

# *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/robbadshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

leave no ground of offence in our use of the Book of Common Prayer, which is redolent with the Name of the One Mediator, by Whom we all can approach directly and personally, and yet in happy communion, to the Father.

Yours faithfully,  
C. A. HULBERT.

Almondbury Vicarage, April 21, 1884.

P.S.—By your courtesy permitted a proof of my letter, I may add, as a reference has been made in it to Mr. Aitken, that in his Article in the May CHURCHMAN appear expressions with which I do not agree, though there is much useful suggestion.

May 14.



## Reviews.



*Plain Reasons against Joining the Church of Rome.* By R. F. LITTLEDALE, LL.D., D.C.L. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. *The One Offering.* By M. F. SADLER, Prebendary of Wells. London: Bell and Sons.

*The Church Quarterly Review*, No. 26. January, 1882.

*The Sacrificial Aspect of the Holy Eucharist: an Eirenicon.* By the Rev. E. F. WILLIS. Parker and Co.

So much for the matter of our controversy with Rome.

It must not, however, be supposed that, because we have insisted on keeping that controversy on its true lines, we are therefore altogether insensible to the unsound and dangerous tendencies of certain Sacrificial teachings which are not at all necessarily connected with the doctrine of the Mass, and which seem to have a certain fascination for many minds. We should be sorry to seem to be apologists for all that has been written by such men as Hickes and Johnson and Brett<sup>1</sup> in times past, and still less, perhaps, for much that finds currency among us in our own days.

Mr. Sadler has done good service for the Church of England in some able arguments against Romish doctrines in an article which appeared some years since in *The Church and the Age*.

Therefore we regret the more to find that, especially in his "One Offering," he has lent his name to certain teachings, or unhappy approximations to teachings, against which we feel bound to utter a few words

<sup>1</sup> These men were unquestionably innovators in their teaching as to the Eucharistic Sacrifice. And that their doctrine had little support in the Liturgy of the Church of England was felt strongly by Brett, who declared, "The Church of England has wilfully and designedly omitted to make the oblation of the sacramental Body and Blood of Christ; and therefore, according to what Mr. Johnson says, she is without excuse in this matter. . . . If it be but a great defect, it ought to be corrected; and if it be an *essential* one, it is of *fatal consequence*. And surely it is *essential*, if it be what our Saviour did, and commanded us to do." (Brett's "Collection of Ancient Liturgies." Diss., pp. 219-221. Edit. 1838.) Hickes also attributes our forgetting the true doctrine of the Lord's Supper to "the alterations that were made in the office, or order of administering the Lord's Supper in the first Liturgy of the Church of England." (Treatises, vol. i. p. 126, A. C. L.)

of earnest warning. Let our cautions take the form of a few questions submitted to the careful and attentive consideration of those who would earnestly seek the truth in this matter of Eucharistic Sacrifice.

And the first question we will ask is this: Is the continual real sacrificial offering of Christ in heaven consistent with the teaching of Holy Scripture? We cannot but express surprise and regret that Mr. Sadler, while of course regarding the *sufferings* of Christ as past, uses language which conveys the impression of His *death* being, in some sort, a living, abiding, continuous thing. That the sacrifice of the death of Christ is in its effect a *juge sacrificium*<sup>1</sup> is what, we trust, none of us ever question. That our Lord Jesus Christ may be most truly said to appear now in the presence of God for us in virtue of that blood of the everlasting covenant, in which, or through which, He rose from the dead (Heb. xiii. 20); and that as our advocate and intercessor He may be most truly said to plead the merits of that blood for us, and, in some sense, to sprinkle with that blood of cleansing all our approaches to the throne of grace—all this, we trust, we shall not be supposed to doubt. But it seems clearly to be something much more than this, and something quite distinct from this, that Mr. Sadler contends for in such expressions as these, “The death of Christ, though it was actually endured in its pain and horror at one past moment in the world’s history, is yet set forth in Scripture under images which seem to invest it with the attribute of eternity” (p. 79); “that Almighty pleading of His death which He Himself is carrying on now in heaven under a form which makes the very death present” (p. 81); and again, “If the death of the Jewish victim existed, and was included under the presentation of its blood, much more does the death of the All-atoning Victim exist in the presentation now going on on the throne of God” (p. 91); again, “His very death lives and pleads” (p. 44).<sup>2</sup>

Now the teaching which thus insists on the sacrificial death of Christ, as possessing in itself a mysterious continuity of being, has become very popular among us of late years. And it claims to rest on a scriptural

<sup>1</sup> “St. Paul says that Christ ‘has offered one sacrifice for ever,’ that is, one sacrifice available for ever—as the ancient expositors interpret the word. He does not say that He offered one perpetual sacrifice. A past act cannot be perpetual. But Christ HAS offered a sacrifice available in perpetuity.” (Wordsworth on Heb. x. 12. The whole of this note is very valuable.)

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Pusey had said, “That sacrifice, once made, lives on in heaven.” (“Eirenicon,” p. 27.)

The late Bishop Philpotts, in a letter published by Archdeacon Freeman (“Rites and Ritual,” p. 101), speaks of “the Lord’s death” as “one continuous fact, which lasts and will last till He comes and lays down His Mediatorial Kingdom,” and of the Eucharist as “A Sacrament of that continuous act of our Lord’s suffering once for us on the Cross.” Such language, if intelligible, appears to us to be astounding. To declare of a death once died [ἀπέθανεν ἵψαπα], Rom. vi. 10 that it is lasting through time, is surely a contradiction in terms.

There is a very wide difference indeed between attributing to a sacrament the power to make an act which is finished in the past, in such sort continuous in the present and the future, that it must cease to belong in its perfection to the past alone—and regarding a sacrament as having for its divinely appointed office to be in such sort an effectual ἀνάμνησις, that we (in the language of ancient Liturgies) μεμνημένοι . . . τοῦ σωτῆροῦ σταυροῦ (see Neale’s “Tetralogia,” pp. 136, 137) may be (in the words of Bishop Andrewes) “carried back to Christ as He was at the very instant, and in the very act of His offering” (“Sermons,” vol. ii. pp. 301, 302, A. C. L.), in the power of that faith to which *things past* are *present*; as was well said by Rupertus Tuitiensis—“ut fidei, cui præsentia sunt omnia præterita, ejus passio memoriter repræsentetur.” (“De Trin. In Gen.,” lib. vi. cap. xxxii. Op. ed. Migne, tom. i. c. 431.)

foundation. It is ever ready to set before us the vision of St. John the Divine—the heavenly vision of “a Lamb as it had been slain,” and to plead the evidence of this vision as clearly attesting the abiding sacrificial condition of Christ in heaven. We are fully persuaded that this argument is an entire misconception of a divine symbolism—the symbolic representation of the truth conveyed in the words which were spoken to St. John in the heavenly vision, “I am He that liveth, and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore. Amen. And have the keys of death and of hell.” The Lamb is not seen on an altar, nor lying as slain. But It is standing in life—standing on a throne, with the marks and wounds that tell how once It had died. So It receives the tribute of praise, because “Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood.”<sup>1</sup> But let it suffice to appeal on this point to the Commentary of Bishop Wordsworth, to whom the Church of England owes a debt of gratitude for other similarly faithful testimonies to the same truth : “He is represented as having been slain, and as *standing* . . . as the ancient expositors rightly interpret the passage, ‘The Lamb *stands*.’ He does not *lie*, as a lamb which is *slain* does. He *stands*, because He is *risen*, and *dieth no more*. . . . This is also manifest from the use of the perfect tense here, *ἴσθαι γείνεσθαι*, which declares that the Lamb *has been* once immolated . . . and that He is not now continually being sacrificed. . . . This is also further intimated by the conjunction *ὡς*, *as*. St. John does not say that he saw a Lamb *being sacrificed*, but that he saw a Lamb *standing*, *as if it had* been sacrificed, that is, bearing marks of its sacrificial immolation that was *past*; as Christ showed the prints of the nails, and the mark of the spear in His side to His disciples. Consequently, the song of the heavenly host is not, ‘Worthy is the Lamb that is *being slain*,’ but ‘Worthy is the Lamb that *hath been slain*,’ and ‘Worthy art Thou to receive the Book, for Thou *wast slain*, and didst redeem us by Thy blood.’ Therefore . . . it is allowed by the best Romish expositors that *this* passage, literally and grammatically interpreted, is not to be expounded in that sense [of a continual sacrifice] ‘although the Holy Spirit may seem here to allude to it.’ See A. Lapide here.” (On Rev. v. 5, 6.)<sup>2</sup>

To suppose that an eternal Priesthood involves the idea of an eternal offering of an eternal sacrifice in a state of eternal death, is not only to do violence to our conceptions of the very meaning of death as once endured by the Saviour of the world ; it is also to fall altogether short of the apprehension of the unique character of that Divine Priesthood, which, however it might be foreshadowed by a continuous teaching on earth of perpetual offerings and unceasing sacrifices, was itself to be a Priesthood of abiding mediation<sup>3</sup> in virtue of one all-sufficient sacrifice, once only offered and accepted for the sins of the world. It is excellently said in our Homily “Of the Misery of Man” (a Homily attributed to the pen of Bishop Bonner<sup>4</sup>) : “He is that high and everlasting Priest, which hath offered Himself once for all upon the altar of the Cross, and with that one oblation hath made perfect for evermore them that are sanctified.” (P. 22. Edit. Griffiths, Oxford, 1859.) How can any conception of a

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Wordsworth observes, “The original has the aorist *ἴσθαι γείνεσθαι*—*ἴγραστας*, Thou wast slain, and, by being slain, Thou didst purchase or redeem men by Thy blood ; that is, Thou didst effect this blessed work at a *special time*, by a *special act*, namely, by Thy *death*, suffered *once for all*, on the Cross.” (On Rev. v. 9.)

<sup>2</sup> See also Vogan, “True Doctrine of Eucharist,” p. 467.

<sup>3</sup> Bishop Hall says, “It doth not more belong to the priesthood of Christ, that He offered Himself once for us, a spotless sacrifice, upon the altar of the Cross, than that He daily offers to His Father the incense of our prayers, on the altar of heaven.” (Works, vol. ix. p. 67, edit. 1808.)

<sup>4</sup> See Hook’s “Lives of Archbishops,” vol. ii. (new series) p. 212.

continuous death of Christ be made to harmonize with the Apostle's teaching, "In that He died He died unto sin once (*ἰφάνταξ*), but in that He liveth, He liveth unto God"? How can the idea of a sacrificial offering and death, continuously abiding in any sense as apart from His sufferings, stand beside the language which declares, "Nor yet that He should offer Himself often . . . for then must He often have suffered since the foundation of the world"? How can any continuousness of strictly sacrificial offering at all consist with the declaration, "As it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment, so Christ was once offered (*ἄπαξ προσενέχθεις*) to bear the sins of many"?<sup>1</sup>

No ingenuity of man can ever succeed in so evacuating the force of the Apostle's declaration, as to make it possible for this sacrifice to be afterwards really and sacrificially offered, either by iteration or by continuation.

Herbert Thorndike has well said that it (the act of sacrificing Christ) "can be no more repeated" (and we may add can be no more *continued*) "than the present time can become the present time another time."<sup>2</sup>

According to the teaching of Holy Scripture, Christ is now indeed a Priest, yea, a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec. But the word of the oath which declares His Eternal Priesthood follows close upon the word which says to Him, "Sit Thou on My right hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool." And now in heaven He sits—sits,

<sup>1</sup> As to the argument from the use of the word *προσφέρει*, in Heb. ix. 7, see Marriott's "Correspondence with Canon Carter," part i. letter i., and Vogan's "True Doctrine of Eucharist," p. 470. It is very observable how, in the application of the teaching of the type to the work of the Antitype, there is an entire omission of all language that has a sacrificial sound when reference is made to the work of the Great High Priest in the true Holy of Holies. Nowhere, we believe, either in the Epistle to the Hebrews or in any other writing of the New Testament, is the present work of Christ in heaven ever spoken of in words which can fairly be said at all to convey any idea of sacrificial offering. See Rom. viii. 34; Heb. ii. 18, iv. 14, vii. 25, viii. 1, ix. 24, x. 21. On 1 John ii. 2, see Bishop Wordsworth's Commentary. It is also observable how, with the idea of Christ's Priesthood before him, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews continually interchanges the term "Priest" with other terms, which would naturally lead our thoughts away from such a notion. See ii. 10, viii. 6, v. 9, vi. 19, vii. 22.

In Heb. viii. 3, our version "Wherefore it is of necessity" may mislead. "*Οθεν* ἀναγκαῖον (whence a necessity) might equally admit the sense (as rendered by the Syriac) "it was necessary." And the change of tense from the present to *ὁ προσενέγκει* can scarcely have been without design. See Marriott's "Correspondence with Canon Carter," part i. p. 5. See also Owen's Works, vol. xxiii. pp. 28, 29 (Edinburgh, 1862). To understand the sacred writer's words of a present sacrificial offering (unless of spiritual sacrifices, which are not here in view) seems impossible (though sound writers have sometimes maintained it). See vii. 27, and compare ix. 9 and 11, and especially x. 18 with xiii. 20. See also Morton "On Eucharist," p. 421.

As to the argument from ix. 23, *κρείττοντι θυσίαις*, it may suffice to answer in the words of Aquinas, "Id est meliori sanguine. Ob: Illa erat una hostia. Resp. . . . Pluribus hostiis veteris Legis figurabatur." So other Romish expositors. See Morton "On Eucharist," p. 414. Mr. Willis explains it as a Hebraism, "what is called in modern grammars, *pluralis excellentia* or *pluralis majestaticus*." Mr. Willis illustrates by several examples from the Hebrew, and adds, "I take it, then, that by a figure of speech familiar to himself and his hearers, the author speaks of the majestic Sacrifice of Christ in all its manifold aspects and efficacy, in the plural, though meaning the one true Sacrifice offered on the Cross, and perpetually pleaded in heaven." ("Sacrificial Aspect of the Holy Eucharist," pp. 47, 48.)

<sup>2</sup> Works, vol. v. p. 547, A. C. L.

like Melchizedec, King as well as Priest. He is a Priest sitting on His throne<sup>1</sup> (Zech. vi. 13), not standing at His altar.

Then let us pass on to ask another question—Is this doctrine of a continual real sacrificial offering of Christ in heaven, supported by the teaching of Christian antiquity?

It is a wide subject, and one to which it is impossible to do justice in such an article as this. But we need feel no hesitation in declaring that the testimony of the Fathers is clearly and decidedly against it. In the midst of all their abounding sacrificial language there are voices which unmistakably utter the condemnation of such teaching.

Take for example St. Chrysostom, in whose writings sacrificial language is well-known to abound, and more than abound. In dealing with the subject of Christ's mediatorial work in heaven, his teaching may sometimes, indeed, be open to the charge of assigning too little to His offices above—of seeming to convey the idea of Christ's Priesthood ceasing with His session<sup>2</sup> at God's right hand. In this respect his language may be said to be incautious.<sup>3</sup> But his very incaution serves to make it more abundantly evident how entirely alien from his thoughts and from his teaching is anything like the notion of His ever offering an eternal sacrifice of Himself—how completely his doctrine excludes anything like such a conception of a continual oblation of His death. It is no wonder that words so distinctly and directly to the purpose have been often quoted before. They may well be quoted again: *Μὴ τοίνυν ἀντὸν ιερείᾳ ἀκούστας, ἀεὶ ιεράσθαι νόμιζε. ἄπαξ γάρ ιεράσατο, καὶ λοιπὸν ἐκάθισεν*<sup>4</sup> These words are spoken with direct reference to the one perfect Sacrifice once offered, *τῆς θυσίας τὸ μεγαλεῖον· οὐκ ἡρκεστε μία οὐσία, καὶ ἄπαξ προσενεχθείσα, τοσούτον ὅσον αἱ πᾶσαι οὐκ ἴσχυσαν.*<sup>5</sup> Could words

<sup>1</sup> See Boulbee's "Doctrine of the Lord's Supper," p. 11.

<sup>2</sup> As if the Priesthood must cease with the Sacrifice. So some Romanists have argued that the enduring of the Priesthood implies the continuance of the Mass Sacrifice. "But," says Brevint, "in the judgment of others, this proof is not only weak, but also false. For, says Vasques, 'Christ hath no need of this continuing Sacrifice; for He shall be Priest still, even after the end of the world, when there shall be no such Sacrifice.'" ("Depth and Mystery," p. 181.) Canon Carter has also argued, "If a Priest, He must, as St. Paul says, have something to offer." ("Correspondence with Marriott," p. 14.) To this Mr. Marriott has replied, "That this argument may have any force, you must assume that when St. Paul says a Priest 'must have somewhat to offer,' he means that none can be a Priest *unless he always, and at all times, have somewhat to offer*—that he ceases to be a Priest the moment he ceases to offer. But you have only to state this in words to see its absurdity." (P. 56.)

In the "Instruction in the Christian Faith according to the Orthodox Armenian Church of St. Gregory the Illuminator," there is the following question and answer—"Q. Did He indeed fulfil the office of Priest? A. Yes; because having offered Himself in Sacrifice, He was appointed Intercessor on our behalf, and Mediator of reconciliation with the Father." (Malan's Translation, p. 16.)

<sup>3</sup> The correction of the misunderstanding to which it might lead will be found in Hom. xiv. p. 140.

<sup>4</sup> In Ep. Heb., cap. vii., Hom. xiii. tom xii. p. 134. Edit. Montfaucon, 1735.

<sup>5</sup> How strangely the language of St. Chrysostom contrasts with such language as the following: "This once entering in the holy place . . . there to exercise the functions of His Eternal High Priesthood . . . does not in any way mar the unity, or impair the perfection, of His Sacrifice on the Cross; on the contrary, it is *part* of that one Sacrifice, it is a *continuation* of that Sacrifice, it is one and the same with it. . . . Thus the Christian Sacrifice is at once permanent and single. . . . It is precisely in the *multiplicity* of the *oblation*, whereby the one ever-living Victim is offered, and the Sacrifice of the Cross constantly applied anew in its effects to the whole body and its individual members, that the perfection and indissoluble power of that Sacrifice reveals itself." (Willis's "Sacrificial Aspect of the Holy Eucharist," pp. 30, 31, 2nd edit.)

express a stronger contradiction of an abiding offering of an abiding sacrifice?

Not less distinct (notwithstanding incautious expressions in Hom. xvii.) is the witness of the same writer to the truth that the sacrificial offering of Christ is to be identified with His sufferings on the Cross: ἐπὲι ἔδει αὐτὸν, φησι, καὶ πολλάς ἔδει θυσίας προσενεγκεῖν πολλάκις ἔδει σταυρωθῆναι. (In Ep. Heb., cap. ix., Hom. xvii. tom. xii. p. 165, edit. Montfaucon.)

And equally distinct is his recognition of the truth that the efficacy and sufficiency of the one Sacrifice in the past leaves no room for another (and by parity of reasoning we may surely add, for a continuation of the same) in the future. Τὴν διαθήκην διὰ τῆς θυσίας ἔδωκεν. Εἰ τοίνυν ἀφῆκε τὰς ἀμαρτίας διὰ τῆς μᾶς θυσίας, οὐκέτι χρέα δεντρίας. ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ. (In Ep. Heb., cap. x., Hom. xviii. tom. xii. p. 175, edit. Montfaucon.) Again: ἀπαξ προσηνέχθη, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἀεὶ ἥρκεσε. (Ibid. Hom. xvii. p. 168).

Certainly in the mind of St. Chrysostom the real sacrificial offering of Christ was a thing of the past, and in nowise of the present. The idea of a continuous sacrificial offering of Himself as in a state of death in heaven must have been a thing altogether foreign to his conceptions.

We proceed then to ask—Is the perpetual real sacrificial offering of Christ *upon earth* consistent with the teaching of Holy Scripture?

The affirmative argument has commonly been made to rest very much on the analogy with that supposed continuous sacrificial offering of Christ in heaven. And so far, in the fall of that must this fall also.

But it is surely strange that the negative of this question has not been clearly seen to be contained in the statements, “By one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified” (Heb. x. 14), “Where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin” (x. 18).

Here is the assurance of the all-sufficiency not only of the one Sacrifice, but of the *one offering*, and a declaration of the consequent exclusion not only of any other sacrifice, but of any future (whether iterated or perpetual) offering of sacrifice for sin.<sup>1</sup>

Is, then, this perpetual real sacrificial offering of Christ upon earth supported by the teaching of Christian antiquity? It must be acknowledged, indeed, that there is in the writings of the Fathers and in the ancient Liturgies much which at first sight, and to a superficial view, may seem to warrant this teaching.

But it will be found on examination that their language goes too far a great deal to be understood any otherwise than as the language of mystical representation. What is *passive*, indeed, in their sacrifice is real for the communion of the faithful in the Crucified Body and Blood of their

<sup>1</sup> “The force of our Apostle’s inference, and the very pith of his discourse . . . doth more punctually refute the doctrine of the Romish Mass than it did the contradicting Jews.” (Jackson’s Works, vol. ix. p. 530.)

“The Apostle could not prove the legal sacrifices to have been imperfect for this reason, that they were often offered, unless this universal were true, and taken by him for granted, ‘that no sacrifices or sacrifice, of what kind soever, which is often offered, can be perfect, or sufficient to take away sins.’ . . . The very root and ground of this distinction [as to the manner of offering], if you examine it by our Apostle’s argument, includes a confession or acknowledgment of the *crime* or *heresy* which we object unto them, to wit, that the bloody Sacrifice of the Son of God is not by their doctrine of infinite value, nor of force and virtue everlasting, but infinite only *secundum quid*; i.e., infinite in the nature of a bloody Sacrifice, not so simply infinite as to exclude all other sacrifice or offering for sin.” (Ibid., pp. 584, 585.) “If . . . the value of the Sacrifice be truly infinite . . . the often offering of the Sacrifice, after what manner soever, is superfluous and blasphemous.” (Ibid., p. 592.)

Lord ; but what is *active*<sup>1</sup> is only mystical, figurative, and commemorative.

When we are with them in the mysteries we have before us not only the offering, but the Sacrifice ; and not only the Sacrifice, but the very death of Christ, and in that death the very suffering and slaying and blood-shedding of the Lamb of God. The evidence of this is well-known and abundant. " *Passio Domini*," says Cyprian, " *est sacrificium quod offerimus.*"<sup>2</sup> But the passion of Christ, as all acknowledge, can be in the Eucharist only by representation.

In their earnest desire to make the ordained memorial efficacious in calling up and making present to Faith's view the reality of the things represented—they revel in the use of language abounding in excess of sacrificial terms. Yet, when occasion requires an explanation they are not slow to make us understand that all is to be understood in propriety of speech, of what (except to the believer's faith) is absent, not what is present, or (in the language of our Homily) of a memory, not a sacrifice.

<sup>1</sup> It will be said, no doubt, that Waterland's distinction of sacrifices as *active* and *passive* is novel. The terms, indeed, are new ; but those who have studied the language of the Fathers will not, we think, hastily say the same of the ideas they are intended to convey.

And if the distinction is real, it is important. Very much perplexity and confusion of thought appears to have arisen from this assumption—that, if in the Eucharist a Sacrifice is given to us for the food of our souls, then in the Eucharist that Sacrifice must first have been there to be offered. Whereas, in truth, the presence to faith of the Sacrifice for food implies the notion of a Sacrifice *only passively, not actively* considered.

Out of this assumption seem to have arisen the strange theories of Christ's sacrificing Himself in His Last Supper. Whereas, in truth, all the language of the institution of the Eucharist, which can be said to be really and clearly sacrificial, will be found to point to a Sacrifice *not actively but passively* considered.

" Our Lord's Sacrifice, *actively considered*," says Waterland, " as a proper act of sacrificing, was performed once for all, was one transient act ; but the subject-matter of it, viz. Christ Himself, and the virtue of that Sacrifice, are *permanent* things, to be for ever commemorated, exhibited, participated. . . . Therefore Christ's Sacrifice is our Sacrifice, but in the *passive* sense, for us to partake of, not to give to God." (Works, vol. v. p. 235.)

Waterland quotes from the moderate Roman Catholic, Barnes : " *Capiendo sacrificium passive, pro sacrificato, noviter applicato nobis, asseritur rite sacrificium missæ.*" (P. 236.)

<sup>2</sup> *Quia passionis ejus mentionem in Sacrificiis omnibus facimus (passio est enim Domini Sacrificium quod offerimus) nihil aliud quam quod ille fecit facere debemus.*" (Cyprian, Epist. lxiii. Op. c. 231, edit. Baluzius, 1728.)

This, we believe, is the earliest use of such language as this. On this language see Waterland, Works, vol. iv. pp. 479, 480, 753, 758 ; vol. v. p. 129. Justin Martyr spoke of offering the bread whereby is commemorated the Passion (Trypho, c. 117), and of the bread which our Lord Jesus Christ commanded in remembrance of His Passion (*εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τοῦ πάθους οὐ ἐπαθεν*). (Trypho, c. 41.) The Liturgy of the Apostolic Constitutions prays for the sending of the Holy Spirit, *ἐπὶ τὴν θυσίαν ταντην, σὸν μάρτυρα τῶν παθημάτων τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ.* St. Cyril of Jerusalem said, *Χριστὸν ἵσφαγασμένον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀμαρτημάτων προσφέρομεν.* (Mystag., v. § 10, p. Op. 328, edit. Bened.)

Undoubtedly, as Professor Ince observes, " Irenæus, and the Church of the first three centuries, held that the bread and wine in the Eucharist were offered to God in grateful memory of His gifts to man in the food of the earth, as well as also in commemoration of the Passion of the Redeemer, and in this sense called the still unconsecrated bread and wine a Sacrifice." (Second Letter to Bramley, p. 6.) See Heurtley's " Sermons on Recent Controversy," p. 56, and Blunt's " Early Fathers," pp. 446, 447. On the sense in which Cyprian and others use the word " offer," see Waterland, vol. v. pp. 269, 270.

So Eusebius Cæs. : μημῆν ἡμῖν παραδοὺς, ἀντὶ θυσίας τῷ Θεῷ διηνεκῶς προσφίρειν. ("Demon. Evang.," lib. i. cap. x. p. 38, edit. Paris, 1628.)

So Chrysostom : προσφέρομεν μὲν, ἀλλ᾽ ἀνάμνησιν ποιούμενοι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ καὶ μία ἵστιν ἄντη, καὶ οὐ πολλά ; πῶς μία, καὶ οὐ πολλαῖ ; ἐπειδὴ ἀπαξ προστρέχθη . . . οὐκ ἀλληγ θυσίαν, καθάπερ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τότε, ἀλλὰ τὴν αυτὴν ἀεὶ ποιοῦμεν μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας. (In Ep. Heb., cap. x., Hom. xvii. tom. xii. pp. 168-9, ed. Montfaucon, 1735.)

So Theodoret : ἐᾶλον τοῖς τὰ θεῖα πεπαδεμένοις, ὃς οὐκ ἀλληγ τινὰ θυσίαν προσφέρομεν, ἀλλὰ τῆς μᾶς ἑκείνης καὶ σωτηρίου τὴν μνήμην ἐπιτελοῦμεν. (In Ep. Heb., cap. viii., tom. iii. p. 594, edit. Schulze.)

So Augustine : "Hujus sacrificii caro et sanguis ante adventum Christi per victimas similitudinum promittebatur ; in passione Christi per ipsam veritatem reddebatur ; post adscensum Christi per Sacramentum memorie celebratur." ("Contra Faustum," lib. xx. cap. xxi. Op. ed., Ben. 1688, tom. viii. c. 348.)

Surely these extracts may suffice to explain what needs to be explained in the incautious language of those who used freely sacrificial terms in speaking of the Eucharist, before the doctrine of a real sacrifice for sins there offered had come into being.

But now we must come to direct our attention more particularly to the teaching of the words used by our blessed Lord in institution of the Sacrament of His Supper. Is it, or is it not, rightly said that they contain the teaching of a continuation or renewal of the offering of the Sacrifice of Himself ?

The argument from the saying *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*<sup>1</sup> has perhaps been sufficiently

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Willis, who argues strongly in favour of the sacrificial sense of *ποιεῖτε*, expresses himself as convinced (though he does not press it as an argument) that in 1 Tim. ii. 1 *ποιεῖσθαι . . . εὐχαριστίας* should be translated not "giving of thanks be made," but "Eucharists be offered on behalf of all men." And this would seem to be a very natural inference from his view. He says, "Εὐχαριστία had no doubt already, in St. Paul's time, become the recognised name for the Holy Communion." ("Sacrificial Aspect of Holy Eucharist," p. 26.) But if St. Paul had really meant to give directions for the offering of Eucharists for all men, we should certainly have expected that St. Chrysostom and Theodoret would so have understood his words. But what does St. Chrysostom say in his Exposition?—δέησις, φησι, προσενχάς, ἐντείκεις, εὐχαριστίας δεῖ γάρ εὐχαριστεῖν τῷ Θεῷ καὶ ὑπέρ τῶν εἰς ἀλληλους γενομένων ἀγαθῶν . . . δρᾶς ὅτι οὐ μόνον διὰ τῆς εὐχῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τῆς εὐχαριστίας ἐνοὶ καὶ συγκολλᾶ ἡμᾶς . . . πᾶσα τοίνυν ἡμῖν εὐχὴ εὐχαριστίαν ἔχετω. (In 1 Ep. Tim., cap. ii., Hom. vi., tom. xi. pp. 579, 580, edit. Montfaucon, 1734.) And Theodoret says, Δέησις μὲν ἐστιν, ὑπὲρ ἀπαλλαγῆς τινῶν λυπηρῶν ἵκετια προσφερομένη, προσενχὴ δὲ, αἴτησις ἀγαθῶν. ἐπενέκτις δέ, κατηγορία τῶν ἀδικούντων . . . ηδὲ γε εὐχαριστία ὑπὲρ τῶν προυπηργίων ἀγαθῶν προσφέρεται τῷ Θεῷ. ταῦτα δὲ ποιεῖν ὑπέρ ἀπάντων ἀθρώπων παρεγγυᾷ, ἐπειδὴ καὶ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἡλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἀμαρτωλοὺς σῶσαι. (In Ep. 1 ad. Tim., cap. ii. § 1. Op. edit. Schulze, tom. iii. pp. 646, 647.)

Theophylact says : Σκόπει δὲ ὅπως καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν εἰς ἀλλους γενομένων ἀγαθῶν εὐχαριστεῖν κελευόμεθα (Com., p. 755, edit. 1636), and Eusebius : δεῖ γάρ εὐχαριστεῖν ὑπὲρ τῶν εἰς ἀλληλους γενομένων ἀγαθῶν (Com., tom. ii. p. 218, edit. Paris, 1631).

It must be allowed, we think, that these extracts afford very strong evidence against the sense of *εὐχαριστίας* which Mr. Willis advocates so decidedly.

That *ποιεῖσθαι* here might have its meaning very well conveyed (as in the Syriac) by "be offered" is what, we suppose, few would care to deny. But for this purpose it obviously need not be used in a strictly sacrificial sense. And we think Luke v. 33 and Philip. i. 4 do not favour such a sense. If it is so used here, it is, we believe, the only example of such use to be found in the New Testament. The *ποιῶ τὸ πάσχα* of Matt. xxvi. 18 (which is parallel with *τὸ πάσχα φύγω* of Luke xxii. 11) cannot certainly be understood of *sacrificing* the

disposed of. Its Syriac rendering, "Do thus,"<sup>1</sup> ought to be taken as very good evidence indeed against its being understood in the first ages of Christianity as meaning "Sacrifice this."<sup>2</sup> That the expression was clearly so understood by St. Chrysostom will hardly be maintained much longer by those who have read Professor Ince's Letters to Mr. Bramley. The Professor says: "I have now carefully reconsidered the passages in which St. Chrysostom comments upon the words of the institution of the Eucharist, and see no reason, notwithstanding what you have advanced, to alter my original opinion; and I am certainly confirmed in adherence to that opinion, by being unable to find any reference in ancient or modern divines before the seventeenth century to St. Chrysostom, as an authority in favour of the sacrificial interpretation of the words"<sup>3</sup> (p. 3). "I am concerned only with the primitive interpretation of the words of institution, *τοῦτο ποιέτε*, and I have found no reason for questioning the position maintained alike by Jewel, the great Protestant champion of the Church of England, and by Estius, the eminent Roman Catholic commentator, that no ancient Father took *ποιέτε* to mean 'sacrifice,' or 'offer'". . . . The sacrificial interpretation, so far as I can ascertain, is comparatively modern, first started by some obscure writers in the sixteenth century. . . .

Passover. Compare Acts xviii. 21, *τὴν ἱορτὴν . . . ποιήσαι*. And see Alford on Heb. xi. 28.

Dr. Daniel says: "Accipimus Græcorum ad Liturgiam commentarios, δεήσεις, προσευχάς, ἵντεξεις εὐχαριστίας, a Paulo Apostolo Timotheo commendatas quotidiana religione in officiis suis ad Deum dirigi. Nam in Litania majori et minori fiunt δεήσεις . . . προσευχαὶ sunt orationes secreto a sacerdotibus recitatae, εὐχαριστίαι sunt hymni in laudem Dei decantati." ("Codex Liturgicus," tom. iv. p. 406.)

<sup>1</sup> In the Peschito version of 1 Cor. xi. 34. A similar rendering is followed by various Syriac Liturgies. See Professor Ince's Second Letter to Bramley, pp. 9, 10.

No evidence has been brought forward, so far as we are aware, of the words having been rendered "offer this" or "sacrifice this" in any ancient Version, or in any ancient Liturgy.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Malan assures us that the rendering in modern Greek is by a word which signifies "to do," and not "to offer." ("Two Holy Sacraments," p. 161.)

That *ποιέιν*, in the language of the Septuagint as applied to a sacrificial object, has constantly a sacrificial sense is what no one disputes.

But is there any example of its having such a sense in such a phrase as *ποιέιν τοῦτο*? In Exod. xxix. 38 the *ταῦτα ἴστων ἀ ποιήσεις* is followed by *ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου*.

<sup>3</sup> We should be sorry to seem to do injustice to the arguments so ably adduced in Mr. Bramley's Second Letter, but they fail to produce anything like conviction that *τοῦτο ποιέτε* must have been understood in a sacrificial sense either by St. Chrysostom or earlier Christian writers.

<sup>4</sup> Professor Ince, indeed, is willing to admit that Justin Martyr uses the terms *ἄρτον ποιέιν*, *τὸ ποτήριον ποιέιν* in the sense of "to offer bread" and "to offer the cup." He says (Second Letter, p. 3): "Justin Martyr is, I think, the only early Greek writer whose words favour your interpretation; but I am by no means convinced that in these passages Justin is giving his exposition of the actual text, St. Luke xxii. 19; for in that text of the Gospel there is nothing whatever said of *τὸ ποτήριον ποιέιν*." For ourselves, before allowing this concession of Professor Ince's, we think it material to inquire: (1) Does Justin Martyr elsewhere ever use *ποιέιν* in this sense? (2) Does the language of the LXX. furnish a parallel to *ποιέιν τὸ ποτήριον* in a sacrificial sense? (3) Was the language of Justin Martyr ever so interpreted before the translation in the "Library of the Fathers"? Certainly his words were not so understood by the learned Benedictine editor (see *Praefatio*, Part II. cap. x. p. xlvi. *sqq.* *Hag. Com.* 1742) among Romanists, nor by the very learned Casaubon among Protestants. Casaubon

There is a vast consensus of divines, Roman and Protestant, against the sacrificial interpretation" (pp. 9, 10, 11).

AN ENGLISH PRESBYTER.  
(*To be continued.*)

*Memoirs of James Robert Hope-Scott, of Abbotsford, D.C.L., Q.C.* By R. ORNSBY, M.A. In 2 vols. John Murray. 1884.

On one occasion, when the Tractarian or Romanizing movement was referred to in the House of Commons, a clever Nonconformist member, whom Mr. Gladstone invited to join his Government, spoke of perverts (if we remember rightly) as Peers, Parsons, and women. A peer who at the time was in the lobby, being told of this, said, with a smile, "Why didn't he take another P?" He might have said, 'Peers, Parsons, and Pleaders.' One of the pervert—"pleaders" to whom the noble lord referred was Mr. J. R. Hope, afterwards Mr. Hope-Scott, of Abbotsford, whose biography is now before us.

An interesting notice of this work, as was remarked in the last CHURCH-MAN, appears in the *Quarterly Review*; but over what may be termed controversial matter, the writer, naturally enough, passes in silence. On the whole, however, he shows himself a very friendly reviewer; and if the article seem to strongly Protestant readers somewhat surprising, they may be reminded that at the outset it professes to treat "Mr. Hope-Scott's religious life with the studied impartiality of the merely ethical student."

James Robert Hope was born in 1812, the third son of General the Hon. Sir Alexander Hope, G.C.B. When ten years old, he went to the Kepyer Grammar School of Houghton-le-Spring, near Durham. This school was founded in 1574 by Bernard Gilpin, "the Apostle of the North," and by John Heath of Kepyer. Among the names of mark on the school books are Hugh Broughton, George Carleton (one of the four English divines who attended the Synod of Dort), and William Romaine. Mr. Hope left Eton<sup>1</sup> in 1828, and went into residence at Christ Church, Oxford, in 1829. He was surrounded at Oxford by friends, many of whom afterwards attained the highest distinctions in the State, such as, e.g., James Ramsay (Marquis of Dalhousie), and James Bruce (Earl of Elgin). Of Mr. Gladstone, in later years an intimate friend, at that time he saw but little. Mr. Hope's many attractive qualities, we are told, naturally created even a greater impression at Christ Church than they had at Eton; and he entered on academic life with great satisfaction.

wrote: "Justinus in Dialogo cum Tryphone dixit ἀπὸν ποιεῖν, πανem facere vel confidere, hoc est, Christi exemplo εὐλογεῖν καὶ εὐχαριστεῖν, benedictione et tgraniarum actione consecrare in sacramentum Corporis Christi. Alludit Justinus voce ποιεῖν ad vocem Christi apud Paulum, 1 Cor. xi. 24, τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἡμῖν ἀνάμνησιν." (Ad Bar. Ann. xvi. 33.) See Bishop Kaye's "Justin Martyr," p. 94, note. Mr. Scudamore supposes that other Greek Fathers wanted the key to the meaning of τοῦτο ποιεῖτε which Justin possessed. ("Notitia Eucharistica," p. 625, 2nd edit.) But it is scarcely conceivable that if these words, spoken on such an occasion, really possessed and conveyed, and were intended to convey, such an important sacrificial injunction, their meaning should so soon have been lost to the Church.

<sup>1</sup> The Rev. Edward Coleridge wrote, in 1873, to Miss Hope-Scott: "While at Eton he became intimate with my accomplished brother-in-law, the present Bishop of Chichester (the Right Rev. Dr. Durnford), then a private tutor there." In the same letter, referring to Hope-Scott's later years, Mr. Coleridge wrote: ". . . . to my unspeakable sorrow he left our communion, constrained, as he himself assured me, by the example of that glorious man, J. H. N., to whom he was almost spellbound."

His health, however, was not robust ; he sometimes was depressed ; he suffered from a sort of lassitude, and did not read for honours. But some of his friends, had interest ; and in April, 1833, he was elected to a "close" Fellowship of Merton.

The ensuing three years of Mr. Hope's life, writes Professor Ormsby, "form a period full of uncertainty and wavering as to his future career, anxiety as to his religious state, and deep suffering from the sickness or deaths of relatives whom he dearly cherished." "The basis" of his religious education, says the Professor, was Presbyterian ; but his father "much preferred the Book of Common Prayer to extempore devotions," and "had a great horror of Calvinist doctrine." When in England Sir Alexander attended "the ministrations of the Anglican Church ;" and if, "out of the numerous shades of opinion there are now to be found in the Anglican Church," says the Roman Catholic Professor, "*the so-called Evangelical was the one which chiefly fell across his path, it was one from which he entirely dissented.*" The italics are our own. We lay some stress upon the words, for this reason. The *Quarterly Review* observes that in early life James Hope "had been brought up among Evangelicals." There is no warrant for this statement in this biography ;<sup>1</sup> and the inquiry which we have been able to make leads us to conclude that the *Quarterly* writer is mistaken. One who knew Hope well assures us that he was *not* brought up in a Low Church atmosphere. His father was a High-Churchman of the old fashion or type, who used to read Mant's Bible in his family. His sister, too, had an early prepossession against the Evangelical school. When Hope was a young man, we are informed, he made the following observation upon the effort of a friend who was sending Bibles in boxes to the Colonies : "Do you think *that* is the way to make people Christians ? they must be taught by the Church !" Such an observation is not the natural growth of a "Low" ecclesiastical temperature.

The "Tracts of the Times," it will be remembered, commenced in 1833. The "Anglican" Fellow of Merton was carried into the very thick of the Tractarian ideas. In a year or so he became troubled about "the question of forgiveness of post-baptismal sin." (Dr. Pusey's well-known treatise was published in the "Tracts of the Times," in 1835.) But after a time his peace of mind was restored. Accusing himself of having given way to a sort of moodiness, he set himself to settle in real earnest his walk in life. Should he go to the Bar, or seek Holy Orders ? "A great disappointment," it seems, "led to his giving up all idea of adopting the clerical life." His "religious feelings," however, "had deepened." In 1835 he wrote to his sister, Lady Henry Kerr, "I am idle, very idle ;" but the "more healthful tone of his mind" was gaining the victory, and in 1836 he wrote, "My law goes on amazingly well." Yet, after this, he felt discouraged ; he was sometimes depressed. He worked, however, and his religious life was one of strictness ; his gifts and acts of kindness were great. In 1837 he had formed habits in keeping with those of the more advanced of the Tractarian party. In a conversation with Mr. Gladstone the year before, he had said that, in his opinion, "the Oxford authors were right." And from this time forwards his views ran more and more strongly in a Romeward direction. In January, 1838, he was called to the Bar, and in 1840 his speech before the House of Lords

<sup>1</sup> It is true that Mr. Gladstone, in a letter to Miss Hope-Scott, dated September, 1873, printed at the end of Vol. II., says that though he cannot say why he believes that James Hope (as he was himself) "was brought up in what may be termed an atmosphere of Low Church ;" but the right hon. gentleman was evidently not clear about it. It is an entire mistake.

was the foundation of signal success. In 1843 he began his remarkable career as a Parliamentary barrister ; and in 1846 his income was "enormous."

In the year 1838 Mr. Hope became connected with the S.P.G., which he desired to regard as a Committee of the Church of England for Missionary work ; the S.P.G., he thought, should absorb the C.M.S. ! He was one of the prime movers in founding Trinity College, Glenalmond. Of his "proposed reform of Merton," an interesting sketch is given. Mr. Hope's turn of thought, as an Oxford acquaintance of his tells us, was antiquarian ; and the rigid rules of the mediæval system, with their keynote "THE CHURCH," formed a most congenial study. He visited the tomb of Walter de Merton. Of his most intimate friends, even then, some were Romanists. He read and criticized the MSS., and corrected the proofs of Mr. Gladstone's "Church and State." In 1840, in the *British Critic*, appeared his article on College Statutes ; and one sentence in this article gives, we think, the clue to his career as a strong Tractarian and then an unquestioning Romanist. He points out Waynflete's "two principal instruments for the Church's good—the maintenance of continual liturgies, and the formation of a learned, frugal, obedient clergy" (*obedient*) ; and then he asks whether in the present Church of England there is amongst the clergy a general sense that they are enrolled "*into a company where but one will should prevail*"—(*ONE WILL*).

Of his tour in Germany and Italy, in 1840, writes Professor Ornsby, a chief object was to study "the organization of the Catholic Church;" *organization*, apparently, fascinated him. Before he set out he was installed as Chancellor of Salisbury ; he occupied his own stall in a surplice and hood, being preceded to it by two vergers." His B.C.L. gown seemed to some persons the right dress ; but "he was positive for the surplice," feeling that he was "full an ecclesiastical person" as the singing men. He was evidently much pleased with his stall and surplice ; yet he was hardly satisfied, for he says : "All the confusion arises from the *disuse of the tonsure and the minor orders.*" The italics, of course, are our own. Of the "minor orders" Mr. Hope makes mention more than once, and suggested that the Episcopal Church in Scotland should make a beginning in that direction. Dr. Pusey writes to him, "I am very glad that you are seeing so much of the R. C.'s."<sup>1</sup> In writing to Mr. Gladstone, from Milan, Mr. Hope praises the Jesuits : "*What a noble theory theirs is!*" We have here so to say, an echo of his—*Only "one will should prevail."* He admitted to the "Father-General" that he had been born in prejudice against the Society, but he added, he "was ready to shake it off" ! The Jesuits, no doubt, made sure of his obedience ; but the time was not yet come. The Father-General, too astute to be led into discussion, said that "argument was not the thing." Mr. Hope admitted that prayer was best. The visit to Rome, "on the whole," "disappointed him." The Romanist Professor admits this ; and the letters prove it.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Hope himself wrote : "The ceremonies which I have seen as yet move me

<sup>1</sup> A little later Dr. Pusey wrote about Tract XC. ; he feared that many would blame them for "Jesuitism," but on the whole, "a great deal" of good would be done. N. was coming out wonderfully ; and his "touching simplicity and humility" [!!] would win many.

<sup>2</sup> In a letter from Lord Blachford (then Mr. Rogers) to Mr. E. S. Hope, in 1873, we read : He (*i.e.*, Mr. Hope-Scott) was not "much affected by the external magnificence of the Roman Church, but rather the contrary." But what did affect him "was the coherent system of organization of Rome," etc. It is the "only one will" over again.

very little, and I am more struck with the Romanism than the Catholicity of the system." The ecclesiastical "exterior," he adds, "is most repulsive." Nay, he was "half angry with Rome for looking so very like what Protestants describe it to be"!

In 1841, the project for establishing an Anglo-Prussian Bishopric at Jerusalem gave, says his Roman Catholic biographer, "the first serious shock to Mr. Hope's confidence in the Anglican Church." He did not think the Church of England should be termed "Protestant," but the Archbishop of Canterbury maintained the use of that word as applicable to our Reformed Church. Charges hostile to Tract XC, disturbed Mr. Hope; and he asked Mr. Newman what "Catholics" (he means, of course, Tractarians) ought to do; the answer being that "till truth is silenced," "Catholics" should only "contemplate the possibility" of leaving a Protestant Church, a Church, we must add, which is truly "Catholic" as well as Protestant. It is of organization, and of obedience to one man's will, rather than of truth and liberty as set forth in the Word of God, of the Church rather than of Christ, that these Tractarians were thinking. Mr. Newman's letter, towards the close of Vol I., and his protest, will be read, we think, with something more than surprise by even High Churchmen who have not, as yet, studied the Tractarian literature of 1841-42.

We have now reached, in a brief summary of Mr. Hope's career, the end of Volume I. In the second Volume there are many matters, *e.g.*, some expressions in Mr. Gladstone's letters, on which we might well touch. But our space is limited. Mr. Hope married, as is well-known, Miss Lockhart, daughter of John Gibson Lockhart, and grand-daughter of Sir Walter Scott. Three years after his marriage he went over; his wife followed, to the deep and lasting regret of her father. Mr. Hope-Scott's second wife was Lady Victoria Howard. He was, of course, a thorough Vaticanist. A single step after the type of Montalembert he never took.

The work has an interest of its own, for it shows the attractions which the Church of Rome possesses for a certain class of minds, and it illustrates the consummate cleverness of the leaders of that organization in which Christian liberty, as commended in the New Testament, is—whether for the clergy or the laity—an absolute impossibility. Again, it shows how essentially Roman the Oxford movement really was. The biography is written, it must be remembered, by an earnest member of the Church of Rome. But its testimony, in this respect, is full enough and true. It is a melancholy book.

---

## Short Notices.

---

*Modern Criticism and Clement's Epistles to Virgins* (first printed 1752), or *Their Greek Version newly discovered in Antiochus Palentinensis*. By J. M. COTTERILL, author of *Peregrinus Proteus*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1884. Pp. 127.

We must confess, at the outset, that we have not seen "Peregrinus Proteus," and so far are at a disadvantage in noticing the present volume, which contains references to the earlier work. But the treatise before us is sufficiently intelligible in itself. It is, to a considerable extent, an attack, often not very pleasing in tone, upon Dr. Lightfoot's edition of "The