brother James and another

---

[1] A story about the late Sir James Stephen has been flatly contradicted by the distinguished son of that distinguished man, on the authority of Mr. Gladstone and Lord Blachford (then Sir F. Rogers). "The story about your father and myself," wrote Lord Blachford to the present judge, "is absolutely imaginary and impossible." The biographer of Dean Hook has refuted an attack upon the Dean ; Miss Whately has written concerning the Archbishop.

[2] As such a periodical as the *Quarterly* has stated it (to say nothing of lesser lights), there can be no harm in mentioning—to many of our readers certainly no secret—that Mr. Mozley became a contributor to the *Times*.

"member of our Oriel circle, the offer of employment in a quarter then supposed "to be friendly, not only to Newman, but to the movement of which he was "now held to be the real leader. After a good deal of conversation in the "Temple Gardens, in which I declared myself very strongly, for specified "reasons, against the Corn Laws and Protection generally, I agreed. This act "was necessarily a departure, as far as co-operation was concerned, and from "that time there could not be confidential correspondence on the heart of "affairs. But I had frequent letters from Newman, and occasional reminders "that what I did must be for heaven as well as for earth, and would have to "be so judged."

Those who fancy they can detect Mr. Mozley's share in the work which he thus describes, will be apt to think that Newman's reminders were much needed and much neglected. There may be some excuse for scoffing at a Church which you are preparing to leave: there can be none for habitually ridiculing, depreciating, and misrepresenting one in which you elect to stay.

Mr. Mozley, it may here be stated, was one of Newman's earliest pupils, and married his sister.

On the fourth objection, stated above, we might easily enlarge. A very friendly Reviewer in *Blackwood* remarks that Mr. Mozley is "somewhat hard upon the Evangelicals" of fifty years ago; and he adds that "whatever impressive preaching there was at that time in the Church was almost exclusively confined to the Evangelical School." Mr. Mozley's great brother-in-law, says *Blackwood*, was "a man of a gentler spirit and of wider sympathies";[1] and, as a matter of fact, until he drew near the Rubicon, Mr. Newman, a contributor to the *Record*, was most friendly to Evangelicals. Mr. Mozley tells his readers that he is no theologian. The information is needless. A clergyman of his standing and ability who can assert that "the Evangelical theory" is—"*You were to be quite sure . . . . that you had received a special revelation that Jesus Christ died for you in particular*," may be a very clever leading-article writer, but—charitably allowing that he makes such a statement in good faith—we cannot acquit him of crass, inexcusable ignorance. Again, his picture of the Evangelical clergy of fifty years ago, as neglecting their parishes and travelling about to this or that meeting, is simply absurd. In 1821 Henry Venn, at St. Dunstan's, Fleet Street, spared no pains in regard to pastoral work; the larger portion of his working hours was spent in courts and alleys; and when he went to Drypool, he established a system of district visiting. But, indeed, the question is not worth arguing.

Short Notices.

Henry and Margaret Jane Shepheard. Memorials of a Father and Mother. By their Son, Clement Carus-Wilson Shepheard-Walwyn, M.A. Pp. 340. Elliot Stock. 1882.

A notice of this excellent biography has by an inadvertence been delayed. We very gladly recommend a book so full of interesting devotional matter.

[1] Mr. Mozley's *animus* may be seen from a single sentence (vol. ii., p. 312): "For many years of my life," he writes, "my chief religious conclusions had been of a negative character, one continual revolt against the hollowness, flimsiness, and stupidity of 'Evangelical' teaching."