---

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

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

# THE

# CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

*CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN*

*OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND*

VOL. I.

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1880

# PREFACE.

THE completion of the first volume of THE CHURCHMAN imposes upon its Editor the grateful duty of rendering his hearty thanks to the friends under whose advice and encouragement the Magazine has come into existence, to the contributors who have lent to its pages their literary ability, experience, and learning, and to the subscribers who have given it their support. THE CHURCHMAN is indebted to their combined influence for an early history full of promise. It has already acquired a circulation considerably larger than was attained by the *Christian Observer*, in the years when that Magazine was a power in the Church, a circulation larger, indeed, than many of its hearty supporters ventured to expect. THE CHURCHMAN may, therefore, be regarded as a commercial success. If the same amount of support can be secured from the laity as the clergy have generously accorded, a prolonged career of influence and usefulness may be confidently anticipated.

In soliciting the enlarged co-operation of the clergy in bringing THE CHURCHMAN under the notice of their lay friends, the Editor bases his appeal on the recognised need of some organ of public opinion among Evangelical Churchmen. Evangelical Protestantism in the Church of England must needs have its own standpoint. A representative periodical, which at once possesses a clear insight into the real meaning of current events, and is competent to express a sound judgment on the most important works in sacred and secular literature, cannot fail to render valuable service in the guidance of opinion, the defence of truth, and the encouragement of well-directed Christian effort.

The Editor is, however, fully aware that the final success of any magazine must depend upon its own merits. If it proves

false to the principles it professes, or fails to accomplish the purposes for which it was founded, by falling short of the literary excellence demanded by the growth of taste and the increase of knowledge, no goodwill of its friends will save it from decay. For THE CHURCHMAN'S faithfulness to its principles the Editor can pledge himself; for its literary excellence he must in some degree be dependent on his friends.

The Evangelical section of the Church has proved itself to possess ample abilities and learning to hold its own in any competition, if they can be fully enlisted in the work.

There are two difficulties inherent in the conditions of the task laid upon the Editor and his co-workers, of which it is desirable that all friends of the cause should form a clear and adequate conception. One arises from the limited space of a monthly serial containing only eighty pages: another from the constitution and circumstances of the Evangelical body.

The first affects the details of management. Two classes of readers have to be consulted. The one asks for readable articles on general subjects; the other for the complete and exhaustive treatment of questions of a higher order. Papers of this latter kind cannot possibly be short. If excessive condensation be employed, all grace and vivacity of style are necessarily forfeited. If the length be excessive, they not only weary ordinary readers with their prolixity, but they occupy so large a portion of the space at command as to render variety of subjects impracticable. To adjust the mutual claims of the two modes of treatment is a task of equal difficulty and delicacy. Should the Editor sometimes be thought to miss the happy mean, he can only deprecate severity of judgment, and appeal to the forbearance of the student and the patience of the general reader.

Nor is the task less difficult to regulate the allowance to be made for diversities of opinion on secondary points, consistently with the firm and most unflinching maintenance of the distinctive principles of Evangelical truth. Wide variations of opinion, even on points of doctrine, have always existed, wider, indeed, than persons, conversant only with the history of their own times, are probably aware. It is inevitable that this should be the case in a School, of which a primary principle is the bounden duty of private judgment. Profound reverence for the absolute authority of the Word of God, and devout belief in Christ's

promise of the gift of the Spirit of truth, encourage an independence of judgment, which calls no man master. It would be strangely foreign to all past experience of human nature if such a tendency did not sometimes run into excess; but in itself it is right and good. If on one side it renders a close organisation and anything approaching to party discipline impracticable, it nurtures on the other side a free vigorous life, which grows by exercise and is full of spiritual force.

That the difficulty of adjusting these two various claims has been felt by the Evangelical Fathers of the past generation will be seen from the following extracts. They proceed from the pen of the Reverend Henry Venn, whose sagacity of judgment was as eminent as was his jealousy for the truth of God:—

> No one intimately acquainted, by tradition or by the careful study of the biographies and letters of the early Evangelical ministers, will be surprised that such differences as those alluded to should arise within the Evangelical body. Differences on secondary matters always have existed, often to a far greater extent than at present; many such differences have been precisely of the same character as some at this day—many on far more important theological questions."

He sums up the whole question as follows:—

> In addition to the cautions here given respecting the treatment of young and immature inquirers after the truth, it must ever be borne in mind that while the Evangelical body are united by certain great principles essential to the life of the soul, there always have been, there always must be, differences on many points, without compromising those principles, arising from the natural bias of mind, or individual relations, or, it may be, from idiosyncrasies which call for mutual forbearance, candid construction, and charity which is the bond of perfectness.

On these lines THE CHURCHMAN will be conducted. The Editor earnestly asks the prayers of those who are alive to the necessities of modern controversy, that a work, commenced out of a single desire to promote the glory of God, may be guided by His Spirit, and effectually prospered to the maintenance of His truth.

# INDEX TO VOL. I.

THE

# CHURCHMAN

OCTOBER, 1879.

## ART. I.—THE EVANGELICAL SCHOOL.

1. *The Evangelical Movement: its Parentage, Progress, and Issue.* By the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE. (*The British Quarterly Review* for July, 1879.)
2. *History of the Eighteenth Century.* By W. E. H. LECKY.
3. *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century.* By the Rev. C. J. ABBEY and Rev. J. H. OVERTON.
4. *Religion in England under Queen Anne and the Georges.* By JOHN STOUGHTON, D.D.
5. *Essays on Ecclesiastical Biography.* By Right Hon. Sir JAMES STEPHEN, K.C.B.

IF the concurrence of independent testimony can establish any matter of opinion, the prevalent influence of the Evangelical School on the thought and feeling of the Church of England must be accepted as an established fact. All the writers above named concur in asserting it—the statesman, the philosopher, the clergyman, the Nonconformist, and the lawyer form the same general estimate. They differ widely, indeed, from each other as to the period at which the predominance of the School was reached, and as to the causes to which it is to be ascribed, but as to the fact they are unanimous. Mr. Gladstone affirms that by infusion it profoundly altered "the general tone and tendency of the preaching of the clergy." Mr. Lecky asserts that before the close of the eighteenth century "the Evangelical movement had become dominant in England, and it continued the almost undisputed centre of religious life till the rise of the Tractarian movement in 1830." Mr. Abbey, in the introduction to the valuable work with which his name is associated, states

that the Evangelical movement did good even in quarters where it had been looked upon with disfavour, and attributes to its influence "better care for the religious education of the masses, an increased attention to Church missions, the foundation of new religious societies, greater practical activity and improvement in the style of sermons." Mr. Overton declares that the Evangelical leaders were "the salt of the earth" in their day, and concludes his history of the Evangelical revival with the declaration that "every English Churchman has reason to be deeply grateful to them for what they did." Dr. Stoughton, in his introduction, speaking of the "outburst of religious zeal which took place under George II., both within the Church of England and without it," describes it as "a wonderful movement," "which developes into large and still larger dimensions as time rolls on." Towards the close of his second volume he states that the revival of Evangelical religion, with the religious machinery to which it gave rise, "penetrated efficaciously into the depths of society, so as to render the continuance of certain existing evils almost impossible. . . . . And beyond all this, multitudes were converted to the faith and practice of the Gospel, so as to live in virtue and benevolence, and die in the hope of eternal life." Sir J. Stephen, in his Essay on the Evangelical succession, declares that its members "accomplished a momentous revolution in the national character."[1] If it may be permitted to combine all these statements into one, they cover the whole life of Evangelicalism from its revival in the eighteenth century down to the present day. They constitute a splendid eulogy; and those who can trace their religious genealogy back to Simeon, Scott, Newton, and Venn, have cause to be proud of their spiritual inheritance.

The fact must, therefore, be held to be established that the Evangelical School, more than any other, has moulded the religious character of the English nation. It is not simply that a

[1] Note in Lord Macaulay's Life, vol. i. pp. 67, 68.—Macaulay writing to one of his sisters in 1844, says, "I think Stephen's Article on the Clapham Sect the *best thing he ever did.* I do not think with you that the Claphamites were men too obscure for such delineations. The truth is, that from that little knot of men emanated all the Bible Societies, and almost all the Missionary Societies in the world. The whole organisation of the Evangelical party was their work. The share which they had in providing means for the education of the people was great. They were really the destroyers of the slave-trade and of slavery. Many of those whom Stephen described were public men of the greatest weight. Lord Teignmouth governed India at Calcutta. Grant governed India in Leadenhall Street. Stephen's father was Percival's righthand man in the House of Commons. It is needless to speak of Wilberforce. *As to Simeon,* if you knew what his authority and influence were, and how they extended from Cambridge to the most remote corners of England, you would allow that his real sway in the Church was far greater than that of any Primate."

revival of spiritual life, like the revival of letters in the thirteenth century, took place, and that this section of the Church of England, in common with other sections, partook of its quickening influence; but it is that the Evangelical School, taking its rise in the middle of the eighteenth century in the persons of a few men—not powerful from their wealth and social position, not remarkable for special intellectual genius or for vast erudition, not giving expression to the secret thought of their times or of their Church, but standing in opposition to it, and struggling against obloquy and reproach—has yet permeated and interpenetrated with its own spiritual force the heart and mind and conscience of the Church of Christ in this country for a period of more than a hundred years. In the face of such a fact despondency and timidity in the maintenance of our principles should be for ever discarded.

The mind naturally inquires about the source of this power, and the elements that have composed it. Two answers have been given, and it would seem that two answers only are possible. The one attributes the result to the character of the men themselves, principally of its first founders, and subsequently of those who have received their mantle, and inherited their spirit; the other attributes it to the doctrines embodied in the School—that is, to the vital power of the truth which formed the substance and communicated the quickening energy to their teaching.

"The points," Mr. Gladstone says, "in which the Evangelical School permanently differed from the older and traditional Anglicanism were those of the Church, the Sacraments, and the forensic idea of Justification. They are not, in my view, the strong points, and I do not wish to dwell upon them." Accordingly, in contrast with them, he proceeds to place what he assumes to be the primary points of difference. "Its main characteristic was of a higher order. It was a strong, systematic, outspoken, and determined reaction against the pervading standards both of life and preaching. It aimed at bringing back on a large scale, and by an aggressive movement, the Cross, and all that the Cross essentially implies, both in the teaching of the clergy, and into the lives as well of the clergy as of the laity." In this effort it is admitted that they succeeded; "the pith and life of the Evangelical teaching, as it consists in the reintroduction of Christ our Lord to be the woof and warp of teaching, was the great gift of the movement to the teaching church, and has now penetrated and possessed it on a scale so general, that it may be considered as pervading the whole mass." Let the statement be accepted; but how did the Evangelical Fathers succeed in reintroducing Christ the Lord as the woof and warp of teaching, but by inculcating those very doctrines which Mr. Gladstone professes to put on one side as questions of

inferior importance. What is the "preaching of the Gospel" which the Evangelical fathers are stated to have restored, but the doctrines relative to the person and work of Christ. There are few of these doctrines more crucial than the very three which are deemed not to be strong points of the Evangelical School. They are the doctrines of all doctrines. Let it be said that the soul derives spiritual life by membership with the Church; that the body and blood of Christ are *in, with,* or *under* the consecrated bread and wine; that justifying righteousness is inherent and not imputed — and in every case our Lord is pushed into the background, and other objects interposed between Him and the sinner. Yet it is implied (p. 14) that these doctrines are negative, not positive. The Evangelical teaching is but the echo of the eleventh, the nineteenth, and the twenty-fifth Articles, and in all these Articles the language is not negative, but affirmative and didactic to the utmost degree.

The statement, therefore, that the great obligation conferred by the Evangelical School upon the Church of England consists in "having roused her from her slumbers and set her vigorously to work" (p. 10) is scarcely consistent with the admission that the revival of Gospel preaching was due to it, or with the statement in another place (p. 24) that the function of the School is to keep alive "the vigour and activity in the Anglican body of those 'doctrines of grace,' without which the salt of Christianity soon loses all its savour" (p. 24). It may, however, possibly be thought that the spiritual force of the School is due not to the doctrines they preached, but to the depth of conviction and fervency of zeal with which they were preached. It would be not only foolish, but ungrateful, to overlook the service rendered to the Church by the personal qualities of the Evangelical Fathers. Their profound convictions, their intense earnestness, their self-sacrificed devotedness, their self-abnegation, their heroic courage, their lofty faith and spirit of devotion, were worthy of all admiration. It is scarcely possible to exalt them too highly. Nevertheless, no force of personal qualities can adequately account for the work that has been accomplished. For personal qualities only act upon the circle of those who are brought into personal contact, and this circle is, after all, a narrow one. It was so especially with men who, like Newton, Scott, Romaine, Cecil, and Simeon, were pastors of congregations, or incumbents of parishes, which taxed all their energies, and from which the most vexatious and trying opposition was sometimes encountered, as with Newton and Scott at Olney, and Simeon at Cambridge. No doubt the itinerancy maintained during the earliest stages of the revival extended the sphere of personal influence. The immense labours of Wesley and Whitefield, within the sphere of Methodism, and of Grimshaw of Howarth, and Berridge of Everton, outside

of it, must have acted over a very considerable area. It has been computed that Whitefield preached from forty to sixty hours every week, and ten or even twenty thousand hearers at a time would hang breathlessly on his words. Grimshaw itinerated throughout the Northern counties, Berridge in the Eastern, Toplady and Walker in Devon and Cornwall, and all of them with a burning zeal that knew no weariness. By these labours, the seeds of truth must have been sown broadcast throughout the land, and men's minds have been brought into a receptive condition. But the impression produced by the personal earnestness of the preachers, valuable as it must have been in establishing what Aristotle calls the ἦθος of the speakers, must have been in itself too superficial to have lived, still less to have worked, without some solid basis of doctrinal truth to support it. By the very necessities of the human constitution, strong and permanent affections can only be excited and maintained by equally strong and permanent convictions. Every human emotion has its root in some truth apprehended by the understanding. It is certainly conceivable that a general sentiment of reverence and desire may have been aroused by such preaching and such preachers in persons who understood but little of the truths presented and impersonated; but such a sentiment can have had no vitality. It must have been too nerveless to act upon others; too deficient in backbone to be able to stand by itself. The holy enthusiasm of the Evangelical Fathers was a powerful instrument for exciting attention; but the spiritual force of the movement must be sought in something much more inward, more constraining, and more abiding.

Moreover, if it be admitted that the Evangelical School has been distinguished for peculiar earnestness—and to use a Scriptural as well as a popular word, "unction"—in preaching the doctrines of grace, the question occurs, whence this earnestness has been derived. It cannot have been a personal attribute if it has descended in the succession of a School. Unity of spirit maintained for a hundred years would be an abiding miracle if there were no underlying cause to which it is to be attributed. That the common characteristics of a School should hold no relation to the peculiar system of belief which constitutes it into a School is absolutely incredible. Men die, but truth lives.

This leads to another aspect in which the whole question may be considered. It has already been observed that the admissions of the various writers, who have discussed the rise and progress of the Evangelical School, involve the existence of a spiritual force peculiar to the School, and not possessed by other Schools of religious opinion. This force must exist in that which distinguishes it from other Schools, that by which

it is differentiated. What are the specific marks by which it is to be identified? There are three possible answers—by the personal holiness of its members; by its outward system of worship; by its inward principles of truth.

Of the personal qualities of its members little more need be added. It would ill become an Evangelical writer to assert any monopoly of holiness, or of earnestness and zeal, for the members of his own School; and was he conceited enough to advance the claim, certainly none of the writers mentioned at the head of this Article would admit of it for a moment. The claim has, indeed, been advanced on the other side. Few things have been more prominently pleaded in Episcopal Charges and the columns of the press than the peculiar holiness and self-devotedness of English sacerdotalists. Those who would not for a moment advance such a claim on their own behalf may be pardoned for demurring to its justice when advanced on behalf of others. Such a comparison should be not only unspoken, but unthought. The operations of the Holy Spirit upon the human heart are no special prerogative of any School. In the absolute freedom of His sovereignty He divides to every man severally as He will.

Is the secret of Evangelical influence to be found in the system to which it has given rise, and the modes of worship in which it has embodied itself? This needs to be carefully considered, the more carefully, because of the confessed, and perhaps the growing similarity of practice which exists between Evangelical Clergymen on one side, and High Churchmen and even Ritualists on the other. Some view this approximation with the greatest alarm; some with exultation and loud-expressed triumph. Both of these parties widely mistake the facts of the case, and exaggerate the results. One broad distinction which lies at the threshold of the inquiry, and which must be jealously kept in mind throughout, may perhaps tend to allay the alarm of one section, and to moderate the triumph of another. A line, broad and deep as it can possibly be drawn, separates ritual practices which are symbolical of doctrine, and ritual practices which are matters of æsthetic taste, and which vary with the varying constitutions of men. That ritual may have a symbolical meaning was openly asserted at an early period of the ritualistic history by the Rev. F. Lee, in his "Directorium Anglicanum," and has been constantly repeated since, as, for instance, by the Rev. W. J. Bennett in his "Plea for Toleration," and very recently by the Lord Bishop of Colombo in his correspondence with the agents of the Church Missionary Society. One quotation may suffice for all. "Ritual and Ceremonial," says the Preface to the "Directorium," "are the expressions of doctrine, and witness to the sacramental truth of the

Catholic religion." With practices of this character, ritual or otherwise, no man of Evangelical belief can have anything whatever to do. To adopt them would be to deny the fundamental principles of his own creed. He must not only shrink with jealous vigilance from the slightest complicity with them on his own part, but must protest against their introduction into the Church of his forefathers. He must regard them with an abhorrence not measured by the trivial nature of the acts, but by the importance of the doctrines they are employed to symbolize. His attitude towards them must ever be an attitude of indignant protest and uncompromising opposition.

There is one matter not strictly belonging to the class of practices just mentioned, which may be noticed in this place more properly than in any other. I refer to the habitual disrespect exhibited by Ritualists towards their Bishops, when they happen to disagree with them. It furnishes a curious illustration of the genealogical descent of modern sacerdotalists, for it would be unfair to the great body of English High Churchmen to involve them in the charge, from the Ultra Churchmen of the eighteenth century. The latter are described by Mr. Lecky in a passage which might be adopted as an accurate portraiture of the modern Ritualist. The passage is worth quotation, in spite of its length, so precisely and exactly true are the particulars of the portrait:—

The writers of this school taught that Episcopalian clergymen were as literally priests as were the Jewish priests, though they belonged not to the order of Aaron, but to the higher order of Melchizedek; that the Communion was literally, and not metaphorically, a sacrifice; that properly-constituted clergymen had the power of uttering words over the sacred elements which produced the most wonderful, though, unfortunately, the most imperceptible of miracles; that the right of the clergy to tithes was of direct Divine origin, antecedent to, and independent of, all secular legislation; that the sentence of excommunication involved an exclusion from heaven; that the Romish practice of prayers for the dead was highly commendable; that all non-episcopal communities who dissented from the Anglican Church were schismatics, guilty of the sin, and reserved for the fate of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. Aiming especially at sacerdotal power, these theologians had naturally a strong leaning towards the communities in which that power had been most successfully claimed, and negotiations were accordingly at one time opened for union with the Gallican, at another with the Eastern Church. Some of them contended that all baptisms except those of Episcopalian clergymen were not only irregular, but invalid, and that, therefore, Dissenters had no kind of title to be regarded as Christians. Brett, some time before he joined the sect, preached and published a sermon maintaining that repentance itself was useless unless it were followed by priestly absolution, which could only be administered by an Episcopalian clergyman; and both Dodwell and Lesley were of opinion that such absolution was essential to salvation. . . . .

It might have been imagined from the solemnity of the ordination vow, and from the peculiar sanctity supposed to attach to the clerical profession, that clergymen would be distinguished from lawyers, soldiers, and members of other secular professions, by their deference and obedience to their superiors. It might have been imagined that this would be especially true of men who were continually preaching the duty of passive obedience in the sphere of politics, and the transcendent and almost divine prerogatives of Episcopacy in the sphere of religion. As a matter of fact, however, this has not been the case. If the most constant, contemptuous, and ostentatious defiance, both of civil and ecclesiastical authorities, be a result of the Protestant principle of private judgment, it may be truly said that the extreme High Church party in more than one period of its history has shown itself, in this respect at least, the most Protestant of sects. While idolizing Episcopacy in the abstract, its members have made it a main object of their policy to bring most existing Bishops into contempt, and their polemical writings have been conspicuous, even in theological literature, for their feminine spitefulness and for their recklessness of assertion. The last days of Tillotson were altogether embittered by the stream of calumny, invective, and lampoons, of which he was the object. One favourite falsehood, repeated in spite of the clearest disproof, was that he had never been baptised.—*Lecky's History of the Eighteenth Century*, vol. i. pp. 86–88.

For the Sacerdotalists of the eighteenth century take the Sacerdotalists of the nineteenth; for Archbishop Tillotson substitute Archbishop Tait, and *de te fabula narratur*. Caustic, however, as Mr. Lecky is, he has failed to trace this common likeness to its common source in the two centuries. The cause is probably to be found in the conception formed of the Church by the Sacerdotal School of the two periods. To their imaginations she has stood ever in the front, an august and majestic figure bearing on her crowned brow the words, *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. Such a conception has been a pure work of imagination. It has had no existence in fact. It is but a great name given to an abstraction of the mind; a vague, shapeless shadow beneath the majesty of which each man may idolize his own private judgment and stamp it with an ideal Catholicism. But with such a conception in view it is not surprising that the actual claims of practical authority should be disregarded, and treated with contempt in face of a supreme authority, which, were not the conception as utterly baseless in fact as it is imposing in theory, would naturally overshadow particular persons, however high their office, into insignificance. If the curious accuracy of Mr. Lecky's portraiture be doubted, or its application to some moderns be called into question, we have only to refer the doubter to the *Church Herald* of July 15, 1874.

But while there can be no truce between the Evangelical

School and practices, which are the unwritten language of doctrines offensive to all our deepest convictions, there is another class of devotional practices which are common to more parties than one, and which, consequently, furnish no line of distinction between the Evangelical School and other Schools with which we stand in conflict. I refer to practices relative to the solemnity of public worship, to the honourable beauty of the outward structure, to the office of the Christian ministry, as being of Divine appointment, and not of Ecclesiastical convenience, and to the authority of the Church as an organised society, with "power to decree rites or ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith" (Art. xx.).

No candid mind will claim perfection for the Evangelical School, or be ashamed of admitting that in modern times it has learned something from its opponents. It is probably true that higher conceptions of the functions of the Church, and of the value of the sacraments now prevail than were common among Evangelicals fifty years ago; but this change, if it be a fact, has only brought the School back to the standpoint of its most eminent founders. In those practices which are distinctive of Sacerdotal doctrine there has been no approximation between the Schools; no, not a single hair's breadth. There is, however, a tendency in the human mind in avoiding one extreme to approach rashly towards another. There is danger lest, in getting as far as possible from a given error, the simple standard of revelation should be overstepped, and some corrective truths overlooked in the very vehemence of the rebound. It is not given to any human mind to embrace with equal clearness and force every section of the Divine circle of truth. We cannot yet see things as God sees them. The Great Master governs His Church in a great degree by the action of contraries. Each man sees with peculiar vividness some truth or class of truths, and for that truth he must contend with all his might. He sees a part, where God sees the whole; grasps a part, while God holds in His mighty hands all the converging lines in one perfect and harmonious unity. That in their strong revulsion from Romish or Romanizing teaching some ardent minds should trench too far towards the other side is no more than natural. Richard Cecil saw and lamented the tendency in his own day.

Man is a creature of extremes—the middle path is generally the wise path, but there are few wise enough to find it. Because Papists have made too much of some things, Protestants have made too little of them: the Papists treat man as all sense; some Protestants would treat him as all spirit. Because one party has exalted the Virgin into a divinity, the other can scarcely think of that "most highly-favoured among women" with respect. The Papist puts the Apocrypha into his

canon; the Protestant will scarcely regard it as an ancient record. The Popish heresy of human merit in justification drove Luther on the other side into most unwarrantable and unscriptural statements of that doctrine. The Papist considers grace as inseparable from the participation of the Sacraments; the Protestants too often lose sight of them as instituted means of conveying grace.—*Remains*, p. 168.

The attitude of the Evangelical Fathers, adjusted to the parties of our own day, may be aptly described by the phrase "Protestant Evangelical Churchmen." Mr. Overton, in his sketch of the Evangelical Revival, states that the early Evangelicals were as firmly attached to the Church and to parochial order as the highest of High Churchmen. Dr. Stoughton states that while "Newton and Scott were friendly with Methodists, and were not shocked at the Ecclesiastical irregularities of their fellow-labourers, Cecil and others were Churchmen to the backbone, and intensely disliked the doings of the itinerants."

Cecil says of himself, "I never choose to forget that I am a priest, because I would not deprive myself of the right to dictate in my ministerial capacity." Newton in his "Theologia" expresses himself thus—"Though the Bishop who ordained me laid me under no restrictions, I would not have applied to him for ordination if I had not previously determined to submit to his authority and to the rules of the Church."—*Works*, vol. v. pp. 44, 45.

It is true that Venn, of Huddersfield, did himself itinerate. But his son writes, "Induced by the hope of doing good, my father, in certain instances, preached in unconsecrated places. But having ackowledged this, it becomes my pleasing duty to state that he was no advocate for irregularity in others; that when he afterwards considered it in its different bearings and connections, he lamented that he had given way to it; and restrained several other persons from such acts by the most urgent arguments."—*The English Church*, vol. ii. p. 184.

Thomas Scott's loyal attachment to the Church was attested by the publication of his "Seven Letters on the Evils of Separation from the Church of England." Simeon, as already stated elsewhere, was charged by the writers of his day with being more of a Churchman than a Gospel-man. And in the discussions of the Eclectic Society it appears that the unanimous opinion of the brethren held schism to be a sin. Firm attachment to the Church of England, therefore, and a devout recognition of her claims on the obedience of her ministers, and of the Divine appointment of the ministerial office, furnish no line of demarcation by which the Evangelical School can be distinguished from the Anglican School, either of the eighteenth or of the nineteenth centuries.

Nor did there exist in the Evangelical Fathers any lack of re-

verence for the Sacraments, or any tendency to depreciate baptism, or to neglect the Lord's Supper. Any such accusation would be most untrue. Simeon protested against being misrepresented, as if he thought meanly of the Sacrament. "All penitent adults have in baptism the remission of their sins sealed to them, and the Spirit in a more abundant measure communicated. Infants dedicated to God in baptism may, and often do (though in a way not discoverable by us save by its fruits), receive a new nature from the Spirit of God in and with and by that ordinance;" and he prefaces the statement thus: "We are no more disposed to detract from the honour of that sacred ordinance than our adversaries themselves." At a later period he expressed himself somewhat more cautiously. We have not, indeed, very ample materials for ascertaining the views of the Evangelical Fathers on the Sacraments, because it was not this side of doctrine which had been forgotten in their day, or consequently which they had need to revive and to confirm. Their work lay in the vivid proclamation of those "doctrines of grace" which all writers admit had nearly disappeared from the pulpits of the Church of England in the first half of the eighteenth century. But we have intimations here and there in the story of their lives and labours, from which their views may be not obscurely gathered. We know, for instance, that Thomas Scott administered a weekly communion at Lothbury. And earlier in the movement we read of such immense numbers of communicants thronging to the ordinance as to prove that "mad Grimshaw" himself had no low estimate of that blessed Sacrament. Three thousand persons are recorded to have received the consecrated memorials of the Body and Blood of Christ at one time, and no less than thirty bottles of wine to have been used in a single administration. Neglect of the Sacraments was, therefore, no characteristic of their system.

Neither, again, is the specific characteristic of the Evangelical School to be found in the careless performance of Church ordinances, or the disrespectful neglect of the sacred buildings appropriated to public worship. This has been a common charge; but it unjustly shifts on to the shoulders of the Evangelicals what was the general fault of the Anglicans of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and especially of that section popularly known as the "high and dry!" That the services of the Church were wretchedly conducted, the congregations irreverent in the extreme, and the churches themselves neglected and mean, can scarcely be denied. Archbishop Secker, in 1750, thus described the condition of the churches of his day: "Some, I fear, have scarcely been kept in necessary present repair, and others by no means duly cleared from annoyances, which must gradually bring them to decay; water undermining and rotting the foun-

dations, earth heaped up against the outside, weeds and shrubs growing upon them. . . . . Too frequently the floors are meanly paved, or the walls dirty or patched, or the windows ill-glazed, and it may be, in fact, stopped up . . . . or they are damp, offensive, and unwholesome." So much for the structures. Dr. Stoughton draws a picture of the same general character. "In country villages, where no exemplary minister was found, where the rector or curate lived a free and easy life, and liked to drink a dish of tea with the landlady, and afterwards a bowl of punch with the landlord of the inn, not much attention would be paid either to spiritual necessities, or to the decencies of religious service. Buildings were neglected; chancel and nave fell into decay; the communion-table presented a shabby appearance; surplices were dirty; the singing was miserable; the preaching no better; and, from beginning to end, everything presented a slovenly aspect" (I. p. 286). He tells a story, that the high-backed pews which have only of late years been ejected from our churches originated in the reign of Queen Anne, and were occasioned by complaints that the maids of honour and the gentlemen of the Court at Whitehall and elsewhere spent their time in looking at one another, instead of attending to their religious duties. All accounts concur in representing the irreverence of the age as absolutely shocking during the early part of the century. Addison thus describes the demeanour of a friend of Will Honeycomb: "He seldom comes in till the prayers are about half over, and when he has entered his seat (instead of joining with the congregation) he devoutly holds his hat before his face for three or four moments, then bows to all his acquaintances, sits down, takes a pinch of snuff, and spends the remaining time in surveying the congregation." When all allowances are made for exaggeration, the picture that remains is equally melancholy and offensive.

Now, on what section of the Church must rest the responsibility of this state of things? Surely, on that party which had a predominant influence, and yet allowed the evil to grow unchecked. This party was High Church, and its prevalence at that time is unquestionable. An attempt has been made to call this predominance into question, and so to relieve the School of the responsibility of the unhappy state of things that has been described. But the more closely the matter is examined the more firmly does the odium rest on the shoulders of High Churchmen. Mr. Lecky establishes the fact with his usual abundance of evidence in the first volume of his History (pp. 53-57 and pp. 73-80); and that the High Churchmen of the eighteenth century were the legitimate progenitors of the Sacerdotalists of the nineteenth has been illustrated in a passage already quoted in this Paper. That this irreverent slovenliness in the services and in

the churches is in no degree due to the Evangelicals, and is no characteristic of the School is certain, since the Evangelical revival had not originated when these things were at their worst. As soon as their influence began to be felt, the evil was abated. "During the latter half of the century," writes Mr. Abbey, "the careless and undevout could no longer have ventured without fear of censure on the irreverent familiarities in church which they could have freely indulged in for the first twenty years."

The real fact is that the Evangelicals were the first to set the example of restoring the Churches of England into a state worthy of their sacred purpose, and to them belongs the honour of cultivating that reverential regard to all the accessories of public worship which has become characteristic of our own day. The Camden Society was instituted in 1838. But twenty years earlier the Rev. R. P. Buddicom, St. George's, Everton, Liverpool, and Archdeacon Jones, of St. Andrew's, were remarkable for the order they maintained in their churches, when the general state of things on every side of them was very different. The Rev. W. Carus Wilson, about 1817, was the first to introduce order into the churches of the North, administering baptism in obedience to the rubric after the Second Lesson. The Rev. R. Carus Wilson during his incumbency built five churches in the parish of Preston, all of them distinguished among the churches of the day by their ecclesiastical character, and was himself suspected in some quarters of being too "churchy." The Rev W. Richardson, of St. Michael-le-Belfry, who died in 1820, his brother, James Richardson, and John Graham, of St. Saviour's, were staunch Churchmen, and remarkable for their strict observance of church order. The same thing is true of many others of their contemporaries. Charles Simeon's church was restored in 1833, and was the first at Cambridge to undergo the process and be brought into a state of comely beauty. The fittings were of oak throughout, and the work handsome and costly, the total expense having been 3000*l.* In the words of a living dignitary, whose name is a title of honour, "The Evangelicals began the great work of church restoration and extension, were the introducers of order in their services, and gave the impulse to church building." Thus it was that the early Evangelical Fathers lived and worked, combining in one harmonious system the love of God's truth with loyal attachment to the Church to which they belonged. The grand "doctrines of grace" were, as it was right they should be, the first supreme objects of their care; yet they were not indifferent to secondary truths, but held them with firm conviction and consistent observance.

It is evident, therefore, that the specific characteristic of the

Evangelical School, and the source of its spiritual power, is not to be found in those points of belief or of practice which are common to itself with other Schools contained within the broad comprehension of the Church of England. If it has exercised a peculiar force, that force must lie somewhere in its peculiar attributes. The source of it is, in short, to be found in Evangelical doctrine. Mr. Gladstone practically admits this, when he states the special function of the School to be the maintenance of the doctrines of grace, and attributes to its influence "the reintroduction of Christ our Lord to be the woof and warp of preaching." Such a work goes far beyond the use of the Divine name, which is as "ointment poured forth;" it must include the Divine person and the Divine offices, all that circle of doctrine by virtue of which Christ is Christianity, and Christianity is Christ. But Evangelical doctrines constitute one complete and harmonious whole, cemented by a strictly logical connection of truth with truth. They cannot be broken up, as Mr. Gladstone breaks them up, nor can one part be accepted, while another part is put on one side as comparatively unimportant. They must consistently stand together or fall together. They are a galaxy of jewels strung on one thread, and that thread is the immediate personal contact of the individual soul with God. This truth is not only replete with the richest comfort and full of strength, but it is a singularly grand one, and throws its own dignity over the human soul, and all its relationship to the Divine Being. Mr. Lecky has had the sagacity to perceive this, and to appreciate the fact.

It is (he says) the glory of Protestantism, whenever it remains faithful to the spirit of its founders, that it has destroyed this engine (Sacerdotal pretension). The Evangelical teacher emphatically declares that the intervention of no human being, and of no human rite, is necessary in the hour of death. Yet he can exercise a soothing influence not less powerful than that of the Catholic priest. The doctrine of justification by faith, which diverts the wandering mind from all painful and perplexing retrospect, concentrates the imagination on one Sacred Figure, and persuades the sinner that the sins of a life have in a moment been effaced, has enabled thousands to encounter death with perfect calm, or even with vivid joy, and has consoled innumerable mourners at a time when all the commonplaces of philosophy would appear the idlest of sounds. This doctrine had fallen almost wholly into abeyance in England, and had scarcely any place among national convictions, when it was revived by the Evangelical party:—Vol. ii. p. 639.

But whence did the Evangelical School derive their special doctrines? They drew them out of the formularies of the Church of England, as those who prepared the formularies drew them from the pure fountain of the Word of God. It was the strength of their case, as Evangelicals, that they appealed to the

authority of the Sacred Scriptures, and, as Churchmen, to the authority of the recognised documents of their Church. No one can peruse their writings, as, for instance, the Theological Essays of Thomas Scott, without perceiving this. "In this great and cardinal business," writes Mr. Gladstone, "without doubt, the Evangelical preachers of the English Church were not innovators, but restorers. They were restorers, not by re-enactment of laws which had been repealed, but by revived attention to laws which had been neglected or forgotten." "The Evangelical leaders of theology," says Dr. Stoughton, "drew their inspiration from the Protestant works of the sixteenth, and Nonconformist works of the seventeenth century. The Homilies were their delight. They appealed to them in proof of their own distinctive theology; certain Articles they regarded with great satisfaction, especially the seventeenth." This witness is true. It is the honourable pride of the School that they represent not only the letter but the spirit and reality, what Mr. Gladstone pithily calls "the sap and juice," of the teaching of their Church. Their belief has been not only framed on its broad outlines, but nicely adjusted to its proportion of faith. Nor is there any point of doctrine on which this is the more remarkable, than that moderate Calvinism (not extreme Calvinism), which has ever been characteristic of the School, and which has been moulded on the exact lines traced with equal moderation, firmness, and wisdom, in the language of the seventeenth Article. The claim is equally true in regard to the three special doctrines which are declared by the statesman not to be the strong points of Evangelicalism, but which are specified by the Nonconformist historian in an exactly opposite estimate. The Evangelical doctrine of Justification is the accurate echo of the eleventh Article, supplemented and explained by the Homily of Justification—that is, as the Bishop of Winchester states in his learned work upon the Articles, the Homily on the salvation of mankind. The doctrine of the Sacraments is the exact echo of the twenty-fifth, twenty-seventh, and twenty-eighth Articles; and the Evangelical doctrine of the Church of the nineteenth and twentieth.

It has been said that the Evangelical scheme of doctrine, indistinguishable from that of the Church herself, is a harmonious whole, and that all its parts must in consistency stand or fall together. But, happily, men are not always consistent, nor are they guided by strict logical conclusions. Thus, in modern times there has been a distinct School of divines who, with the highest views of sacramental grace and of the corporate life of the Church, have held also the doctrine of immediate faith and of spiritual conversion. This is the distinctive feature of what has been known as "Aitkenism."

The Scriptural doctrine of grace has been a spring of Divine life wherever it has been held, and has fructified what otherwise had been barren. Even the broken fragments of Evangelical truth have borne fruit, just as a tree may flourish by virtue of some roots which have struck deep into the fertile soil, although other roots may touch the stony ground, whence neither moisture nor nourishment can be derived. It is in this respect that Theological Schools have approximated in our day. It is not that the Evangelical School has borrowed from its opponents those principles of a Scriptural Churchmanship which were distinctly maintained by its founders, but it is that other Schools have borrowed from it the vivifying doctrines of justification by faith, and of the sovereign operations of the Holy Spirit of God. We have Mr. Gladstone's authority for this statement. "To bring it (the preaching of the Gospel) back again was the aim and work of the Evangelical reformers." "The juice and sap of the Evangelical teaching has in a very remarkable manner coursed through 'the natural gates and alleys of the body' of the English Church." It would not be difficult to extract passages from the writings of High Ritualists which, taken alone, might be supposed to have issued from the warm heart and the burning tongue of the Evangelical School. The necessity of drawing this Paper to a conclusion prevents more than a quotation or two from a single writer: "Justification derives its special force from our being by nature sinners and culprits. It supposes a judicial process—a judgment-seat and a prisoner. Such is our condition. As sinners, with guilt in the past, there can be for us no justification but the Divine acquittal. Justification, as viewed in connection with the past, can mean nothing else. Not in our power is it to unlive the past; we cannot unsay the words we have spoken, or the deeds we have done. Would to God we could, but we cannot. And here God comes and freely pardons; and such a pardon really proclaimed, and leading the sinner on to the knowledge of the forgiveness of sins, is the justification that can alone satisfy the cravings of the sin-burdened heart, and change its agonizing cry into the deep thanksgivings of him "whose transgression is forgiven, and whose sin is covered." Again, "Many a soul, burdened and heavy laden with the sense of its sin, has gone to the Cross of Calvary, and there, kneeling at the feet of the Crucified, and looking unto Jesus, has seen in Him his sin nailed to the Cross, and in the recognition of Christ's redeeming grace, 'his soul set on fire with the joy of Divine forgiveness,' has sung to Him who loved him his triumphant thanksgiving." Could any Evangelical preacher express himself more clearly, or more eloquently? Yet they are the words of the Rev. G. Body, extracted from his book on the "Life of Justification."

What has been already said may constitute a sufficient answer to the suggestion that the Evangelical School is partly responsible for the rise of Tractarianism, just as the Tractarians are responsible for the constant stream of secessions that has flowed from their ranks to the Church of Rome. The proportionate dimensions of what the two Schools are respectively alleged to have contributed to Schools beyond themselves might show the parallel to be illusive. For if all that is asserted be accepted as true without qualification, there are some half-dozen cases in which distinguished men have passed from the Evangelical School to the Tractarian School; while the perversions from Tractarianism to Rome are numbered at three thousand. If all that is meant had been the existence of a historical sequence, and of that reaction to which the weakness of the human mind renders it specially susceptible, there would be no need of being careful to disprove the imputation. No doubt the Reformation preceded the rise of Socinianism. "Hampden moved in the direction of Cromwell; Lafayette in the direction of Robespierre." In all such cases, it is enough to reply *post, non propter.* But more than this is intended. It is vaguely suggested that some undefined, and to all appearance wholly undefinable, connection of cause and effect has existed between the Evangelical and the Tractarian Schools. Now that the matter is reduced to a question of doctrine, such a connection scarcely lies within the sphere of possibility. In regard to the three specified points—the Church, the Sacraments, and the mode of Justification—the difference between the two Schools is fundamental. There are some minds which, wrestling against a conviction they are unwilling to receive, find refuge in an extreme hypothesis in the other direction. But this is the fault, not of the doctrine, but of the mind of the thinker, and of his constitutional tendency to run into opposition. On the principle that none are such bitter enemies as apostates, it may be readily understood that those who reject an Evangelical doctrine once entertained by them, may run violently into the opposite extreme; just as the sons of Nonconformists are often found to become the bitterest of High Churchmen. But inclined plane between the two Schools there is none and can be none, where the line of separation is as deep and sharply cut as between Protestantism and Romanism. Between Tractarianism and Rome the case is wholly different; there is a distinctive principle common to both, and there is no difficulty in defining it. It is the acceptance of the authority of the Church as supreme. On Evangelical principles the Bible gives authority to the Church; on Tractarian principles the Church gives authority to the Bible. The Church is, therefore, supreme, and, consequently, whatever is stamped with the authority of the Church must be accepted, whatever it may be. The conclusion

s inevitable; and a vigorous mind will readily receive it in proportion as its habits of reasoning are logical and its convictions deep and earnest. Does it follow from all this that there has been no connection between Evangelicalism and Tractarianism, and that the one contributed nothing to the other? By no means. Those who passed from the one to the other took with them their Evangelical warmth and earnestness, and their supreme faith in the personal Christ. This Mr. Gladstone affirms, and so far we willingly accept his evidence.

It remains, then, that the distinctive characteristic of the Evangelical School is the Evangelical doctrine. It is only a truism to say so, and nothing but great subtlety of intellect could ever conceive of it otherwise. If there has been a spiritual force in the Evangelical School, such as no other religious School possesses, it must be in that Evangelical doctrine which no other School holds with the same completeness and consistency. This doctrine has been already shown to be identical with the teaching of the Church of England. But its genealogy may be traced yet higher. In the words of Sir J. Stephen, it is "that system of which (if Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Knox, and the writers of the English Homilies may be credited) Christ Himself was the author, and Paul the first and greatest interpreter."

Here, then, we find the secret of the spiritual force exercised by the Evangelical School. It is not intended to assert, for a solitary moment, that the men by whom the School has been represented at any given period have been perfect men; that there has been neither defect nor redundancy in their opinions, or that they have reflected, without any admixture of human error, the revealed mind of God. It cannot be that the most absolute truth should not acquire some touch of imperfection, some taint of contamination from the earthly vessels in whom has been placed the priceless gift. Nor is it asserted that no precious fragments of the great diamond have found place in other Schools. But the Evangelical School has possessed the truth of God in a far higher and more complete degree than any other School, and by it has been linked backwards in an unbroken succession to the true Church of God that has worshipped Him in secret in all periods, to the Primitive Ages, to the glorious company of the Apostles, and to the Great Master Himself. The Spirit of God has accompanied the truth He has Himself revealed. In its ultimate source, the spiritual power of the School has therefore been nothing less than the operation of God the Holy Ghost on the intellect and heart and conscience of mankind. But here we prefer to speak by another, and by an impartial tongue. Sir J. Stephen, in his "Essay on Wilberforce," thus expresses himself:—

The human mind is subject to a sacred influence, which, like the wind, bloweth where it listeth, although it be given to none to discover whence it cometh, or whither it goeth. It is a fact which few, if any, self-observers will deny, that in the inward life of every man there are occurrences explicable on no hypothesis, but that of the direct intervention of the Supreme Ruler of the Universe for the spiritual improvement of His rational creatures. Such events may be considered, either as parts of some great pre-determined system, or as immediate interpositions of the Deity in particular cases. Each supposition alike refers to that Divine origin, those salutary changes in human character, which the least thoughtful so often notice, and which even the most depraved not seldom undergo.—Vol. ii. pp. 214, 215.

Then we reach a height where the varying fortunes of religious controversy and the hopes and fears of party strife lie far below. From the imperfect knowledge of man we pass into the sphere of Divine omniscience; from the mingled motives of human action into the cloudless atmosphere of Divine wisdom; from amid the shattered wrecks of human hope to the full sunshine of Divine accomplishment. As we look at the widespread and varied landscape, presented in the fortunes of the Church of Christ from the beginning, we see that the course of the spiritual kingdom has been that of progressive triumph. Like the course of the natural sun, its march has been ever onward. Now almost eclipsed by clouds, now dimmed with earth-born mists and fogs, now struggling up through drifting storms, it has yet risen higher and higher towards its zenith. The progress has been interrupted and irregular; but it has been sure. Not only faith, but even reason herself anticipates the full meridian, when, before the unclouded face of a manifested God, the last trace of human ignorance, the last doubt and fear, the last conflicts of faith will for ever pass away in the perfected manifestation of the Redeemer. That meridian will have no decline, that sun no setting, that "sacred high eternal noon" no evening. Then the saints of Christ will doubtless be permitted to see truth in its ultimate relations, and all the doctrines of our earthly faith will be found to have their origin, and to find their explanation, in the immutable realities of God Himself.

EDWARD GARBETT.

## ART. II.—THE CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

### ITS ORIGIN.

IT is a question whether there is any institution in the world that has engaged so much affection, and called forth so many prayers, as the Church Missionary Society. Of all Protestant institutions, whether religious or philanthropic, it is the one that certainly receives the largest amount of contribution and is most probably maintained by the largest number of contributors. There are tens of thousands of zealous friends throughout the country who are deeply interested in its welfare, and many amongst the number who are exercising great self-denial for its support. Some are persons of high distinction and wide-spread influence, while others are in the humblest walks of life, who are influential only with God; but all are united in one common desire to maintain and extend the sacred work in which, with one heart, they take so deep an interest. It is right, therefore, that the Church Missionary Society should have a foremost place in our new Magazine, and that its true character should be brought clearly before our readers.

This is the more important as there are some who stand aloof from it because they believe that it was formed in antagonism to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, and who consider its formation as an act of opposition to the previously existing missionary agencies of the Church. But it requires a very slight acquaintance with the real history of missionary work in the Church of England to convince any one that such was not the case. This Paper, therefore, shall be devoted to an examination of the state of things that led to the formation of the Church Missionary Society.

In order to understand its origin, it will be necessary to review the previous work of missions in the Church of England. For some reason or other there was very little done for the extension of the Gospel for the first century after the Reformation. The Reformers appear to have been so much occupied with the great conflict with Rome that their attention was not directed to the claims of the heathen world. There was, however, a holy line of devoted men, who, by their true missionary spirit, were faithful witnesses for the Lord. Such men as Hariot, who went with Sir W. Raleigh to Virginia in 1585; Hunt, who followed in 1606, and Bucke in 1609. But the real systematic commencement of English missionary work was made by the Puritans in the time of the Commonwealth. The first English missionary society

was called "The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England, and the Adjacent Parts." An ordinance of the Long Parliament in 1649 formed the corporation of the company. A Lord Protector's letter was afterwards sent round to all the parishes of England requesting contributions, and a sum of about 11,000*l.* was collected, with which certain estates were purchased. Charles II., on his accession to the throne, gave the company a royal charter. After a time Robert Boyle became the governor. He was a member of the Royal Society, and one of the leading philosophers of his day. So highly was he esteemed, that, though a layman, he was offered a bishopric, and urged to receive holy orders in order that he might accept it. But, though a philosopher, he was not one of those who exalt their philosophy above the Word of God. Like his contemporary, Sir Isaac Newton, he regarded the study of Divine truth as the highest of all philosophies. To him is ascribed the saying respecting Scripture: "That it is a river in which a child can wade and an elephant swim." This was the Society that sent forth those apostolic men, Eliot and Brainerd, the former of whom has been called "The Apostle of the Indians;" and its missions still exist. I have myself visited one of them in the Indian reserve on the banks of the Grand River in Canada, and there conversed with the chief of one of the six tribes, who has since become the highly-valued clergyman of an English congregation in the diocese of Huron.

The next great institutions for the spread of the Gospel were the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, founded A.D. 1698, and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, in A.D. 1701.

Thus, by the commencement of the eighteenth century there was a certain amount of Church organization for foreign work, but in the great mission field there was very little done. The primary object of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was the extension of Christian knowledge through books and education. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel was established for the benefit of English colonies, the colonists themselves being the primary objects of its labours.

But neither society was permitted to rest long without having the claims of the heathen forced on its attention, for there was a contemporaneous movement taking place in Denmark. It should never be forgotten that the Danes were the brave pioneers who led the way in our Indian missions. In the year 1621 the Rajah of Tanjore had allowed a Danish commercial company to purchase Tranquebar and a small surrounding territory, on the coast of Coromandel; and about the time of the formation of the two English Societies, Dr. Lutkens, one of the chaplains of Frederick the Fourth, King of Denmark, set before his Majesty the duty

of providing for the conversion of his Indian subjects to the Christian religion. He immediately received the king's commands to carry the suggestion into effect. Dr. Lutkens, therefore, was the real originator of English missionary work in India. When he had obtained the royal consent his first object was to find suitable men for the missions; and through the help of Dr. Franck, Professor of Divinity in the University of Halle, he was directed to two students pre-eminently qualified for the work, Ziegenbalg and Plutschou, who sailed for Tranquebar as the first Protestant missionaries to India in the year 1705. The beautiful spirit of faith in which they went forth is indicated by their account of their thoughts during a storm in the Bay of Biscay:—"The sight we had of the marvellous works of God cheered our spirits not a little; and the more the stormy and roaring seas broke in upon us, the more were the joy and praise of God increased in our mouths, seeing that we had so mighty a Lord for our Father, whom we may daily approach, and as confiding children put up our prayers to Him." Such language may teach a wholesome lesson to many of our modern Christians who are frightened out of all their joy by the first appearance of a storm.

But the people of Denmark do not appear to have realized the absolute necessity of steady help for the maintenance of a mission. The funds provided were insufficient, and the greater part of them were lost, as two ships were wrecked, each containing a remittance of a thousand crowns. The result was that the missionaries were reduced to great extremity, and their case was laid before the newly-founded Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. The Danish mission in India lay very clearly far beyond their appointed province; but Christian love has the noble art of bursting, or over-leaping, boundaries; so the managers of the venerable Society for once disregarded their charter, and sent a present of 20*l.*, with a case of books, and letters of encouragement. This gift may seem small in modern times, but it was considered so great then, that the Governor of Madras would not entrust it to Ziegenbalg's messengers, but required him to come himself to Madras in order to secure its safe delivery.

But the letters were more valuable than the money, not only because they express a beautiful Christian spirit, but because they establish a remarkable proof of the close bond of union between the Church of England and the Reformed Churches on the Continent. In one of them it was said:—

> May the Lord bless you whom He hath counted worthy to sow the first seed in a work which, in time, may grow to be the tree in whose branches the birds of the air may build their nests! . . . . We may go forth boldly, but it must be in the name of Christ. We may go

on, but it must be in His strength. When all who profess the name of Christ throughout the world shall hold together, as members of one body, in holy love, they will show forth great strength, and exercise a mighty, though secret, influence over the heathen, who then cannot but hear, see, and feel that there is a power residing in us to which they are strangers.

But the 20*l.* was soon gone, and the chartered boundaries began to reappear, so the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel were unable to renew their help. The appeal was then made to the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, but it was considered that they also would be stepping out of their proper sphere in appropriating to a Danish Mission to the heathen moneys contributed for Promoting Christian Knowledge in Great Britain and the Colonies. But the love of the Lord Jesus Christ was once more too strong for their rules, and the difficulty was overcome by opening a special fund for the Danish Mission. The result was, that from the year 1710 to 1826, when the Mission was handed over to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge had the high honour of leading the way in English missions to India, in maintaining the spirit of union with the Protestant Churches of the Continent, and in supporting some of the noblest missionaries ever known in Christendom—such as Gericke, Jænicke, and Swartz!

But the eighteenth century was a dull, dark period, and the missionary spirit appears to have made very little progress till near its close. During the century the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel sent out to the colonies some admirable men, including, as some may be surprised to find, John Wesley. But at the close of the century there was very little life in either of the two Societies, and their incomes were miserably small: that of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge amounting to 2280*l.* 7*s.*, and that of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel 706*l.* 0*s.* 1*d.* The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was, as I have just stated, still supporting the Danish Mission in Tranquebar; and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel was carrying on its own appointed work amongst the British possessions; but, with one exception, I meet with no record of any systematic effort for the conversion of the heathen. Those who were outside the British possessions were never thought of, and even those within the colonies appear to have been left to the zeal of any of the missionaries who might be labouring amongst the colonists in their neighbourhood. Thus, there was a zealous man who took an interest in the Maroons in the Bahamas; and a most devoted man, Mr. Stewart, afterwards Bishop of Quebec, who showed a warm-hearted missionary spirit towards the Indians in the neighbourhood of Kingston, in

Canada. But the only effort especially for the heathen mentioned in the Reports, was the payment of 50*l.* to a Mr. Philip Quake, "missionary, catechist, and schoolmaster to the negroes on the Gold Coast." This 50*l.* was half his salary, the remainder being supplied by the residents of Cape Coast Castle, amongst whom he appears to have laboured as a kind of lay-chaplain. As objections have been made to the employment of lay agency, and to co-operation with the non-Episcopal Reformed Churches of the Continent, it is important that the practice of these two great Church Societies should be carefully observed and remembered.

Thus, towards the close of the eighteenth century, there was very little being done by the Christians of England for the evangelization of the heathen world. The heathen within the British Dominions were in some cases cared for by the devoted men who were labouring as clergymen amongst the colonists; but, with the exception of the contributions to the Danish Mission at Tranquebar, the whole mass of the heathen outside the British Dominions were left to perish in all the miseries of heathenism. There was the whole Continent of Africa with its teeming population weltering in its blood, through the curse of the slave-trade. There was Palestine, India, China, Japan, and almost the whole of Asia, without one ray of Christian light. There was Australia, the islands of the Pacific, and New Zealand, without one witness for the truth; and neither of the existing Church of England Societies could regard any one of these vast spheres as falling within its province. Was there not, then, a need for some fresh organization that might devote its whole attention to the heathen world, and that might go forth as the bearer of the everlasting Gospel without any reference to chartered boundaries? Was there not a vast gap to be supplied? And ought not all loyal members of the Church of England to be thankful that at length it pleased God to rouse His people to a sense of their duty; and to lead them, without any interference with any existing institution, to make a fresh effort to fill the void?

But, considering the enormous magnitude of the work, how small was the beginning! When we look around at the present missions of the Church Missionary Society encircling the world, and then look back eighty years at its commencement, we may well say, as the Word of the Lord said to the Prophet Zechariah, 'Who hath despised the day of small things?" The idea of he new Society was first suggested in the house of the Rev. W. Goode, Rector of St. Anne's, Blackfriars, the father of that eminent theologian, W. Goode, the late Dean of Ripon, and that devoted man, Francis Goode, the author of "Goode on the Better Covenant." It was afterwards discussed at a meeting

of the Eclectic Society, a small clerical society held in the vestry-room of St. John's, Bedford Row. On March 18th, 1799, the subject of discussion was, "What methods can we use most effectually to promote the Gospel among the heathen?" The subject was opened by the Rev. John Venn, Rector of Clapham, the father of that great, noble-minded Christian statesman, Henry Venn, who for thirty-one years as its honorary secretary guided with consummate wisdom the affairs of the Society. He laid down three principles—

1. That success must depend entirely on the Spirit of God, and that God's providence must be followed, not anticipated.
2. That all success must depend on the persons sent on the missions. They must be men made by God.
3. The mission must proceed from small beginnings, and not enter on a large scale at first.

After which he submitted certain resolutions for the consideration of the meeting.

The Rev. Josiah Pratt advocated the adoption of the resolutions, "as breathing a quiet, humble, dependent spirit." The Rev. Charles Simeon, in a most characteristic manner, proposed three questions, "What can we do? When shall we do it? How shall we do it? and urged the meeting to immediate action.

The Rev. Thomas Scott, the commentator, gave the caution: "We must not expect too perfect missionaries."

The Rev. W. Goode summed up the discussion by saying that the difficulties only proved that there was no missionary spirit abroad, and urged them without delay to "form a plan and publish it."

The practical result was that on the 12th April, 1799, a meeting was held at the Castle and Falcon, Aldersgate Street, for the foundation of the new Society. There were present on that occasion seven rectors, one fellow of a college, two lecturers, two ministers of proprietary chapels, one curate, three other clergymen, and nine laymen—in all twenty-five brave men; without wealth, without the patronage of the great, without any agents to carry on their work, and, above all, without experience; but prepared to go forth in the Lord's name boldly to grapple with the heathenism of the world, for the simple reason that they believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, that they knew that He had said, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature," and that they trusted His promise, "I am with you always even unto the end of the world."

Such was the origin of this great institution, and such the commencement of the sacred, scriptural, and most blessed work, which it is our privilege to labour by God's grace both to maintain and to extend. Our position is, of course, entirely different to theirs. We have both encouragements and difficulties to

which they were total strangers. But, thanks be unto God! we have the same principles, the same hope, the same call from God, and the same blessed Saviour to be the Leader and Commander of His people. It is more difficult sometimes to maintain than to originate; but we may take courage from their experience, and remember that the same Lord who carried them through difficulties which seemed at the time to be insuperable, can help us through any difficulties which may arise, and enable us to hand on the sacred work unchanged in its principles, and vastly increased in its efficiency.

EDWARD HOARE.

## ART. III.—THE IRISH UNIVERSITY ACT.

### I.

AFTER many vain attempts and fruitless efforts to grapple with the question, a Bill has received the Royal assent, intituled "An Act to Promote the Advancement of Learning, and to Extend the Benefits connected with University Education in Ireland." Its passage through Parliament has been watched with no little anxiety by many persons, who, though willing to credit the Government with the best intentions, are unable to believe that it is possible to satisfy the so-called demands of the Irish people, without making concessions to the claims of the Ultramontane party, fatal to the advancement of sound learning in Ireland. It cannot be denied by any person acquainted with the subject that the claims of the Ultramontanes involve the submission of the education of Roman Catholics to the absolute authority of the Latin Church; nor can it be doubted by any well-informed and impartial person that education so conducted would narrow the mind and dwarf the intellectual stature. Under the most favourable conditions the aim would be rather to cultivate the memory than the reasoning powers of the pupils—the exercise of the latter being inconvenient; and when the standard could safely be kept low, without unfavourably attracting public attention, the results—as in Italy a few years ago—would be utterly unworthy to bear the name of education in any civilized country. No Government could long retain the confidence of the English people whose conduct justly exposed them to a suspicion that they were prepared to yield in this particular to the demands of the Roman hierarchy, whether advanced in their own name or in that of the people of Ireland. Suspicion is easily roused on this question, and it was perilous even to touch the subject. It is therefore not

surprising that the Bill promoted by the Government has been sharply criticized, and their policy severely handled.

It was asked, last July, why, if the Government could not give all that was desired, and if they would not give more than the Bill contained, did they stir the question at all? Why should they adopt a course which must end in disappointment for the Roman Catholics, and might lead to fresh embarrassments for themselves? These questions are plausible; they have been urged with considerable effect, and will doubtless be repeated; for it cannot be denied that with their present majority in the House of Commons the Government could have escaped for the moment from the difficulties of the position. One thing, however, ought to be borne in mind, in justice to the Government—that they did not stir the question. It is one which has been forced upon the consideration of every Government of recent years; indeed, it may be regarded as one of the questions, if not the main question, which broke up the Liberal party, brought about the downfall of the administration of Mr. Gladstone, the dissolution of Parliament, and the accession of the Conservatives to power. And though, as they were not bound by any pledges to deal with it, Lord Beaconsfield and his colleagues were for a time content—wisely, as we think—to let it alone, the Irish Papists in the House of Commons were not content to see it shelved. Ever on the watch to advance their own interests, and never unwilling to embarrass a Government, the Ultramontane party raised the question. The mistake they had made in 1873, and its result in 1874, seem to have taught them a lesson. They went warily to work. The late Mr. Butt was their agent. It was he who raised the question in 1876. His Bill gave it a definite shape in 1877; and when illness and death prevented him from prosecuting the notice which he had given for last Session, the question was taken up by the O'Connor Don. The Bill which he promoted as a measure for secular education proved on examination to be in fact a scheme for the endowment of denominational colleges, and, as such, it was met by the introduction of the Government Bill. It may be asked, why did they not content themselves with a statement of their objections to the proposal of the O'Connor Don, and rely upon their majority to defeat it? To understand this, we must dispassionately consider the position of the Government. Judging from the speeches made by Cabinet Ministers it would appear that their position was this:—

(1) They could not accept the Bill which was before them; they were not prepared to see a Roman Catholic University established in Ireland, and endowed with 1,500,000*l.* out of the Church funds. (2) They could not say that the existing system was in their opinion perfectly satisfactory, seeing that under it some

of the Roman Catholic subjects of the Crown were debarred by conscientious scruples—honest, though, as we think, mistaken—from giving their sons an University education. (3) They thought it right and just that these scruples should be respected, and were of opinion that they might be removed by a measure such as that which they subsequently introduced.

Whether we can entirely sympathise with this view of the case or not, it is sufficiently clear that, this being their opinion, her Majesty's Ministers could not well avoid the introduction of a Bill on the subject. Had they contented themselves with a simple statement of their opinions, their conduct would have raised expectations in Ireland which it is beyond their power to satisfy, whilst it would have created an amount of alarm and uneasiness amongst their Protestant supporters, which, though not well founded, would have been most injurious to the Conservative party. It must be conceded that, entertaining the opinions with which they are credited above, they adopted the right course in embodying their proposals in a Bill for the consideration of Parliament. Whether it was introduced in the right manner, or at precisely the right time and in the right form, has been questioned and may be disputed. The reasons which influenced the Cabinet, if they were fully known, might, in the public estimation, justify their proceedings entirely; with that we are not now concerned. The present Paper is intended rather as an historical *résumé* of recent occurrences, than as an apology for or a defence of the Government.

It is desirable that the country should clearly understand what has taken place; but it is even more important that it should be borne in mind that this Bill is only a beginning, and that now we are mainly concerned with the future. Whatever may be the intentions of her Majesty's Ministers, the Home Rule party have their own ideas of the terms of settlement which they will accept; and they have already given us a sufficient indication of their policy. They will take what they can get, and will agitate for more. They accept the present Act only on account of the destructive elements which it contains—as an "unsettling" Act. Doubtless there is a struggle before us, for which we need to prepare; and it is more important for us to realize that, and to make ready for it, than to question or to justify the policy of the Government.

The foregoing remarks are intended to lead up to a due appreciation of the present position of affairs. Whether we like it or not, a new departure has been taken by the Legislature and by the Ultramontanes. By passing the University Bill in its amended form the Legislature has, in effect, said: "The Roman Catholics are subjects of the Crown. Some of them entertain conscientious scruples as to mixed education in Ireland, which we can no longer ignore. Their education in the higher branches

of learning is a thing to be desired. We will not entertain any proposal which involves sectarian endowment, whether in the form of a direct vote of money, or in the shape of result fees to be paid to denominational teachers; but we will extend to the Roman Catholic youth of Ireland increased facilities and substantial inducements to obtain in Ireland, without frequenting colleges of which they disapprove, a degree which shall mark a definite attainment in intellectual culture." By their zealous support of the Bill the Ultramontanes, in effect, have said: "We see that we shall get nothing at all if we do not take what is now offered. We cannot get all we want; we will take all we can get *as an instalment,* and agitate for more." Meanwhile, those who regard the question from a Protestant point of view have been somewhat divided—but rather in action than in opinion. Whilst all have agreed that the dissolution of the Queen's University is a misfortune, and the proposal to create a new University on its ruins is open to risks and dangers from which a scheme for an extension of an existing University would have been free—some, on this account, have opposed the measure as a whole, or challenged details of which they disapprove; others, chiefly those found in the Conservative ranks, have thought it right, in the main, steadily to support the Bill. Their action has been influenced, amongst other considerations, by the conviction (1) that, as Protestants, we ought to do what is in our power to promote the sound secular education of Roman Catholics, and to give them all the assistance which we should desire to obtain for ourselves were the circumstances of the case reversed. (2) That the concessions made in the Bill, great as they are, and even unnecessary as they may appear to some of us, do not involve any question of principle, and when proposed, were accompanied by a definite pledge on the part of the Government that they would not countenance any direct or indirect endowment of Roman Catholic colleges. (3) That power is reserved to Parliament to approve or disapprove the scheme to be prepared under the Act, and hereafter to exercise, if need be, a permanent control over it, by voting the money required for its development. They thus supported the Bill as an indication that they were ready to do all they could to meet the wishes and the religious convictions of their Roman Catholic fellow-subjects; and further, as a deliberate declaration that they would not endow out of the public purse any institution over which Parliament can have no control, and for the efficient working of which it can take no sufficient precautions.

So much for the past. As to the future working of the University Act, we can only observe in the present Paper that the ultimate success of the scheme is still problematical.

JAMES MADEN HOLT.

## ART. IV.—WHERE ARE WE?

WHAT is the state and condition of the Evangelical body in the Church of England? This is a question which demands special attention just now. Where are we? What is our present condition? What are our future prospects? Let us see if we can supply an answer to these inquiries.

Whatever the cause may be, there is no doubt that the eyes of the public have lately been concentrated on the Evangelical body in a very marked and peculiar manner. When our late gallant champion, Dr. M'Neile, died, the *Times* at once contained a leading article declaring that Evangelicalism was worn out, decaying, and passing away. We were useful, forsooth, at one time; but we are played out, and our usefulness is at an end! When the probable sale of Exeter Hall was recently reported, the *Saturday Review* coolly informed its readers that this was a symptom of our decline, ignoring the notorious fact that the tide of fashion has run westward since the hall was built, and that the famous great room in the Strand at best is a most inconvenient, awkward place of meeting, with means of entrance and egress disgracefully insufficient, and far too long tolerated by the authorities. The *Church Times* continually tells the public that there is not a single real theologian in the Evangelical School—nobody, of course, being a theologian who does not agree with the *Church Times!* The *Guardian* gives us occasionally some faint praise, but never ceases to remind us that our views are sadly defective, and that our system does not meet the times. Mr. Gladstone in the *British Quarterly;* Mr. Lecky in the *Nineteenth Century;* Dr. Lang in the *Catholic Presbyterian*, all have been writing about us lately, and making us a text for articles of various kinds, tendencies, and proclivities.

I suppose we ought to feel much flattered by the amount of attention we are receiving, and the proofs supplied, that our existence is a great fact which cannot be ignored. We evidently live, and move, and have a being in the Church of England. But surely when the fierce light of public opinion is turned so fully upon us, it is common prudence to review our position, and see how we stand. If there are any real symptoms of decay in the Evangelical body, let us look them fairly in the face, and know what they are. If there are no such symptoms, let us show cause for our confidence. To bring the matter to a definite point, let us look back over the last fifty years, and compare the position of the Evangelical body at the end of that period with the position which it occupied in 1829.

It may clear the way if I remind my readers that the state of things as to religious parties within the Church of England has undergone a complete change since 1829. At that date it is not too much to say the Evangelical body formed the only distinct party of any activity within our pale, and that it had almost a monopoly of the life and zeal of the Establishment. No doubt from the days of Bishop Hooper and the Vestiarian controversy there were always two Schools, a "High" and a "Low" School of thought, among our clergy. But in 1829 the immense majority of Churchmen took very little interest in religious matters beyond a formal use of the Church's services, and perhaps the only bond of union among them, with a few bright exceptions, was a common dislike to Evangelical principles and practices, and to all who followed them. In short, outside the Evangelical body, as a general rule, sleepiness and apathy was the order of the day. I need hardly say that this Bœotian state of things has utterly and entirely passed away. Within the last fifty years two other distinct and active Schools of thought, beside the Evangelical, have crystallized and come into existence. I mean, of course, the High Church and the Broad Church. Each of these two Schools has its own distinctive opinions, and makes its mark on the nation. Each has attracted round it numerous adherents, each has also its own peculiar phraseology, its own literature, and its own organs in the press. Each party is rich in preachers, speakers, and writers, and zealous in pushing and maintaining its own views. Not least, each of the two can show as much laboriousness and diligence in ministerial work as we can ourselves, however much we may think it misdirected. The logical tendencies of the two parties at first sight seems to be in diametrically opposite directions. High Churchmen who push their principles to legitimate conclusions seem in danger of returning to Rome, and swallowing the creed of Pope Pius IV. Broad Churchmen who go all lengths seem likely to give up all creeds, and articles, and dogmas as fetters, and to cast them overboard like useless lumber. Within these three great Schools in 1879 the greater part of the energy and life of the Church will be found ranged.

The modifications, and subdivisions, and shades, and half-tones of these three great Schools of thought are so many and so delicate that I cannot pretend to enumerate them. Their name is legion. There are honest, old-fashioned High Churchmen of the School of Andrewes. There are equally honest Broad Churchmen of the School of Burnet. There are Ritualists, pure and simple, who make no secret of their dislike to Protestantism. There are Evangelical Ritualists, and Ritualistic Evangelicals. There are Broad Church Evangelicals, and Evangelical Broad Churchmen, and Broad Church Ritualists.

There are Eclectics, who try to pick a tit-bit out of every School, and partly agree with none, and partly agree with all. There are some zealous and active Churchmen who hold such rabidly outrageous opinions that, like the fly in amber, you wonder how they are in the Church at all, and why they do not go to their own places. There are some decidedly non-Evangelical men who really work so hard, and preach so much truth, that you feel "Cum talis sis utinam noster esses!" There are other zealous fellows much run after and admired, on whose pulpits you might justly write "Mangling done here!" and whose sermons, like Solomon's ships, contain not only gold and silver and ivory, but worthless apes and gaudy peacocks. In short, there are such complications of opinion in the present day that it baffles any attempt to classify all. For all this time, we must remember, there remains outside all Schools of English Churchmen a large residuum of men who are ever proclaiming that they belong to "no party," and hold "no extreme views," not knowing in their Arcadian simplicity that they form about the most distinct party in the land! Never, I suppose, were there so many distinct schools and religious parties as there are in England at the present day. It need not surprise us; it is the natural consequence of increasing intellectual life and thought; men are awake and will think and act. It is not an unmixed evil; we provoke each other to emulation; we keep each other in order. We almost all agree in loyal love to the Church of England; the man who tries to destroy the Church, because we are divided, will find that he might as well interfere in the quarrels of husband and wife. We may scratch each other's faces, but we will not allow any one else to do it. One curious fact, however, remains to be mentioned. Of the three great parties in the Church, the most isolated and unpopular among the clergy is our own. Whenever a question has to be settled by voting, all Schools of thought combine in voting against the Evangelical.

But after all, when we balance party against party within our pale, and measure their comparative strength, what is the precise position which the old Evangelical School occupies in 1879 as compared with fifty years ago? Are we weaker or are we stronger? Is our influence in England increasing or diminishing? Do we hold our own, or, like the later Roman Empire, are our boundaries contracting every year? Is our strength, like that of Caleb, equal to anything, or are we silently decaying and melting away? Is there any vigour left in our School, or are we, like extinct volcanoes, the cold memorials of a bygone power to shake the world? These are deeply interesting questions which ought to be looked in the face. I shall not shrink from looking at them and giving an answer.

Now, it is the fashion in many quarters just now to speak

of the Evangelical School of Churchmen as an effete and worn-out body. It pleases some to proclaim everywhere that our day is past and our work is done. We were once useful, like the old wooden three-deckers, but are now only fit to be laid up in ordinary or broken up. We are distanced in the Ecclesiastical race and left far in the rear. We shall soon be as useless as an old almanack or a stranded wreck on a sand-bank. Such is the talk of many. Mr. Gladstone once wrote in the *Contemporary* that Evangelical Churchmen are deficient in learning, and that their system "contains in itself the elements of disintegration." The organs of extreme ritualism declare that we are destitute of theological knowledge, and are rapidly falling to pieces. I believe some weak folk are frightened by all this "tall talk," and are preparing, like rats, to quit the sinking ship, or, like rabbits, to bolt into their holes. For my own part, I regard it all as "talk," which there is nothing whatever to justify. The wish is father to the words of these men. I see facts, great patent facts, which lead me to a very different conclusion. No doubt the faults and infirmities of the Evangelical body are not few, and it does not need a Solomon to discern them. No doubt we are only a minority in the Church of England. We never were anything else, and probably never shall be. If we pleased men, and all spoke well of us, we should not be servants of Christ. We are completely outnumbered by all the other Schools of thought combined together. We are comparatively a little flock among the clergy, while "the Syrians fill the country." But if any man means to tell me that on striking the balance of parties and analyzing the spiritual condition of each, he sees in the Evangelical party the signs of decay, I take leave to tell him that he is utterly and entirely mistaken. I will give him some plain facts to digest, and in the face of those facts I defy him to prove the truth of his assertion.

1. Does it look like decay when the Evangelical body occupies a commanding position, both in the pulpits of London and almost every other large town in England, which it certainly did not occupy fifty years ago? Where and in what number were the Evangelical clergy in the metropolis, in Marylebone, Paddington, St. Pancras, Westminster, Chelsea, St. Giles's, St. George's, Bloomsbury, Whitechapel, Spitalfields, Islington, Stepney, Greenwich, Southwark, in the year 1829, and where are they now? Where at the same date was the Evangelical body in Manchester, Salford, Liverpool, Birmingham, Macclesfield, Bradford, Sheffield, Newcastle, Sunderland, Gateshead, Hull, Nottingham, Derby, Cheltenham, Bath, Bristol, Clifton, Plymouth, and where is it now? I cordially dislike this numbering and counting. But necessity is laid upon me. Does this look

like a dying party, or a failing cause? Is this decay? I think not.

2. Does it look like decay when all over the land we possess the confidence of the majority of lay Churchmen—that is, of the middle classes and intelligent lower orders? That we are in a minority among the clergy I fully admit, and probably in the ratio of four to one in the south of England. An Evangelical clergyman has very little chance of being elected a proctor in Canterbury Convocation. But I firmly believe a return from the laity, if it could be obtained, would tell a very different tale. When the Public Worship Bill was before the House of Commons, which is the true representative of the middle classes, Mr. Gladstone, with all his tail of Ritualistic and Broad Church followers, never dared to go to a division. When Diocesan Conferences containing clergy and laity from all the parishes are brought together, and the churchwardens are fairly represented, you soon find that the speeches which elicit the most hearty response are those which are most thoroughly Protestant and Evangelical. When large masses of the population are brought together for religious objects in places like Manchester or Liverpool or Birmingham, you soon see that the good old principles of the Reformation—the principles of Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, and not of Laud—are the only principles they cheer and applaud. And does this look like decay or a dying cause? I think not.

3. Does it look like decay when our most distinctive doctrinal views and opinions can stand the test of sifting, searching, judicial inquiry, and can come out from such ordeal not merely unscathed and unharmed, but triumphant and victorious? Men used to say fifty years ago that Evangelical clergymen were little better than "tolerated heretics." They might be good earnest ministers, but they were not sound Churchmen. And too many of our party, I fear, with more meekness than book-knowledge, and more grace in their hearts than learning in their heads, used to hold their tongues, assume an apologetic attitude, and find nothing to answer. But since the Gorham case, and the Denison case, and the Mackonochie case, and the Purchas case, and the Bennett case, have been argued, and the arguments made public, I note that men have altered their tone a good deal, and changed their minds. Moreover, such books as Dean Goode's volumes on Scripture, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, and Dr. Blakeney on the Prayer-book, and Canon Mozley on the Baptismal Controversy, have made their appearance and stand to this hour unanswered and unrefuted. In short, people have found out that Evangelical Churchmen are as loyal and true Churchmen as any in the land. We hold our ground at Church Congresses, and are recognised as an honest integral part of the Church of England which has a right to be heard anywhere. A Congress in which

the Evangelical body was not represented would hardly be considered a Church Congress at all. We can set our foot down firmly, and speak with our enemies in the face, and defy any one to convince a jury that our distinctive views are not the views of the Articles and Prayer-book, if fairly, honestly, and harmoniously interpreted. If any are "tolerated heretics" now-a-days, at any rate it is not the members of the Evangelical body. And does this look like decay? I think not.

4. Does it look like decay when every kind of Evangelical machinery has been borrowed from Evangelical Churchmen by clergy of other Schools, and adapted to their own purposes? They confess by their actions that they find no tools like ours and can invent no better. To hear some people talk, one might fancy there never was any hymn-book before *Ancient and Modern*, and never any Mission Weeks till the Ritualists began them! But this notion is ridiculously and entirely incorrect. I boldly assert, and I defy contradiction, that lively hymn singing, special Missions at home, non-Liturgical Services, Lay Agency, Mission Women, Pastoral Aid Societies, Missions to the Heathen, Missions to the Colonies, Missions to Seamen, Missions to our brethren on the Continent—all, all, all were first started by the Evangelical body. Other parties have had the wisdom to borrow our engines, but have too often not had the grace to acknowledge where they got them. But does it look like decay when the rival Schools of thought are continually coming to our arsenals, like Russians to Woolwich, and getting patterns to work by in their own way? I think not.

5. Does it look like decay when the religious societies, supported by Evangelical Churchmen, are continually growing in wealth, power, attractiveness, and influence? Let any intelligent Englishman quietly study the history of such institutions as the Church Missionary Society, the Jews' Society, the Pastoral Aid Society, the Colonial and Continental Church Society, the Irish Church Missionary Society, the Bible Society, and the London City Mission. Let him mark the constant increase of income which, comparing one decade of years with another since 1829, each of these great societies can report. Let him remember that each of these societies represents and expresses the voluntary confidence of that important body, the middle classes in England, and that this confidence is evidently increasing. And then let him note the huge fact that the 4000 or 5000 Evangelical congregations of the Church of England raise more money by annual voluntary contributions for their own distinctive religious societies than is raised by all the non-Evangelical congregations put together! Does this look like a decaying School, a dying body, a worn-out party, a failing cause? I think not.

6. Does it look like decay when gatherings of Evangelical Churchmen are increasing and multiplying every year in numbers, size, and importance? Fifty years ago, the well-known Islington Meeting stood almost alone, and used to assemble with ease in the Vicar's library. I need hardly say no clergyman's library in London would hold it now. Within the last thirty years the annual meetings of the West of England lay and clerical, the Midland lay and clerical, the Northern Counties lay and clerical, the Home Counties lay and clerical, the Southport lay and clerical Societies—all based on Evangelical principles—have sprung into healthy existence and been most successful. I hear of no such large meetings being held by Ritualists and Broad Churchmen. Specious and plausible as their principles are, they appear to have no power of self-propagation and vital energy like our own Evangelical views. And does this look like decay? I think not.

7. Finally, does it look like a falling cause and a decaying School of Theology when the very doctrines which are the glory of the Evangelical body, and which we are constantly accused of teaching too prominently and exclusively, are resorted to at last with avidity by members of other parties. Not a year passes over my head but I hear of such cases, and I have no doubt that my experience is that of many. I hear of people who have spent their lives and strength in the ranks of Ritualism and Broad Churchism eagerly grasping simple Evangelical truths in their last hours, and taking comfort in the very thing which they used to hold cheap and even despise. I hear of them, as they go down the valley of the shadow of death, casting aside all their old favourite tenets, and talking of nothing but the blood of Christ, the righteousness of Christ, the intercession of Christ, justification by faith, and all those precious corner-stones of our system which in former days they used to say we used to make too much of. On the other hand, I never heard of one single case of a true-hearted Evangelical Churchman forsaking our principles in his last hour for Ritualism or Broad Churchism. Oh, no! The nearer men draw to the grave, the more they find out the value of simple Evangelical truth, without subtraction or addition, and the more determined they feel not to give it up. To use the words of William Romaine, "The truths, which they held as doctrinal principles in life, they find comforting in death." And does this look like decay? Does this look as if Evangelicalism were an effete and worn-out system? I think not.

In saying all this, I hope I shall not be mistaken. I abhor even the appearance of boasting. The defects and blemishes of our School of thought are so many that we have nothing to boast of, and much cause for humiliation. I could easily put my finger on not a few blots and blanks which require our serious atten-

tion. But I refrain, and leave this point for future consideration. I have said what I have to show my readers that a calm review of our position in 1879 affords strong reasons for thankfulness and encouragement. I have said it for the special benefit of my younger brethren in the ministry. I ask them not to be moved by the taunts and gibes of our rivals in other Schools, but to look at plain facts, and see what a tale those facts tell. To appreciate facts and depreciate talk is one mark of a wise man. I ask them, in short, to believe that the Evangelical party, with all its faults, shows no symptoms of decay, and is as strong as any School of thought within the Church of England, if not stronger. We are not a sinking ship. We are not worn out yet. We are not dead, but alive. Yes! by the help of God we continue unto this day, and by the same help I believe we shall continue and hold our own for many a long day, in spite of ridicule, contempt, and persecution. "We shall live and not die," as Wycliffe said to the Friars, and be a thorn in the side of the Pope and the infidel, and all their satellites and allies. We shall live and not die if we are only true to our old principles, if we will only work, and watch, and pray, and read, and understand the times.

But I repeat emphatically, we must be true to our old principles—the principles revived by Henry Venn, Romaine, Berridge, and Grimshawe, kept alive by Newton, Scott, Milner, and Cecil, handed down to us by Simeon, Daniel Wilson, Legh Richmond, and Bickersteth, kind and courteous to everybody, but stiff as steel in our adhesion to the old lines. We must steadily refuse to exalt things indifferent and secondary to the same level with the primary verities and weightier matters of the Gospel. We must beware of trimming, compromising, and conceding, under the vain hope of conciliating our rivals and catching them by guile, or keeping our young people from adopting what we disapprove. It is wretched policy to try to out-manœuvre our opponents by borrowing their uniform and imitating their drill. It is a policy which gains over no enemy and disgusts many friends. Saul's armour will not fit David. It is useless to go down to Egypt for chariots and horses. We cannot do better than stick to our sling and stones—the Word of God and prayer. We cannot improve on our old principles; then let us not lightly forsake them. We cannot make them popular; they never were and never will be. Let us put up with unpopularity if conscience tells us that Christ and truth are on our side.

I am no prophet, and in a changing world I dare not conjecture where the Evangelical party will be when another fifty years have passed over the Church of England. The drying-up of the Turkish Empire, the prevalence of Popery, infidelity, lawlessness, are dark signs of the age. It may be that sifting, trying times are before us. It may be that our numbers may be thinned, and

many may desert our cause under the pressure of incessant official frowns, persecution, ridicule, and unpopularity. But, come what may, I trust the Evangelical cause will always have a representative body in the Church of England, and a faithful remnant who can stand fire, and stand alone. If gaps are made in our ranks, I hope the cry will always be, as it was in the squares at Waterloo, "Close up, men, close up; let none give way." It was a grand saying of Lord Clyde on a memorable occasion, when some one talked of a battalion of the Guards retiring, "Sir, it would better that every man in Her Majesty's Guards should die where he stands, than that Her Majesty's Guards should turn their backs to the enemy." So say I this day to my Evangelical brethren, we have no cause for discouragement, despondency, or despair. Things are in a better condition in 1879 than they were in 1829. Then let us stand firm and fight on.

J. C. RYLE.

## ART. V.—ON SOME PRACTICAL RESULTS ARISING FROM THE INTRODUCTION OF A REVISION OF THE AUTHORISED VERSION.

THERE are sometimes periods in the history of religious thought when questions which at other times have agitated the Church have lain so long dormant that men's beliefs, while still sound dogmatically, have become, as it were, practically fossilised and lifeless. Such has been (I am speaking only of its action on the general untheological mind) the subject of the inspiration of the Word of God, its mode and its limits. Few of our ordinary lay Churchmen would be able to explain, even if they cared to think, what is the exact meaning of the term *Inspiration*. Practically, in quiet times, this may not be of much consequence. So long as the Bible is received as the voice of God speaking to man, so long as each definite statement is accepted when it comes to us under the sanction of that Book, it may be well to pass over the *mode* of inspiration, while simple faith receives the message with undoubting reverence and acceptance. A Church which had been ignorant of heresies throughout the whole period of its existence might not require the Nicean expansion of the Apostles' Creed, and might be only bewildered and perplexed by the refinements and dogmatic niceties of the Athanasian formulary. Now, for two centuries and a half the Authorised Version has been the sole text-book of the English-reading student of the Bible. Launched without

legislative or ecclesiastical enactment, it has, by its own intrinsic merits, absolutely superseded and supplanted every predecessor, not only in the Church of England, but in every English-speaking Protestant community in the world. Not one of the many other versions can now be procured, excepting as typographical curiosities, and almost all of them at prices which no other printed books, save Shakspeare, have ever reached.

This universal acceptance of the one version has not been without its effect on the popular mind, in its impressions of the meaning of Inspiration. Familiarity for generations with the *ipsissima verba* of the Authorised Version has led to an unconscious acceptance of the English words as being themselves literally inspired. Very often the preacher who suggests an interpretation differing from the received one is half suspected of irreverent audacity, or of "free-handling." How many popular errors are founded on half-texts wrested from their context, and twisted to suit the prevalent view! The passage, "Know ye not that your bodies are the temples of the Holy Ghost?" is continually appealed to as a proof of the necessity for assurance of personal salvation. In a series of lessons on Confirmation, published forty years ago, under the sanction of an eminent prelate, every passage in which the word "confirming" or "confirm" occurs in the New Testament was adduced as a proof of the Apostolic authority of the rite of Confirmation. "At the name of Jesus every knee shall bow" is appealed to as commanding an outward obeisance, in utter contradiction to the letter and spirit of the original (ἐν). It would be difficult to find a more reckless handling of the Word of God than cutting out the words "Hear the church" (Matt. xviii. 17), from the sentence of which they form a fragment, and building upon them a claim for ecclesiastical power. This scarcely falls behind the grotesque perversion in which Rowland Hill, when preaching against vanity, is said to have satirised this irreverent liberty by employing as his text the words, "Top not come down." The unfortunate use of the word "Hell," both to express Hades and Gehenna, has led to strange misconceptions in the popular mind. And who shall say how many timid souls have been troubled and repelled because the word "damnation" has come to bear a very different sense since our translators employed it to express κρίσις? But it is needless to multiply instances, which might be adduced without limit, especially from the handbooks of popular controversial Romanism.

Now, we may reasonably anticipate that in the forthcoming Revision many archaisms will be modified, as well as mistranslations corrected, while we may well trust the learned divines, who have been so long employed on this work, not needlessly to change the form of sentences, or in any way to modernise the diction, so as to impair the dignity and noble

simplicity of the grand old English Bible. But still changes there must be. How will these affect the popular belief? To many they may prove a rude shock; but yet, I believe, a shock which will be productive of much ultimate benefit, and will establish faith upon a firmer basis. Even as it is, not the uneducated alone are apt to pin their faith to their own interpretation of the words of the Authorised Version, and even in disputed interpretations of historical records to maintain their own view as though it were a matter of orthodoxy connected with the soul's salvation. This surely is none other than an exhibition of the same spirit which persecuted Galileo. On the universality of the flood, for instance, the common belief that it covered the entire earth, founded simply on the rendering that it covered "all the high hills that were *under the whole heaven*," loses all its support from Scripture, when we find that the same Hebrew words are used elsewhere in a very limited sense, as in Deut. ii. 25, where "under the whole heaven" can only possibly mean Canaan and the nations immediately adjacent. Had the original, instead of the Authorised Version, been appealed to, the elasticity of the Hebrew expressions would, as soon as recognised, have prevented many an apparent conflict between Revelation and Science. In all these difficulties as to the interpretation of Scripture, the controversialist much needs to offer up the prayer of St. Augustine, when perplexed as to the meaning of the inspired writer, "Do Thou, O Lord, either reveal that same sense to us, or whatever other true one pleaseth Thee, that whether Thou discover the same to us, as to that Thy servant, or some other by the same words, *Tu tamen pascas nos, non error illudat.*"

Now, if the Revision had been presented to the English public at a period of stagnation, or of tacit and indifferent acceptance of religious truth, the new rendering might in the course of a generation or two have become thoroughly naturalised and familiar to all classes, and have come into general acceptance without stirring any incidental questions. We can scarcely expect such results at present. The Bible is generally and fiercely, if not indiscriminately, attacked by avowed opponents on very different grounds, all, however, converging to one point—viz., that it is *inaccurate*—whether it be in its history, its science, its moral teaching, matters not. We of the Clergy must, to meet these foes, and to meet the difficulties they will raise, while unfurling the standard of Inspiration, know very clearly what we mean by it, and we must bring the subject before our people far more prominently than many of us have heretofore done. We must enable every man to give a reason for the faith that is in him. In the first place, we must beware that Christians be not led away by the plausible but pernicious sophistry that the Bible

*contains* the Word of God. We maintain, on the contrary, that it *is* the Word of God. To hold otherwise, would be to admit the pruning-knife of every self-constituted arbiter, whose "higher criticism," "inner consciousness," or "historical theories," would lead him to excise passages, chapters, verses—aye, and whole books—and to arrange and re-arrange authorships and chronology so as to suit his preconceived theories. It would give full scope to the shallow and unscholar-like captiousness of a Colenso, and to the ingenious audacity which mutilates and transposes the prophecies—*e.g.*, of Isaiah or Daniel—and thereby changes prediction into annalistic records.

We maintain not the Inspiration of a version, and, so far as the English reader is concerned, *verbal* Inspiration is impossible, but we must maintain *plenary* Inspiration. And this can be held as much of a carefully revised version as of an original. We welcome the new version if it casts light on disputed passages, and corrects the inappropriate expressions which have been already referred to. We shall be glad that it shall not be left to each scholar, preacher, or orator, to decide, *e.g.*, whether the text be right which says, "Thou hast increased the nation, and *not* increased the joy," or the margin which reads "and hast increased its joy."

Again, there is a sense in which, I presume, few will contend for the *verbal* Inspiration of the whole original, or that a Divine Providence watched over the transcribers of MSS. and prevented a mistake of a point or a comma. The vast numbers of various readings, increased as they are by the exhumation of each newly-discovered MS., would at once render this impossible. But the *plenary* does extend to the *verbal* when the word is important to the sense, and especially to the doctrinal teaching; and in such cases when find we ever a discrepancy? I mean that in such passages as Gal. iii. 16, Inspiration has guided the word "*seed*," not "seeds."

There are three leading views of Inspiration. First, that every idea and *every* word is inspired, or directly indited by the Holy Spirit's influence. This seems scarcely tenable without hedging it with so many limitations and safeguards as to transcription, as to render it scarcely the simplest mode of setting forth the doctrine. Second, that the ideas but not the words were inspired. This seems even more perilous, and however hedged and defined, must leave open the door to every subtle device of unbelief and false doctrine. Third, that every idea is inspired, and every sentence and word so far as to prevent anything being written which is inconsistent with truth. This last definition appears to present fewest difficulties, and to be the most easily definable—not that it is without its difficulties. The *mode* of Inspiration must ever be a difficulty and a mystery. If it were

not a mystery it would not be Inspiration, it would not be divine. In maintaining this latter view, we maintain that this inspiration is *plenary*, and that it is *superintendent*. By *plenary* we understand that the person inspired was superhumanly guided, not to lose his personal identity, as shown in his diction or his mode of thought, but to express only what the Holy Spirit dictated in words which, if his own, yet were superhumanly directed to enunciate the matter; and that the writer was so guided even when in many cases he but dimly guessed, or had no understanding at all, of the true meaning of what he wrote. (1 Peter i. 10, 11.)

By *superintendent* we understand, that when recording facts, as the story of creation, the description of battles, the records of nations or of families, the writer was so guided as to be preserved from writing anything contrary to historic truth, and that therefore historic error has no place in the narrative. That in recording speeches or letters, such as the speeches of Job's friends, of Gamaliel, of Tertullus, or the letter of Claudius Lysias, the sacred penman was both divinely directed to indite them, and was guided to indite them truly and accurately.

And if we are, as we must be, perplexed by difficulties under any view about solitary and isolated expressions which are not verbally accurate, but which convey truth—*e.g.*," the setting of the sun"—we must remember that the Bible had, while necessarily using human language, and clothing eternal truths in the ideas current in each writer's time, to fulfil an impossible condition—impossible for man, and possible only for God—it had to belong to all generations, and to speak intelligibly to men of every stage and diversity of culture and civilisation. This it still does. It still has its lessons for rich and for poor. It still exercises the same power, whether to raise from stolid brutishness the fishing Indian of Western North America, or to resist and correct the tendency of every form of higher civilisation to exhaustion and decay.

If our new Revision brings us nearer, not only to this idea but to the correct idiom of the original, so far as Oriental phraseology can be naturalised in Occidental expression, it will be a gain to every Christian student; and among its incidental benefits not the least will be that it will compel us of the Clergy to train our flocks in clear and definite views of the meaning of Inspiration; that they may have an answer to give to him that asketh them.

H. B. Tristram.

## ART. VI.—THE MOVEMENT IN MEXICO.

1. *The Work of the Church in Mexico: Timely Words from several Bishops.* New York: Whittaker, 2, Bible House.
2. *The Reformation in Mexico.* By the Right Rev. ALFRED LEE, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Delaware, U.S.
3. *The Mexican Branch of the Church, described by Eye-witnesses.* New York: Published by "The League in Aid of the Mexican Branch of the Church."

MOST of our readers, probably, have heard of the "Church of Jesus" in Mexico, and of the movement to which the founding of that Church is due. The movement is deeply interesting, and is likely, we believe, to lead to great results. Its initial stages, we have been informed, were connected with tracts bearing the honoured name of J. C. Ryle.[1] We are, therefore, the more inclined to regard it, in its all-important doctrinal aspects, as a thoroughly sound movement. It certainly has especial claims upon the readers of THE CHURCHMAN. It is Episcopal, Liturgical, and appeals, as does the Reformed Church of England, to the Word of God. A distinguished supporter of Missions writes to us: "I believe it to be a *doctrinal* movement; utterly unlike the Old Catholic affair. . . . . The most curious point is that the movement is attacked both in front and in rear; on one side by certain High Churchmen as 'Protestant,' 'Fanatical,' and 'Low,' on the other side by Plymouthites, and, I am sorry to say, by certain Presbyterians and Methodists, as 'High,' 'Ritualistic,' &c. The truth is, however, it is doctrinally sound. . . . . In reality, I regard it as the most healthy and satisfactory movement we have had since the Reformation. . . . . Not the least interesting point is that they are framing their Liturgy on the lines of the old Mozarabic—ancient Spanish—Liturgy. This is wise, and will conciliate Spaniards." Time will show, we believe, that our correspondent is not unduly hopeful.

At present we are unable to do more than give a brief sketch of the history of "the Church of Jesus," with a few extracts from American documents. At the beginning of the

[1] From private advices we learn that Bishop Riley has translated several of Mr. Ryle's tracts into Spanish. The tract which the converted friar Aguas calls "True Liberty" was Mr. Ryle's "Are you Free?"

present year there were six ordained Presbyters, several candidates for the ministry and a lay reader to each congregation. There were about 3500 regular members, and about as many more casual members. There were three churches in the capital; the church and chapel of St. Francis, the church of St. Joseph, and one in the ex-convent of St. Anthony. Several congregations have built a house of prayer, according to the scanty means they possess.

From a statement prepared by the Rev. H. Dyer, D.D., of the diocese of New York, soon after his return from Mexico, we quote the following:—

In 1865 there commenced in the city of Mexico a religious movement, having reference to the establishment of an independent Mexican Church. This movement was manifestly inspired by the Holy Ghost and the Word of God. For a time it was under the supervision of a former Roman Catholic Presbyter, by the name of Aguilar, and of a layman by the name of Hernandez. The Bible was freely circulated. The Rev. Dr. Riley, then in this country,[1] heard of this work, and had many pamphlets published in the Spanish language, and sent them to Mexico for distribution. The Liberal Government, then under the presidency of Benito Juarez, a pure Indian of the Aztec race, sympathised with this movement, and rendered it such support and protection as it could. In 1868 it had made such progress as to justify the sending of a delegate to the United States to make known to the Christians here its character and its promise. On reaching our city this delegate petitioned Dr. Riley to go himself to Mexico. Accordingly, towards the end of 1868, he left New York, and soon after was actively employed in his new field of labour. By reason of his birth and early training in a Spanish-speaking country, he had great facilities in the prosecution of his work. He was most cordially received by the lovers of a pure Gospel, and rendered very effective service. He continued his labours for a year and a quarter, during which time the movement was organised under the name of the Church of Jesus in Mexico. After this Dr. Riley spent some time in the States, making known and advocating the claims of this enterprise. In 1871 he returned to Mexico, and was soon joined by Manuel Aguas, a very distinguished Presbyter of the Roman Church. They secured and opened the large church of St. Joseph, and the chapel of the famous church of San Francisco. Under the united labours of these two earnest men the interest rapidly increased, and extended throughout the city and into the country.

Concerning the Presbyter Aguilar mentioned in the previous ex-

[1] Mr. Riley, a Presbyter of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, of American parentage, but of Chilian birth and education, was then ministering in the Spanish tongue to an Episcopal congregation in the city of New York. In view of the admirable fitness of the Rev. Henry C. Riley for the work in Mexico, it is no presumption to recognise the hand of God in this call.

tract, Bishop Lee gives interesting information. "When the attempt was made to seat the unfortunate Maximilian upon the throne of Mexico," writes the Bishop, "advantage was taken of the new condition of things to introduce a considerable supply of copies of the Bible in the Spanish tongue. This was especially done by the British and Foreign Bible Society. Some of the precious seed fell upon ground prepared by Divine grace for its reception. Among those thus enlightened was a priest named Francisco Aguilar."

Upon him the reading of the volume produced like effects as upon Luther in the convent of Erfurth. He not only rejoiced in the discovery which was so precious to his own soul, but he longed to extend to others the blessings he had found. By him the first Protestant congregation, for the worship of God in the Spanish tongue and the preaching of the Gospel was gathered in the city of Mexico. The thought of Aguilar was to establish a Reformed Catholic Church, evangelical in doctrine and assimilated in model and polity to the primitive Apostolic pattern. He began with a little congregation of about fifty persons, which increased steadily under his assiduous labours. But his course was a brief one. His own exertions were exhausting, and persecution, none the less malignant if restrained from actual violence, was exceedingly harassing. Within two years he succumbed, pressing, in his last moments, the Bible to his heart. Among his papers was found the translation of a little volume, in which the right and duty of every man to search the Scriptures was powerfully argued. This was published by the Rev. H. C. Riley, and proved an effective ally to his work.

Mr. Riley arrived in Mexico in 1869. He re-collected, as far as practicable, the scattered flock of Aguilar, teaching both publicly and from house to house. The Romish party, unable to crush him by violence, determined to employ argument. For this purpose they selected one of the most eminent and learned ecclesiastics of the capital, Manuel Aguas, a Dominican friar, and very popular as a preacher. He examined Mr. Riley's publications with the intention of preparing a refutation. But the Lord led him by a way that he knew not. He was himself vanquished by the power of the truth. "There fell from his eyes as it had been scales." He discovered that he had been all his life in darkness, and that the work he had undertaken to oppose was of the Lord. He sought personal conference with Mr. Riley, and after painful conflict and deep searchings of heart, he joined himself to that which he had been wont to look upon as an odious and heretical sect. A more striking conversion we hardly remember.

On the character and career of Aguas we cannot now dwell. In 1872 he rested from his labours. A most interesting letter was published in October, 1871, by Manuel Aguas, Bishop-elect

of "the Church of Jesus," and we quote a few sentences in which he refers to his conversion:—

I was in this sad state when there reached me the pamphlet called "True Liberty." I read it most carefully; and, notwithstanding that I tried to find, in the arsenal of my Romish subtleties, arguments with which to answer the clear reasoning that I found in this publication, a voice within—the voice of my conscience—told me that my answers were not satisfactory, and that perhaps I was in error. . . . . I commenced to study the Bible, without paying any attention to the Romish notes and interpretations. This study, from the moment that it was accompanied by earnest prayer, led me to true happiness. I commenced to see the light. The Lord had pity on me, and enabled me to clearly understand the great truths of the Gospel.

We may add, in closing this preliminary Paper, that on June 24th, 1879, the Rev. H. C. Riley, D.D., was consecrated Bishop of the Mexican Reformed Church, in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, by six Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. According to the Boston correspondent of the *Guardian*,[1] the Bishop of Maryland, the seventh of the Bishops who had conducted the negotiations with the young sister Church, was prevented by his infirmities from taking part in the consecration. The form of consecration was, for the most part, that of the American Ordinal; but the solemn promise of conformity was necessarily different, and was in the following words:—

In the name of God, Amen.

I, Henry Chauncey Riley, chosen Bishop of the Mexican Branch of the Catholic Church of our Lord Jesus Christ in the Valley of Mexico, in the Republic of Mexico, do hereby promise conformity and obedience to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the said Mexican Branch of the Catholic Church of our Lord Jesus Christ, as the same are set forth in the covenant entered into between the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America and the said Mexican Church, ratified by the said Bishops in Council on the 29th day of October, in the year of our Lord, 1875, and by the Synodical authorities of the said Mexican Church on the 5th day of January, in the year of our Lord, 1876.

So help me God, through Jesus Christ.

The consecration of Dr. Holly to the Episcopate of a new and independent sister Church in Hayti, with the consecration of a Bishop for "the Church of Jesus" in Mexico, are signs of a change in the policy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.

---

[1] *Guardian*, July 23rd, 1879.

## Art. VII.—HISTORY FROM MONUMENTS.

1. *A History of Egypt under the Pharaohs, derived entirely from the Monuments.* By Henry Brugsch-Bey. Translated from the German by the late Henry Danby Seymour, F.R.G.S.; completed and edited by Philip Smith, B.A. In 2 vols. London: John Murray. 1879.
2. *Ægypten und die Bücher Moses'.* Von Dr. Georg Ebers. Leipzig. 1868.
3. *Durch Gosen zum Sinai.* Von Dr. Georg Ebers. Leipzig. 1872.
4. *Histoire Ancienne des Peuples de l'Orient.* Par G. Maspero. Paris. 1876.
5. *Etudes sur l'Antiquité Historique.* Par M. Chabas. Paris. 1876.

So recently as the year 1822 a letter of Jean François Champollion, written after long study of the three inscriptions on the so-called Rosetta Stone, foreshadowed to his correspondent, M. Dacier, the true system of interpreting the hitherto mysterious hieroglyphics of Egypt. The key thus once obtained, successive scholars have, with wonderful skill, advanced in this fascinating study, till now, in less than fifty years from Champollion's death, the author of this "History of Egypt" can put it on his title-page that it is wholly derived from the monuments.

This age has, indeed, been marked by nothing more striking than its recovery of the secrets of antiquity. Sir Henry Rawlinson has transcribed and translated the great rock inscription of Behistan, on which Darius once more speaks in his own words to us; Layard has disentombed Nineveh from the mounds of the desert; Schliemann has brought back Troy with its royal treasures, and at Mycenæ has recovered for us the golden jewels, shields, masks, and armour of Homeric kings; Dennis and others have laid bare the tombs of Etruria, with their wonders of ancient art; the Germans have unearthed priceless treasures in Olympia; Italy has been made to yield details of the household feminine life of the age of Lucretia, or earlier—its workboxes and its toilette cases, with their frail contents; the sanctuaries of Venus in Cyprus and the tombs of her worshippers have enriched our museums; and if Palestine has not been productive in works of art, it has yet yielded many of its topographical details. Ages that were remote at the birth of Christ have been quickened into a posthumous vividness for which the scholars of the past could never have hoped.

Among them all, however, Egypt holds the first place of wonder, for the valley of the Nile was the seat of high civilisation when "The Friend of God" was still wandering through it with his flocks and herds. It is, indeed, a question far from settled how far back we may place the rise of Egyptian national life and culture, but it must have been very ancient; for even Mr. Stuart Poole, one of the most moderate of Egyptian scholars in his demands, assigns it to the year B.C. 2717, or about 700 years before Abraham.

The uncertainty of Egyptian chronology is still, undoubtedly, extreme. The date of the first king, Menes, is fixed by Boeckh at B.C. 5702; by Unger at B.C. 5613; by Professor Owen at about B.C. 5000; by Mariotte Bey at B.C. 5004; by Brugsch at B.C. 4455; by Maspero at B.C. 4500; by Lanth at B.C. 4157; by Chabas at B.C. 4000; by Lepsius and Ebers at B.C. 3892; by Bunsen at B.C. 3059; by Dr. Birch at about B.C. 3000; by Stuart Poole at B.C. 2717; and by Sir Gardiner Wilkinson at B.C. 2691. Thus, between the highest and the lowest estimates there is a difference of 3011 years.

The fact is, the Egyptians, like the Hindoos, had no idea of chronology in the modern sense. Fragments of an old Egyptian history by a priest, Manetho, still remain; there is a list of sixty-five kings from Menes, on a stone known as the Table of Abydus; a worn record, known as the Turin papyrus, with another list; and a tablet, known as that of Saqqarah; but no one can tell how many of the kings named were contemporary, either as heads of separate divisions of Egypt, or on the same throne; and each reign is an independent starting-point from which the events it yielded have their date. "It is only from the beginning of the twenty-sixth dynasty (that is, from B.C. 666)," says Brugsch, "that the chronology is founded on data which leave little to be desired as to their exactitude." "Instead of growing less," he adds, "the difficulties in determining the chronological relations of Egyptian history are, on the contrary, multiplied day by day."

Nor is the proposal to assign an extreme antiquity to Egyptian civilisation from apparent evidence of other kinds more safe. Even so acute a mind as that of Ebers[1] relies on the discovery of fragments of pottery, &c., at great depths in the Nile mud; but other fragments of indisputably Greek origin, and hence comparatively modern, have been found at least as far down; and Robert Stephenson found a brick with Mehemet Ali's stamp on it at a greater depth than that of the supposed prehistoric fragments. No wonder that Sir Charles Lyell speaks of it as "not worth while to notice such absurdities." The

[1] "Ægypten und die Bücher Moses'," p. 22.

presence of stone tools in the Egyptian tombs was also thought to indicate their almost fabulous age, but M. Chabas has satisfactorily shown that similar tools were in use in the latest historical periods of Egypt, and are even now not uncommon in the districts outside.[1]

The origin of the strange people who settled in the Nile valley has been thought by many, of late years, to have been Asiatic; not, as was formerly supposed, African. Ebers, who agrees with Brugsch, tells us that "they were of Caucasian descent, and, as the table of nations in Genesis shows, wandered along with other tribes whose skin we may believe first darkened at a later time under the glowing sun—into the north-east of Africa, apparently by way of Arabia."[2] The skulls of mummies show Caucasian peculiarities, not African, and the Egyptian language, according to both Ebers and Brugsch, not only shows no traces of derivation from African sources, but reveals intimate connections with the Indo-Germanic and Semitic dialects. Thus, we have to recognise in the mysterious community to which we owe the pyramids a distant blood relation to ourselves. Yet the question can hardly be regarded as quite settled, for Dr. Birch still maintains that the Egyptians were derived from an African source which developed itself, under unknown conditions, to a degree to which civilisation never reached elsewhere in antiquity.[3]

For a vivid picture of the pre-historic times of ancient Egypt we must look rather to Ebers than to Brugsch or Maspero. The early settlement of the Delta from the north by Phœnicians; their gradual clearing away the forests of reeds with their hippopotomi, crocodiles, &c., as the forest is cleared off in Canada, and their establishment of busy trading ports on the coast, is drawn out with marvellous skill from materials which would be deemed worthless by any one less skilled in comparative philology. Settlement of the central or more southerly parts of the country proceeded side by side with this Punic invasion, agriculture and the breeding of cattle forming the staple industries. The Nile then, as now, determined the seasons of labour, but it also bore from the earliest ages a first place in the civilisation and prosperity of the land, by furnishing a highway for commerce and travel, in its main stream and greater canals, and by its inundations, and the wide irrigation of its borders by its waters. The Pharaohs themselves did not disdain to sail along the sacred river on the great festivals, in the gorgeous royal ship, or to perform mystic rites in honour of agriculture, and the priests

[1] See Chabas: "Etudes sur l'Antiquité Historique," *passim.*

[2] "Ægypten und die Bücher Moses'," 53; Brugsch, i. 2.

[3] "Congrès International des Orientalistes de 1873," p. 66. Paris, 1876.

taught that the happiness of the future world would consist in tilling the fields of the underground paradise, in feeding and tending the cattle of the subterranean god Osiris, and navigating the breezy water of his realm in slender skiffs. Thus, the husbandman, the shepherd, and the boatman were the founders of the peaceful life which flourished in the valley of the Nile.

Life in the remote ages of this primitive race was much the same as it is with ourselves. The pictures left by them on their tombs, the inscriptions carved on stone, and the records preserved on sheets of reed-paper, show that they clung to life and rejoiced in it, as they well might, in their sunny land. The prayer that they might reach the "most perfect old age" of 110 years constantly meets us. They laughed, they sang, and made merry; roamed the marshes to hunt or fish, and made the meadows echo with their holiday sports. Even the tombs witness to their fondness for jokes and sallies of wit; to their satire on their neighbours, and their cheery way of looking at all things. The working classes had their varied callings then, as now. They toiled in the field, or tended the herd, or steered and rowed their craft on the Nile. Stone-workers abounded from the earliest ages; gold, silver, copper, and iron were wrought into jewellery, tools, and weapons; wood and leather were put to countless uses; glass-works had their sweltering populations; rope-works were busy; the basket and mat-maker drove a good trade; sculptors and painters were in honour; and the potter's wheel restlessly moulded the rich clay into vessels of every shape.

But, after all, society was rotten at the core, for the richer or ennobled classes looked with contempt on labour, and spoke of the masses as the "stinking and miserable mob." The Bible alone, in antiquity, shows respect to man as man, and addresses itself to all classes with a recognition of the essential equality of the whole race. The Egyptian king was the visible divinity, addressed and worshipped as such; the nobles lorded it in grand palaces, and were followed by trains of dependents and slaves; the priest, the scribe, and the military were privileged classes; but the toiling millions suffered only in a measure less than the wretched fellahs of to-day. The stick then, as now, settled matters between the tax-gatherer and the peasant. The names of the kings who built the two loftiest pyramids were never uttered even in the days of Herodotus, from the bitter hatred of their oppressions, burned into the heart of the nation long ages before. It was not the Hebrew only who suffered from the tyranny of taskmasters; the degraded classes of the Egyptians themselves had to bear as hard a lot. That Moses should address himself to *the people* was an utterly new era in history.

Menes himself may be a mere name, but his reign at least

serves as a starting-point for history. While he himself is the reputed founder of Memphis, we ere long find in the records of his successors notices of the construction of great public works, of the introduction of the embalmment of the dead, of great military expeditions; of the building of the pyramid of Sakkarah; of the introduction of animal worship; of the sanction of female sovereigns; and, in short, of all that marks a state in which the royal, priestly, and military constitution is elaborately defined, and the arts fully developed. Architecture, unequalled since in its massive grandeur, and involving a mastery of geometric knowledge amazing in any age, filled the mind with wonder. The hugest masses of stone could be borne down the Nile from the cataracts, transported to their required site, polished and fitted to their place, with a skill we could hardly now equal. Sculpture in the hardest materials was perfect, within the limits of conventional rules. The system of hieroglyphics, so elaborate and ingenious, had been brought to perfection. Memphis was a city of temples, and swarmed with prophets and prophetesses, priests and scribes. The vast tombs which Job describes with wonder as the "desolate places," which kings and counsellors of the earth had built for themselves, had been constructed in vast numbers. The Pharaoh had risen so high over his subjects that they worshipped him as a god, and spoke of him as "his holiness," approaching him only in lowly prostration, with their faces touching the earth. His palaces were in keeping with his majesty, and were thronged by courtiers. The ceremonial of state and of religion was alike elaborate and settled. Grades of nobility were minutely fixed with their rights and precedence. High dignitaries had, respectively, charge of the Pharaoh's wardrobe, hair, nails, and bath. Others had the care of the royal amusements, the singing, playing, and entertainments of the Court. Still others were set over the royal magazines of wheat, fruit, and oil; the cellars, the bakeries, the shambles, and the stables. High inspectors had under them the domains, the farms, palaces, and even the lakes and canals of the crown.

Nor were the great nobles of Egypt, as Abraham saw them, less strikingly surrounded by all the refinements of an elaborate and artificial civilisation and luxury. Their estates were cultivated by slaves; their households full of domestics. Each had around him, for his special pleasure, his own tradesmen and artificers of every kind; the glass-blower, the gold-worker, the potter, the tailor, the barber, the baker, and the butler. The effeminate luxury in their palaces rivalled that of the palaces of Rome more than two thousand years later.[1] The acrobat and the

[1] "Friedländer, Sittengeschichte Roms," 3, 87 ff.

dancer, the harpist and the singer, and many others, strove to while away his evenings. His chief glory, however, was in his farm, with its flocks and herds, his household with its throng of slaves and artisans, and in his luxurious yachts on the sacred river. The use of the horse in riding is not seen on the monuments till the eighteenth dynasty, about B.C. 1700.[1] As yet he contented himself with the stately Eastern ass, and he did not as yet know of wheeled conveyances, which also came later. The cat purred at his hearth, the dog ran at his side, and he amused himself with pet apes. Oxen of different kinds fed in his meadows, and he hunted the gazelle and the antelope. Veal and beef, varied by hyæna, graced his table, but he shuddered like a Jew at the idea of pork, and cared little for mutton. Ducks, geese, doves, and pigeons, wild and tame, were as common as now, but the domestic fowl had not yet been introduced to Egypt. His bread was of barley, but he varied it by biscuits and pastry. Grapes, figs, and dates furnished his desserts; and wine and beer his drink. Dressed in pure white linen, he as yet walked barefoot; but gold collars, bracelets and anklets, showed his wealth, and he carried a wand for dignity. At his feasts he reclined on elegant couches, but his pillows were only wooden head-rests. His chairs, stools, and household furniture were simple but elegant. There were no roses as yet in Egypt, but the lotus supplied him with garlands at his banquets, and he often held it in his hands.

Yet, with all his delight in life the Egyptian was unable to forget for any length of time that death and the world to come were near. Even in Abraham's day stupendous pyramids, the burial-places of kings, overlooked Memphis, and at their feet, in deep pits, the walls of which were covered with pictures and inscriptions, lay the innumerable dead. Preparation for the judgment-day, after death, was the great duty of life which included all others. A high morality was taught in the sacred books, however contradicted in practice. Affection towards wife and children, kindness to the poor and wretched, and reverence to the gods, were strongly urged, but the gods were supposed to be incarnate in the sacred animals; and the good works done to the miserable were more than outweighed by the oppression which prevailed. Then, as now, not a few led quiet and pure lives, but vice and sensuality were only too common. Egypt was a paradise for the rich, but a land of sorrow for the mass. Its religion was lofty in word, but debased and degrading in practice.

Brugsch places the immigration of Jacob into Egypt B.C. 1730, under the Hyksos, or Shepherd kings, whom he describes as

[1] Brugsch, i. 295.

Syrians, with Shashu—this is Hyksos, or Shepherd Arabs—as allies, and the aid of Phœnician and other Shemitic settlers already established in Lower Egypt. A memorial stone of the time of Ramses II., the Pharaoh of the Oppression, speaks of the reign of a Hyksos king 400 years before, and as Ramses reigned about B.C. 1350, this would carry us back to B.C. 1750. Remembering, in connection with this, that Deuteronomy [1] speaks of the Hebrews as having spent 430 years in Egypt, to the time of the Exodus, their immigration falls under the Shepherd kings—a time which exactly accounts for their kind reception as a pastoral clan. An inscription found in one of the tombs of the date of Joseph is quoted by Brugsch for its striking corroboration of the seven years' famine of which Scripture speaks. It records a famine which lasted many years, during which the dead man tells us he issued out corn to the city "at each famine." Such successive dearths, rising from a deficiency of water in the Nile year after year, are so rare, that the Bible narrative of those in Joseph's day is the only instance known. There can be little doubt therefore that this inscription, written in Joseph's life-time, alludes to the famine to which he owed his elevation in the land.

Dr. Brugsch's illustrations of the Scripture narrative of Joseph from Egyptian sources is less full than that of Dr. Ebers, but is very interesting. The word used in Genesis for "bow the knee," Abrek, is a Shemitic one, but is still preserved in the hieroglyphics. The name Zaphnatpaneakh, given to Joseph, means "governor of the Sethroitic nome," [2] a district on the north-east border of Egypt, where his brethren were settled as a frontier guard to protect the country towards Syria. The Egyptian offices, Adōn (lord) and Ab (father), which Joseph attributes to himself before his family,[3] though Shemitic words, were official titles under the Shepherd Pharaohs who had adopted Egyptian manners while retaining in many cases their own Shemitic words. Indeed, they are still found on the monuments. Asnat, Joseph's wife, bears a purely Egyptian name of the old and middle empire. Strange to say, the story of his trouble with the wife of Potiphar, or Putipar, "the gift of the sun," seems to have been a not uncommon one in Egypt, for we find a narrative very like his in a story preserved on a papyrus roll. Brugsch gives an extract from it, but those who wish to read it in full, will find it in the second volume of "Records of the Past." [4] It has been thought by some that a striking support to the Bible narrative is to be found in the fact that the Shepherd kings discountenanced the religion of Egypt, and worshipped as their Supreme Divinity the god

[1] xii. 40.

[2] Brugsch gives the meaning of the word in full as "Governor of the district of the place of life."

[3] Gen. xlv. 8. [4] Bagster, London.

Sutekh—a god of Syria. This, it has been conjectured, was no other than Jehovah, whom the Shepherd kings had introduced in honour of Joseph. But Brugsch tells us that Sutekh was "the origin of all that is bad and perverse in the seen and unseen worlds—the opponent of what is good, and the enemy of light,[1] a description which leaves no room for an identification with the God of the Hebrews—the gracious and merciful Jehovah.

The monuments begin to preserve a clear record of history from the time of Joseph, after whose death the Hyksos kings were expelled, and shepherds became a "pestilence" to the Egyptians. It is curious to find that, not long after Joseph's day, Europeans formed a corps in the Egyptian army.[2] The negro had not been introduced by war or otherwise, so far as the monuments show, in Abraham's time, but from that of the next dynasty they had become a growing part of the population, especially in the south. Egypt had, besides, now made acquaintance with many other nations—European, African, and Asiatic.

The four centuries after Joseph were the most glorious period in Egyptian history. The victories of Thotmes III., the Egyptian Alexander, illustrated by contemporary documents, fill a large space in the pages of Dr. Brugsch, and are intensely interesting, from the insight they give into the condition of Palestine at that early time. His wars with the various nations then holding it reveal a wealth and civilisation among them, long before the days of Moses, for which few would be prepared. The account of the Khita, or Hittites, in the beginning of Dr. Brugsch's second volume, will be thoroughly fresh to most readers, though Ebers has also given an intensely interesting sketch of them in his wonderful story, Uarda. Ramses II., the Sesostris of the Greeks, fills a long space in Dr. Brugsch's volumes; and as he appears beyond question to have been the Pharaoh of the Oppression, it is well that it is so, for nothing can be more interesting than the numerous contemporary documents illustrating his long reign of sixty-seven years. The vast number of monuments he left all over Egypt fill up his story, indeed, with a vivid minuteness which makes one forget as he reads, that it illustrates a life ended at least 1300 years before Christ, while Moses was still an Egyptian courtier, or perhaps a fugitive in Midian. His journey to Thebes, to the feast of Amon, and his return to his great palace at Zoan-Tanis, the scene in his successor's reign of the miracles of Moses[3]—his great war with the Khita, as celebrated in the contemporary epic of the poet Pentaur—his repeated campaigns in Palestine, with long details, written at the time, of the incidents of the war, and lists of the prisoners and booty taken; his

[1] I. 236. [2] Chabas, 221. [3] Num. xiii. 22; Ps. lxxviii. 12, 43.

negro-hunting raids in Ethiopia and Libya; his mighty erections at Karnac and elsewhere, still the wonder of the land; the state of Egypt under his reign, and much else, bring the whole period before the mind as if it were recent history. Nor are side-lights to the main story awanting. Dr. Brugsch believes he has discovered the name of the overseer of the Israelites in Egypt, and he gives descriptions of Zoan-Tanis, the capital, from a letter of the time; a criticism on the literature then in fashion, from a contemporary pen; thinks he has found out the name of the princess who rescued Moses from the Nile, and shows that the name of the great lawgiver is connected with that of an island in the Nile, in an inscription of about a hundred years after the death of Sesostris.[1]

Interesting notices of Zoan, the centre of the Egyptian monarchy in the time of Moses, and the scene of his struggle with Pharaoh, and of his miracles, are given by Dr. Brugsch. Its ancient names show its greatness in these times, for it was known as "The Strong Place," "The City of Ramses," and "The Great and Splendid City of Lower Egypt." The Hebrews and other tribes of Shemitic origin lived all round it, and, indeed, the city itself is everywhere represented in the inscriptions as inhabited mainly by foreigners. It was the starting-point for campaigns towards the East, and of the great roads to Palestine, and, from its position on the border, was reckoned the key of Egypt. The Shepherd kings who had originally settled the Hebrews in its neighbourhood, adorned it with many temples and monuments; but it was left to Ramses II., the Pharaoh of the Oppression, to add so much to its glory, that it was thenceforward known as one of his "Temple—Cities:" this being the true meaning of the name given in the Bible—not "Treasure Cities," as our version has it. Strange to say, the Egyptian records, and especially the papyri, abound in notices of the labours in stone or in brick with which the workmen were overburdened to hasten the completion of their task. "These documents," says Brugsch, "are so precise and specific on this sort of work, that it is impossible not to recognise in them the most evident connection with the "hard bondage" and "rigorous services" of the Hebrews in building certain edifices at Pithom and Ramses."[2]

Mineptah II., the Pharaoh of the Exodus, fills a less space in Dr. Brugsch's pages, as might have been expected from the troubles of his reign. It is striking to find that he, like Ramses II., his father, who had had a family of no fewer than fifty sons and sixty daughters—Mineptah being his thirteenth

---

[1] The island thus mentioned is called in the inscription, T-en-Moshé, "the island," or "the river-bank," of "Moses."—Vol. ii. 112.

[2] II. 354.

child—lived at Zoan, and still more so, in view of the Bible narrative, to find that the end of his reign is unrecorded. His architectural works were mean compared with those of his father, and his only triumphal inscriptions are for victories over the barbarous Libyans. With the dreaded Khita of Lebanon he remained at peace, and Canaanites were employed as his messengers between Zoan and the Egyptian garrisons in their own land. Mineptah, moreover, delighted in sounding titles, and especially used that of Pirao—our Pharaoh—the "Great House" or "High Gate," for his official name, as the Turkish Sultan uses the similar one of the Sublime Porte.

Dr. Brugsch has a new theory as to the course taken by the Israelites in their march out of Egypt. Instead of turning south, to the Red Sea, he thinks he has proof, from the names of the stations given in Exodus, that they went north to the gates of the great wall which defended the exposed north-eastern side of the country. An itinerary of an Egyptian officer which has come down to us seems to him to mark unmistakably the various marches of the fugitive Hebrews. The Red Sea he assumes to be what the Hebrew words really mean—only the "weedy sea" —and to apply with great force to the terrible Serbonian bogs which skirted the coast of the Mediterranean on the north-east of Egypt. In these, he supposes, Pharaoh and his host were engulfed, a great storm on the Mediterranean which lashed its waves at the time over the narrow line of firm land between the sea and the morasses, leading or driving the Egyptians off the right track, as happened, ages after, to a Persian army in an invasion of Egypt. Dr. Ebers, on the other hand, adheres to the traditional scene of the miracle as correct, assigning the shallow head of the Red Sea, at Suez, as the precise locality; and Dr. Birch thinks the matter far from settled in Dr. Brugsch's favour.

The reign of Shishak or Shasanq I., which is fixed as beginning in the year B.C. 966, is another point of great Biblical interest in Dr. Brugsch's narrative. It will be new to many readers to learn that this monarch was the son of an Assyrian king, Nimrod, and thus himself an Assyrian, Egypt having been conquered by his father. It was he who received Jeroboam, and gave him protection till his return to overthrow Rehoboam; and it was by him also that that weak son of Solomon was attacked, and forced to make a humiliating peace. This invasion of Judah has been handed down in outline on the wall of the temple of Amon in the Theban Api. On the south outside wall the Egyptian king is seen, in colossal size, dealing heavy blows with his victorious war-club on the captive Jews. The names of 102 Jewish towns and districts ravaged in the campaign are paraded in long rows on the vacant spaces of the wall, and this list

Dr. Brugsch has wisely inserted to aid students of sacred topography.

It is impossible in the limits of an Article to follow Dr. Brugsch in the many illustrations of the sacred narrative his History affords. But it is pleasing in these days of sifting criticism, and often flippant cavil, to put on record the testimony of one so well qualified to speak as to the striking evidence borne by the Egyptian monuments to the truth of the records on which our faith is based :—

> Any one (says he) must be certainly blind who refuses to see the flood of light which the papyri and the other Egyptian monuments are throwing upon the venerable records of Holy Scripture, and, above all, there must needs be a wilful mistaking of the first laws of criticism by those who wish to discover contradictions, which really exist only in the imagination of opponents.[1]

The History virtually closes at the final conquest of Egypt by the Persians, though a few pages continue it briefly to the defeat of the Persians themselves by Alexander the Great. It marks a great progress in the decipherment of the monuments that such a narrative could have been written, and great praise is due to the author for the ability with which he has constructed it from materials hitherto unused.

CUNNINGHAM GEIKIE.

## ART. VIII.—FRANCES RIDLEY HAVERGAL.

GOD'S servants are immortal till their work is done. A thousand may fall at their side, and ten thousand at their right hand; but as long as the King their Master has one more commission for them on earth, however small it be, the arrow comes not nigh them, the angel of death passes over their dwelling. It may be that the bared breast will welcome the arrow; death may be looked for with expectant joy as the messenger summoning the loyal soul into the King's presence; but none the less is that summons impossible while the allotted work is yet unfinished. No doubt there is a sense in which even the most laborious and the most long-lived have at last to lay them down and die with the deep consciousness that what they have done in the Master's service is but a fragment of what they might have done. Yet, while it is true that opportunities are given us which we miss, and "talents" which we fail to use, that, like King Joash, we smite thrice on the ground and stay, when the arrow of the Lord's

[1] Vol. ii. p. 330.

deliverance in our hands might have been sharp in the hearts of His enemies,—it is also true, that there is a work appointed in the King's hidden counsels to each of His servants, and that when that particular function is fulfilled, He calls them away.

Only thus can we understand the early removal of one so manifestly used of God, and yet so apparently on the threshold of her career, as Frances Ridley Havergal. It is but a few years since her first volume of poems appeared. It is but the other day that she expressed to the present writer, in terms of almost childish glee, her thankful astonishment at the extraordinary success of "My King," the first of those little "Royal" books, as they are called, which were her chief prose works, and which have attained so wide a popularity. She was in the midst of half-finished contributions wherewith to satisfy—if that were possible—the importunity of rival editors, and of plans for "telling it out" in all directions that "the Lord is King," when, almost in a moment, the summons came. The pen—or rather the "type-writer," for she used, with enviable facility, that pretty instrument—was laid down for a day or two; but the hand for which it waited is mouldering in the tomb, while the spirit to whose bright thoughts it gave a visible existence has gone within the veil—fetched away, not, as it seems to our imperfect sight, from an incompleted task, but because the work given to do is *finished.*

Very thankfully, nevertheless, may we look back to that short but much-blessed life of service. Nor is thankfulness awakened only by looking back. For of Frances Havergal it may be said, not conventionally, but most literally, that "she, being dead, yet speaketh." We sometimes say this of those who have gone, thinking of their fragrant memory, of their far-reaching influence. We say it, for example, of a man like Lord Lawrence, and hope that his memory will, indeed, speak to his successors in the administration of the great empire he helped to build up. But a *writer* lives on in his written works as no mere man of action can do; and Frances Havergal will yet speak to many hearts in her "ministry of song," as well as in the little prose books so highly prized by the loyal subjects of the Great King.

Many writers have surpassed Miss Havergal in originality and depth of thought. To her the humbler gift was granted that she should be useful. Yet her writings have very distinct literary merits. In her poems she displays a real command of striking and felicitous language. We need but recall, as a single illustration of this, the truly beautiful "Sunset Chorus" in the cantata of "The Mountain Maidens," in which she pictures the crimson glow of the setting sun upon Mont Blanc, and the "pure and perfect whiteness" it leaves behind—

> Like the calm and blessed sleeping
> Of the saints in Christ's own keeping.

The same power of choosing appropriate words is manifest in her simpler pieces, and even in those few in which she gave rein to her bright humour, as in "London-super-Mare."

We have just used the term "picture" of one of her poems. But, in truth, they are less word-*painting* than word-*music*. Frances Havergal was a musician, like her accomplished father, and her musical inspiration found vent in her poetry.

Another marked feature of her verse—indeed, of her writings generally—is the sunshine that pervades them. Far removed is their spirit from that morbid melancholy which is so characteristic of modern poets. In truth, there is a reason for the difference. There can be little joyousness if, while men feel they cannot help but write about Christ, they can only write about Him as in that most melodious but most melancholy of stanzas, to which the name of Matthew Arnold is attached:—

> Now he is dead, far hence he lies
> In the lone Syrian town;
> And on his grave, with shining eyes,
> The Syrian stars look down.

What would Frances Havergal's verse have been, if she had believed *that?* Truly, "if Christ be not risen, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins."

In her prose writings the same clear, felicitous thought and language are conspicuous. You see it in "My King," and you see it in such stray magazine papers as that exquisite parable, "Our Swiss Guide" (*Sunday Magazine*, October, 1874), in which, from the functions of a mountaineering guide, are drawn a series of most striking analogies illustrative of the work of Christ. There is a directness, too, and reality about all she says. She does not write for writing's sake. She evidently means every word. A good example is seen in the most recent of her posthumous contributions, the chapter of "Marching Orders" in the *Church Missionary Gleaner* for September. The "marching order" for the month is, "Talk ye of all His wondrous works."

> I wonder how many of us have observed this among our marching orders? and how many of us have been obeying it? Think of the last month, for instance, with its thirty-one days; on how many of those days did we talk of all His wondrous works? and if we did so at all, how much less did we talk about them than about other things? . . . . Only suppose that for every time each English Christian had talked about the day's news of the kingdoms of this world, he had spent the same breath in telling the last news of the kingdom of Jesus Christ to his friends and casual acquaintances! Why, how it would have outrun all the reports and magazines, and saved the expense of deputations, and set people wondering and inquiring, and stopped the prate of ignorant reviewers who "never heard of any converts in

India," and gagged the mouths of the adversaries with hard facts, and removed missionary results and successes from the list of "things not generally known!" . . . .

"They shall speak of the glory of Thy kingdom, and talk of Thy power." Is this among the things that we ought to have done and have left undone? Are we not verily guilty as to this command? "Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep *this* law!"

Perhaps we say we have kept it; we have had sweet converse with dear Christian friends about the Lord's kingdom and doings, and surely that is enough! No, read further; there is not even a full stop after "talk of Thy power." It goes on to say why and to whom: "To make known to the sons of men His mighty acts, and the glorious minded friends, exchanging a little information may be, but talking *with purpose*, talking so as to make known what great things our God is doing, not gently alluding to them, but *making* the sons of men majesty of His kingdom." . . . . Some very intelligent and well-educated "sons of men" do not seem to know that there is such a thing as "His kingdom" at all; and whose fault is that? They do not and will not read about it, but they could not help the "true report" of it reaching their ears if every one of us simply obeyed orders and *talked*, right and left, "of the glory of Thy kingdom," instead of using our tongues to tell what we have just seen in the *Times*.

A memorial fund is being raised by Miss Havergal's friends, to be committed to the administration of the Church Missionary Society, for the purpose of employing native Bible women in India, and of translating some of her books into the Indian languages. The idea is a happy one. Frances Havergal's heart was in missionary work, and only a few months back she said, "If I were strong, I must and would go even now to India." We are persuaded that many who have enjoyed her writings will gladly seize the opportunity of helping to perpetuate her name in connection with the noblest of Christian enterprises.

E. S.

## Art. IX.—THE FIFTY-SIXTH PSALM.

WITH the devout, the Psalter has always been a particularly precious portion of God's Word. It has been valued for meditation, thanksgiving, and prayer. The early Christians, as Luther mentions in his preface to the Psalter, diligent in reading Scripture, were specially fond of the Psalms. And in every age, no doubt, among Christians generally, the feeling has been the same. The Church of England, for nearly all her Services, has appointed a Psalm or Psalms; and of our private devotions words or thoughts from the Psalter form no small portion. To

those who are meditating on the sea-shore or in the harvest-fields, to busy workers and to lonely sufferers, to travellers in strange lands shut off from the pleasures of the sanctuary, and to worshippers who chant the ever-fresh prelude to common prayer, "*O come, let us sing unto the Lord,*" the Psalms are equally welcome.

Why is the Psalter so precious? How is it that the Psalms are so suitable for private and for public use among Christians of every class?

The main answer, surely, is this: The language of the Psalms is the language of *experience.* What believers have felt concerning their own weakness and their strength in the Lord; what they have wished for, been glad about, been afraid of, been troubled about; their lyrics of praise, and their *de profundis* . . . . prayers, this is the language of the Psalms.

One feature in such experience is brought before us in the Fifty-sixth Psalm—namely, *Conflict.* "What time I am afraid," says David, "I will trust in Thee."[1] Herein we realise the communion of saints. To say "I am afraid," is common human experience; and this is a tie of nature. To say, "I am afraid, but I trust in God," is religious experience; and this is a tie of grace. David's voice, therefore, is our own; we have the same comfort in conflict, the same confidence: "In God I have put my trust; I will not fear what flesh can do unto me."

The notes of the Fifty-sixth Psalm are Trial, Trust, and Thanksgiving. In verse 1, *Be merciful unto (Have pity on) me, O God; man fighting daily oppresseth me.* In verse 4, *I have put my trust.* In the closing verses, *I will render praises unto Thee; Thou hast delivered.* Thus, the life of faith is a life of conflict, of varied experiences, of mingled feelings. Its songs are sometimes sad; its sadness often smiles. But the minor of timidity generally, through trust, swells into thanksgiving.

The state of mind revealed in verse 3 is complex. David saw perils, and he was afraid; with his fear, however, side by side, there was trust. It is, indeed, a triumphant trust; for in the next verse he sings "the holy boast,"[2] *I will not fear.* Nevertheless, for many believers, in times of trial, the revelation, in verse 3, of feelings contrary to each other is very helpful. The afflicted Christian perceives the perils which encompass him; he knows the weakness and waywardness of his own will; he is afraid—partly, perhaps, from physical weak-

---

[1] "Nevertheless, though I am sometime afraid, yet put I my trust in Thee."—*Prayer Book.* Literally, "In the day that I fear . . . ."

[2] Calvin. "This confidence is no proof that he was rid of all fear. . . . . He was so far from yielding to fear that he rose victoriously above it."

ness—and he is not ashamed to confess his fears; he is no callous Stoic; he remembers the comforting prediction of Christ, "the flesh is weak;" and he says with David, "Have pity on me, O God;" *I trust, but I am afraid.*[1]

Many of the most eminent Christians have gone through such experiences. Cowper, for instance, greatly feared and greatly trusted. Gerhardt, whose hymns, like Cowper's, are full of faith, —Gerhardt who sang—

> Give to the winds thy fears;
> Hope, and be undismayed;
> God hears thy sighs and counts thy tears—
> He shall lift up thy head—

had written for his epitaph—"Here lies a theologian sifted by Satan." And to very many Christians, probably, in some or other "visitation," such language as Psalm lv. 2–6 has come home with peculiar power. "Fearfulness and dread are come upon me, and horror hath overwhelmed me." With the healthy soul, no doubt, such complainings are brief as well as rare. The gloom quickly lifts; and the voice of Jesus, "Why are ye *so* fearful?" brings quietness, if not joy. The one great matter, in a time of need, is to realise His Presence.

Beautifully is this brought before believers by John Bunyan. In the closing scene of *Pilgrim's Progress*, we read:—

> Then I saw in my dream that Christian was as in a muse a while. To whom also Hopeful added this word, Be of good cheer; Jesus Christ maketh thee whole: and with that Christian brake out with a loud voice, Oh! I see Him again! and He tells me, When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee; and through the rivers they shall not overflow thee.—Isa. xliii. 2. Then they both took courage, and the enemy was after that as still as a stone, until they were gone over.

To realise the Presence of Christ, according to the Fifty-sixth Psalm, is to have rest. For what, here, is the Psalmist's notion of *trust?* It is *to cling confidingly to* a Person. Of David's words, for "trust," one is *finding refuge in* (as in Psalm vii. 1), and another is *clinging trustfully to.*[2] The latter part of the third verse, therefore, literally translated, is, *I cling confidingly to Thee.*

---

[1] As to fear and trust in the soul, a German commentator has taken some exception to verse 3. But this only illustrates the fact that learning is not always accompanied by common sense. A very general human experience is the conflict of fear and hope, confidence and concern. Peter was afraid, but he trusted, when he cried "Lord, save me!" The women ran from the empty sepulchre, St. Matthew records, when the angel appeared, "with fear and great joy."

[2] Delitzsch.

In conclusion. This Psalm, as a whole, shows the believer's Perils, his Praise, and God's Presence.[1] The felt Presence is our peace in the midst of perils, and the spring of our praise.

## GENESIS XXVIII. 10–22.

*Tune, No.* 330, *in St. Alban's Tune Book.*

1.

WEARY worn and lonely,
With my rude staff only,
Through the desert thorny,
Went I on my journey.

2.

But night fell, and danger
Compass'd me a stranger:
So to sleep I laid me,
Kept by Him who made me.

3.

Then Heaven's gate unfolding,
I with awe beholding,
Open'd scenes of glory
Passing human story.

4.

Lo, in tiers unending,
Steps of light ascending,
Trodden by the angels
On their glad evangels;

5.

And above, in vision
Of supreme fruition,
Saw, or heard I rather,
God, my God and Father,

6.

Saying, "Child, I love thee;
Loving, I will prove thee:
But will leave thee never:
Thou art mine for ever."

7.

So I woke; and morning
Was the East adorning,
And that spot most lowly
Seem'd a temple holy.

8.

Henceforth true and tender
Be my heart's surrender;
With His Presence o'er me,
Be what may before me.

9.

Be the pathway dreary,
Be my footsteps weary,
Be no friend assistant,
Be my bourn far distant;

10.

Raiment, bread provided,
Home to glory guided,
With my Father only,
I no more am lonely.

1879. E. H. BICKERSTETH.

[1] "David knows that each day of his wandering, each nook in which he has found shelter, each step that he has taken . . . . all have been numbered by his Heavenly Keeper. Yea, no tear that he has shed . . . . in prayer" has fallen unnoticed.—*Perowne.*

# Reviews.

*Reminiscences of Many Years*, 1796–1873. By Lord TEIGNMOUTH. 2 vols. Edinburgh: D. Douglas.

LORD TEIGNMOUTH bears an honoured name as the eldest son of Sir John Shore, a Bengal civilian whose merits recommended him for the high office of Governor-General of India, near the end of the last century. But it was Lord Teignmouth's highest distinction to have been the first President of the British and Foreign Bible Society. His eldest son was born in Calcutta in 1796, and was two years old when he quitted India. His father purchased a large mansion at Clapham Common, which had belonged to Mr. John Thornton, the friend of Newton and Cowper, who devoted so large a portion of his great wealth to objects of Christian philanthropy, and particularly to the purchase of livings, for Evangelical clergymen. He may, in point of fact, be regarded as the originator of what is now called, 'The Simeon Trust."

"Clapham," says Lord Teignmouth, "was at this time the scene of an unsuccessful experiment." A considerable number of young negroes, the children of African chiefs, had been brought from Sierra Leone by the then Governor of that colony, Mr. Zachary Macaulay, at the charges of a gentleman, who had undertaken to have them educated in Scotland, and sent back to Africa, in the hope that some of them might, under God's blessing, be fitted for Christian missions. This plan was changed, and their education was placed under the supervision of the leaders of "The Clapham Sect." A Yorkshire schoolmaster, Mr. William Greaves, was selected by Mr. Wilberforce; but our inauspicious climate proved as fatal to many of the young Africans as their own climate had proved fatal to British missionaries. The African school was, therefore, given up, or rather converted into another establishment, where, in company with six surviving negroes for their companions, the future Lord Teignmouth received the elements of scholastic education, along with the sons of Wilberforce, H. Thornton, Macaulay, Stephen, and others of the Clapham residents. The future Lord Macaulay was one of their younger trio when the number of the school had reached thirty.

Lord Teignmouth having left Clapham in 1808, his son was placed with the Rev. Mr. Jerram, the curate of Chobham, of which parish the Rev. Richard Cecil, of St. John's Chapel, Bedford Row, was then incumbent.

In 1815 he entered Trinity College, Cambridge, as a nobleman, which entitled him to a degree without examination, and he had thus a better opportunity of "studying character" than mathematics. In 1815 the Evangelical Dr. Milner, the President of Queen's College, and younger brother of Joseph Milner, of Hull, towered far above most of the other Dons of Cambridge. But indolence was his great drawback, after the Senior Wrangler had attained his great University position, and finally his deanery. "Dr. Milner's conversation was easy, rapid, and embracing by its ever-ready versatility scientific or more general subjects. He possessed in a marvellous degree the faculty of bringing abstruse subjects within the reach of ordinary and youthful comprehension."—P. 62.

The chief of the other Evangelicals at Cambridge, when Lord Teignmouth went up to Trinity, were Charles Simeon and Professor Farish; but at that time Evangelical religion was at a heavy discount, although just beginning to emerge into life. The low estimate in which it was then held is strikingly exhibited in the description of Mr. Simeon's cha-

racter, published after his death, by his cotemporary and schoolfellow at Eton, Bishop Bethell. The Bishop exaggerates all his foibles, dwelling especially on his natural vanity and egotism, besides depreciating all his hallowed labours and abounding excellencies. In the following sketch Lord Teignmouth exhibits the verification in Mr. Simeon's character of the inspired truth—"them that honour Me I will honour."

Charles Simeon, Incumbent of Trinity parish, had worked and fought his way from the commencement of the century, through good and evil report, opposition, scorn, and contumely, to a position from which he could not be dislodged. A few years previously he had been so unused to encouragement that the sight of a Trinity fellow-commoner (John Thornton) at his church drew tears from his eyes. Now he could reckon on a large number of listeners and adherents, and on some of the most distinguished men in the University as his warm supporters. On revisiting Cambridge, in 1823, I found that attendance at Simeon's church had become fashionable, and that the designation of Simeonite was no longer used as a term of reproach. In 1836, at the installation of the Marquis Camden as Chancellor, it was very gratifying to observe the cordial respect evinced towards Simeon, when, as senior fellow, he held a levée on the lawn of his college, welcoming the guests invited to a dinner at King's—among whom were members of either House of Parliament—or discharging with dignity and urbanity the duties of chairman. In the same year the whole University assembled to pay the last tribute to his memory when his remains were consigned to the college chapel. That Simeon should have presented to the world two different aspects may be readily conceived by any one aware of the intensity of feeling excited by the religious controversy in which he took a prominent part, and the peculiarities of his personal deportment. He derived much advantage from the zeal and energy of his predecessors, Venn and Newton and Scott (the only time I ever saw and heard the externally unpolished commentator was in Simeon's pulpit), who had in a manner smoothed the way for his success. Simeon, wherever he went, was encircled by friends, admirers, and followers. Providence had bestowed upon him means of influence possessed by few, if any, of his brother clergy, supplied by family connection and wealth. He consequently rode the best horses, stocked his cellars with the choicest wines, exercised ample hospitality, and practised boundless munificence.

We may remark on the last sentences in Lord Teignmouth's sketch, that considering how Mr. Simeon was "encircled by friends, admirers, and flatterers," it is a signal token of the grace bestowed on him, that a man of his natural temperament was not more spoiled by admiration. Like Bishop Bethell, Lord Teignmouth, although in a more kindly spirit, glances on "his horses" and "his cellars of choicest wines;" but in regard to these things there is much exaggeration, as well as in what is said of his "wealth." In the "Life of Mr. Simeon," Canon Carus has published Mr. Simeon's own memorandum, where he shows that in 1816 his chief dependence was on the income derived from his college, and that, on the death of his brother Edward, he had accepted a legacy of 15,000*l.* only to fill up the gap that would otherwise have been made in his gifts for the Lord's service and for the poor by the loss of 700*l.* or 800*l.* which for many years his brother had supplied up to the time of his death. At an earlier period Canon Carus states that Mr. Simeon's whole income in 1780, the second year of his residence in college, was only 125*l.*; and after gradually increasing for fourteen years, it became, in 1793, 300*l.* per annum, and it is added, "it seems to have been his plan regularly to dispose of *one-third* of his income in charity."

Lord Teignmouth says of Mr. Simeon in the pulpit:—"In preaching his manner was earnest and forcible, impressive but eccentric. His gesticulation was grotesque, and listeners unaccustomed to his delivery could scarcely repress a smile." Lord Teignmouth's honorary degree of M.A. was granted in 1815, in time to allow him to make a visit to

Lord Hill's head-quarters in the Netherlands, in company with his family connection, Sir Francis Hill, just before the battle of Waterloo. In his letters he mentions his having been at the Duchess of Richmond's celebrated ball on the eve of the battle of Quatre Bras; and he also tells of the panic that visited Brussels on the evening of the great day of Waterloo. Lord Teignmouth, writing immediately after the victory, says: "You know the details of the action better than I do." Lord Teignmouth had seen Lord Hill in military command in Belgium. He next saw him "resuming his place as a younger son under the roof of his venerable sire, Sir John Hill, at Hawkstone, in Shropshire." Mr. Wilberforce characterised the humours of the house as "Hillism." A pleasant picture is given of the piety, zeal, and intrepidity of Lord Hill's uncle, Rowland Hill, as well as of his dignified but kindly bearing and irrepressible drollery.

The winter of 1818-19 was spent by Lord Teignmouth at the Castle of Dublin, with Mr. Charles Grant, the Chief Secretary, afterwards Lord Glenelg. He saw many distinguished characters at the Castle, and also accompanied his host on a visit to the late Earl of Roden, then Viscount Jocelyn. The following is Lord Teignmouth's photograph of this eminent nobleman:—

THE EARL OF RODEN.—Morally, no less than physically, he was one of the noblest among many noble specimens of the Irish aristocracy; his lofty stature, stalwart frame, and countenance beaming with honesty, courage, and generosity, marking him out for influential if not commanding power. A "travelled Thane," he now discharged the duties of several important posts, whether representing his own county, Louth, in Parliament, or taking his place as a courtier in the Royal household, or in command of his local regiment. But nowhere was he more at home (for both he and his lady had become very religious) than when presiding at his chapel and teaching in his Sunday-school. . . . . Fearlessly did Lord Jocelyn maintain as a staunch Protestant his position in the neighbourhood deeply infected by religious discord. Striking proof of our host's beneficence not being confined to members of his own denomination, was given by the fact of his carrying on his own shoulders to the hospital a poor, fever-stricken Roman Catholic whom none else dared to approach.—P. 176.

We regret that we cannot afford space for the description of old Mr. Grant, the father, to whom India probably owes more than to any other human instrument in the hands of God. It was through Mr. Grant that Mr. Simeon was enabled to send out so many Evangelical chaplains to India, and amongst the rest Dr. Claudius Buchanan, Henry Montjoy Thomason, Browne, Gover, and Dealtry. Lord Teignmouth thus describes the termination of old Mr. Grant's invaluable life:—"His great object had been the promotion of Christianity in India; and 'full of years and honours and of the remembrance,' in all Christian humility, of services far beyond the scope of any human record, rendered to God and his fellow-creatures, Mr. Grant survived till 1823, when, at the age of seventy-eight, he literally died in harness sitting at his writing-desk, yielding up his spirit to his Maker as he sat working at his desk. To borrow the words of his son Robert, 'he was not, because God took him.'"

We must pass over many interesting sketches, but we must not omit the following:—

REMINISCENCES OF WILBERFORCE.—My reminiscences of him recall the great and unceasing kindness which I received from him, and the help of all kinds to the discharge of private and public duties. I remember when a child first seeing him at Broomfield, on Clapham Common, and, ere I went to his school, his giving me a seven-shilling piece, which led to my father prohibiting me accepting pecuniary presents from any one but himself. In person Mr. Wilberforce was slightly deformed; his profile, his shoulders being thrown back,

exhibiting, notwithstanding the stoop of his head, the convexity of a bent bow, a defect aggravated perhaps by the weight of books and papers with which his capacious pockets were stuffed.

Mr. Wilberforce usually carried an inkstand in his waistcoat-pocket, applying to it so vigorously on one occasion in the House of Commons, that he jerked it over the nankeen trousers of my informant, Sir Thomas Baring, who sat beside him. On perceiving his misfortune, Mr. Wilberforce started up, and in his distress cut such capers on the floor of the House as to attract universal observation and provoked a roar of laughter, amidst which Sir Thomas walked forth to change his dress. Against such casualties Mr. Wilberforce was proof, as he invariably wore black clothes, sometimes till they had become quite dingy, for he ignored his outer man, never, as his valet intimated, when he dressed at our house, making use of a glass. At Highwood Hill I saw him garnish before breakfast every button-hole of his coat with flowers, whose freshness sorted ill with the faded hue of his almost threadbare garment, till the heat of a summer day had produced assimilation no less singular than the previous contrast.

The latter part of the first volume is occupied with travels in France, Ireland, and Scotland. In the second volume there are also interesting reminiscences of Norway and Sweden.

In 1834, at the installation of the Duke of Wellington as Chancellor of Oxford, Lord Teignmouth, who had then recently succeeded to his father's peerage, received an honorary D.C.L. We are informed that—

The Duke entered Oxford in an open carriage, accompanied only by Mr. Croker, who informed us at the Exeter College dinner that the Duke, on approaching Magdalen College, asked its name. "That is Magdalen," was the reply, "against which King James broke his head; and should any one venture to infringe on the rights and liberties of the University, he would find a Hough in every college." When the Duke made his appearance on the floor of the theatre, the tumult of applause was rapturous. His white head shook vividly with emotion, and whilst there was a simultaneous inclination of the heads of the vast assembly towards the object of their homage, the scene reminded me of some of the pictorial representations of the stoning of Stephen. By his side sat or stood the Duke of Cumberland, to whom, notwithstanding his staunch Toryism and impassioned opposition to Catholic Emancipation, the University refused a degree, looking, whilst his martial figure was set off by a splendid hussar uniform, grimly defiant. The individuals who received degrees were cheered by the good-humoured assemblage, and none more heartily than Lord Winchilsea, who, whilst the public orator, Phillimore, pronounced his eulogy, stood forth, massive and erect, face to face with the Duke, by the friendly grasp of whose hand he was about to be welcomed.

The Duke was unfortunate in his quantities on this occasion, pronouncing Carolus Jacobus, Carŏlus Jacŏbus. But his Latin was said to be very fair, having been furnished by his physician.

In a review in the *Record* the name of the Duke's Peninsular physician, Dr. Hume, was mentioned as probably the physician alluded to; but this statement was corrected in the following short but interesting paragraph:—"We learn on high authority that the physician alluded to was Sir Henry Halford, the uncle of Dean Vaughan, the Master of the Temple. Our informant writes:—'The Duke of Wellington's Latin secretary was not Dr. Hume, whom I knew well, and who I feel assured had forgotten every syllable of the classics; but it was Sir Henry Halford, who wrote Latin verse as often as he wrote prescriptions, and who would repeat his lines to me by a dozen at a time.'"

Lord Teignmouth also recalls Bishop Barrington, of Durham. We quote a paragraph, as follows:—

At his London dinners he was scrupulously observant of early hours. As he was on very friendly terms (says Lord Teignmouth) with my father and his zealous coadjutor in support of the Bible Society, I shared his invitations. Aware of his extreme punctuality I endeavoured to make a point of arriving in due time on my first dining with him, but most unexpectedly found myself ushered into the

dining-room, where all the other guests were assembled standing round the table in their appointed places waiting till the clock struck five, when we sat down.—P. 178.

This worthy prelate died in 1826, in the ninety-first year of his age, attributing his longevity in part to the regular exercise—walking and riding—which he never failed to take until long after his eightieth year, and in part to his always rising from table with an appetite.

In 1836 Lord Teignmouth was the guest of Canon Sumner, of Durham, who had then been also for eight years Bishop of Chester, and was afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury. He found him to be, as he always continued, affable and kind. Adverting to later days, he says—

I found him on one occasion in a railway carriage bound for Crewe on episcopal duty. He intended walking from the station, bag containing his canonical habiliments in hand, some miles to his destination, and returning the same day to Chester. Much did he commend the facility of diocesan visitations afforded to bishops by the railway, contrasting with his own trifling expenses the cost of his predecessor, Dr. Law (father of the present Dean of Gloucester), who travelled for the same purpose in his carriage, drawn by four horses—the postboys clad in his livery—and was obliged to pass a night away from home. The Bishop induced me to accompany him so far as Crewe, whence, having introduced me to the noble owner, he trudged forward on his solitary pilgrimage.—P. 183.

Lord Teignmouth naturally cherishes with much satisfaction the reminiscences of his election for Marylebone, in 1838, one of the few Conservative triumphs in the metropolitan boroughs. He recalls many of the leading notables then in Parliament, and some who had passed away. We can only notice a few.

Of Lord Palmerston he says that he reminded him of one of our magnificent steamers, composed of so many different compartments, that should one or more spring a leak, the rest would sustain the gallant ship elate and buoyant wherever winds might waft or waters roll.

Of Lord Ashley, before he became Earl of Shaftesbury, Lord Teignmouth observes:—"Lord Ashley, though seemingly pledged by previous and prospective tenure of office to a high official career, never compromised the independence which better suited his spirit and temperament. It would be difficult to conceive a public man, eminently qualified though he was for the transaction of business, less disposed to submit to the trammels of subordinate official routine. Already a far wider and less frequented field of enterprise had opened on his view, and as he realised its growing expansiveness, he was ready bravely to endure and triumphantly to overcome the opposition, scorn, and obloquy to which his early philanthropic effort exposed him. The prestige which he derived from his exalted social position no doubt materially promoted his success, more especially as he consecrated to the loftiest purposes any advantages accruing to him."—P. 245. Lord Teignmouth adds—

If there was somewhat of stage effect, there was much of practical wisdom in the assignment of the respective parts of mover and seconder of the resolutions annually brought forward on behalf of factory reform to Lord Ashley and Mr. Feilden; the one the refined and dignified representative of an old, historic, noble family; the other the plain, honest, and unpretending self-raised burgher; the one the *beau-ideal* of aristocratic, the other of plebeian worth.—P. 246.

We may observe that although Lord Shaftesbury's social position as "the dignified representative of an old, historic, noble family," was one of the gifts providentially bestowed on him which could not fail to aid the wonderful success of the energetic and persistent efforts with which he consecrated all his talents to the loftiest purposes; yet it was not for the sake of "stage effect" that Mr. Feilden's name was coupled with

Lord Ashley's. The real purpose was to show to the public that it was not a landed representative and future proprietor of the soil, who undertook the work alone; but that Lord Ashley was supported by a man who was then "the largest mill-owner and most extensive cotton-spinner in the whole world."

Of that distinguished and Christian statesman, Sir George Grey, we are told that even when in a subordinate position, not being in the Cabinet, he was a main prop of the Government. Estimable in the private relations of life, distinguished at his University, professionally trained as a lawyer, and having enjoyed considerable Parliamentary experience, he would probably have been elevated, had there been an opportunity, to the post for which he would have been fitted, not only by such qualifications, but by his universal popularity—that of Speaker. Persevering in his official career, to which he had been early introduced, he discharged the duties of Home Secretary during a longer period than any of his predecessors in that office. His personal appearance and deportment, together with family connections, were much in his favour. The effect of his vigorous eloquence was occasionally "diminished by the surpassing concatenation of his long sentences and almost breathless rapidity of his delivery, seemingly indicative of want of self-confidence and of overweening, and in his case uncalled-for, anxiety respecting the attention of his audience."

Connected with Sir George Grey we should have liked to see a notice of his venerable parent, the late well-known Dowager Lady Grey. Her position as the wife of the Hon. Sir George Grey, for many years Chief Commissioner of the Portsmouth Dockyard, gave to that gifted lady an opportunity of exercising in the Navy an influence for good that can hardly be exaggerated. Lady Grey's name might well be enrolled amongst those honourable women to whom the Apostle Paul alluded as "the beloved Persis, who laboured much in the Lord," or those "other women whose names are in the Book of Life."

There was one distinguished naval officer who was wont to acknowledge his deep spiritual obligations to the honoured and venerable lady, who so long laboured at Portsmouth Dockyard for the welfare of British sailors —we mean the late Captain J. E. Gordon, of whose success in the House of Commons Lord Teignmouth makes honourable mention. After noticing Captain Gordon's zeal for pronounced Protestantism as a member of the Hibernian Society, "Captain J. E. Gordon," writes his Lordship, "the rough-and-ready champion of an uncompromisng cause, a genuine Salt, found ample scope for his combativeness in the cause of the Reformation Society, which he founded, and in the Irish Missions, which he supported; and more especially in the mission to Ireland with Baptist Noel, the one the Luther and the other—the gentler colleague—the Melancthon of a second Reformation. The late George Finch, of Burleigh-on-the-hill, M.P., who married a daughter of the pious Duchess of Beaufort, accompanied them on this mission, and conveyed them in his carriage from place to place on their itinerating tours."

There are many other interesting reminiscences which we are obliged to omit; but we cannot but thank Lord Teignmouth for recalling to notice such a number of the eminent men with whom he has been brought in contact during his prolonged life. It is pleasant to observe how lightly he carries the weight of fourscore years and three.

*Movements in Religious Thought.* I. Romanism; II. Protestantism; III. Agnosticism. Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge in the Lent Term, 1879. By E. H. PLUMPTRE, D.D. Macmillan & Co.

DR. PLUMPTRE, Professor of Divinity in King's College, London, is known as a writer of ability, independence, and scholarship. His recent University Sermons, the volume before us, with an attractive title, promised, as we thought, reading of some interest and value. We must confess, however, that, taking them as Sermons rather than Essays, we have been disappointed; and, further, we have been compelled to consider certain passages, both in the preached language and in the added notes, likely to do much mischief. The opening words, indeed, disappointed us. The text was Eccles. vii. 10—"Say not thou, What is the cause that the former days were better than these. . . ." And the Preacher proceeds to suggest that Ecclesiastes was written when men were "drifting away, under the pressure of new problems and new thoughts, from the moorings of their ancient faith." Whether the Book "represents the conflict in the mind of the historical Son of David, from whom it purports to proceed, between the traditional faith which he had inherited from his fathers, and the largeness of heart which came from contact with other systems of belief and worship; or belongs, as some have thought, to a far later period in the history of Semitic culture, when the teachers of the Garden and the Porch had brought before the mind of some restless thinker other thoughts of God and life, and the chief end of life, than those which had sustained the souls of an earlier generation," Dr. Plumptre does not stay to "inquire." The question of the authorship of Ecclesiates, however, is not left, in this Book, with a mere passing reference, for in a foot-note Dr. Plumptre remarks :—

> The dates that have been assigned to the Book take a sufficiently wide range from circ. B.C. 992, on the assumption of Solomonic authorship, still maintained by many critics, to B.C. 200, as fixed on independent ground by Hitzig and Mr. Tylor.

Now, without discussing the date of Ecclesiastes, about which, however, we have a decided conviction, we must express our deep dissatisfaction with Dr. Plumptre's treatment of this question. He tells his readers, on page 3, that Mr. Tennyson's poem, "The Two Voices," with his "Palace of Art," is, "practically, the best commentary on Ecclesiastes;" and we are inclined to think that some, at all events, of his undergraduate readers may be encouraged in their disinclination to study distinctly Christian commentaries on that Scripture by his language concerning "Semitic culture." "We learn," to quote Dr. Plumptre's own words, page 6, alluding to the drift of what is termed modern thought, "We learn to talk of Semitic tendencies where before we accepted a revelation from the Lord." A Preacher of the Gospel who speaks of the "dim uncertainties" of the future (page 8) can hardly be successful, surely, in seeking to convey to "individual souls" the assurance of faith, when, at the same time, in expounding a verse of Holy Scripture, he speaks of "Semitic culture."

Dr. Plumptre's protest against Romanism is, in some respects, satisfactory. "We protest," he says, "against errors of doctrine, and corrupt worship, and unfounded claims, and unscrupulous intrigue." At the same time, however, he objects to such Protestant "phrases" of our Prayer Book as "Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians" . . . . "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." Further, in referring to the "so-called Catholic revival of the last fifty years," he observes that it has led men "to feel that the ministry of souls involves something more than sermons, however earnest, and calls for the personal contact of

mind with mind and heart with heart, for the outpouring of the confession of the sin-burdened soul, and the words of comfort and counsel that bring home to the penitent the assurance of pardon and absolution." The language is loose; and we hardly know what it is meant to imply, especially as in a foot-note Dr. Plumptre observes that he looks upon ("Confession and Absolution") "this element in the work of the ministry as belonging to its prophetical rather than its priestly character." To ourselves, however, the Preacher appears to confuse the Auricular Confession of Romanism and of Ritualism, with that opening of grief recommended, in special cases, by the Reformed Church of England. In regard also to "personal contact" between a Pastor and his people, and visiting from house to house, to "Mission-work at home and in far-off lands," and other matters, Dr. Plumptre might well have been expected to refer to Evangelical Churchmen rather than to so-called Catholics. We are not surprised, however, at his reference to Ritualistic teaching in regard to the "wider hope than our fathers dared to cherish" concerning those who have passed away impenitent. He mentions Dr. Farrar's unhappy work, with others, on this subject; and, no doubt, such "Broad" doctrines tend in the same direction as Rome's doctrine of purgatory and Ritualistic teaching concerning prayers for the dead. We will add only, upon the question of lawless semi-Romanism, that Professor Plumptre, evidently referring to the Church Association, looks with "a half sad, half contemptuous wonder on the organised action of an Association which *exists only for the purpose of promoting prosecutions about the 'mint, anise, and cummin,' of obscure and obsolete rubrics.*"[1]

The following passage in the Sermon on Protestantism we quote with pleasure:—

> Are we to condemn as schismatic those who have been alienated from us at least as much by the frowardness of our fathers, as by the perverseness of others? Are we to confine our sympathies and efforts at reunion to the far-off Churches of the East, or the corrupt communion of the Latin Church, while we shrink from contact and co-operation with the more energetic and evangelic life of the Reformed Churches of Western Europe, or with the communities to which it would be hard, on any new test principles, to deny the name of Churches that exist among ourselves? We, as Churchmen, need not shrink from following Cosin in holding communion with "the Protestant and best Reformed Churches" of France and Germany by recognising the validity of their ordinations, in declaring that "in what part of the world soever any Churches are extant, bearing the name of Christ, and professing the true Catholic Faith, and worshipping and calling upon God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, with one heart and voice, if anywhere we be now hindered actually to be joined with them, either by distance of countries or variance amongst men, or by any hindrance whatsoever, yet always in our mind and affection we should join and unite with them." We may well be content to walk in the steps of Sancroft in urging on the clergy "that they have a very tender regard to our brethren, the Protestant Dissenters . . . . persuading them, if it may be, to a full compliance with our Church, or, at least, that 'whereto we have already attained, we may all walk by the same rule, and mind the same thing;' praying for the universal blessed union of all Reformed Churches, both at home and abroad, against our common enemies."

Such remarks, as we have said, we quote with pleasure.[2] We are here thoroughly at one with Dr. Plumptre; but when he proceeds to refer to "the Communions in Westminster Abbey, in June, 1870" (of the Revision Companies), and declares that the act "witnesses of a higher unity than that which is *limited by outward uniformity in dogma* or in

[1] Foot-note, p. 52. The italics, of course, are our own.

[2] The Convocations of the Church of England have often accorded to non-episcopal communities the name of Churches.

ritual" (the italics are ours), we must decline to follow him. And, furthur, we must confess our inability to understand what he means, in connection with a declared and determined Unitarian, by the words "an outward uniformity in dogma."

---

*Within the Precincts.* By Mrs. Oliphant, Authoress of "The Chronicles of Carlingford," &c. &c. In 3 vols. Smith, Elder & Co. 1879.

HUMAN life was never intended to be monotonous. The changeful face of Nature, the alternation of day and night, the varieties of the seasons, even the vicissitudes of the weather, provide against the stagnation which is alike morally and physically unhealthful. It is not often noticed, but it is not the less true, that the only people who ever had a Divine legislator were enjoined to take change of air and scene, involving much exhilarating social intercourse, three times in every year. For the Feasts of the Lord, though pre-eminently religious services, were always celebrated with mirth and gladness; and as the long processions of friends and neighbours wound through the glades of Galilee, threaded the flowery passes of the hill country, came up from the thickets of Jordan, or crossed the rolling plain of Esdraelon, converging from every direction to the city beautiful for situation, the joy of the whole earth, they unconsciously drunk in all the subordinate temporal benefits to mind and body, intellect and heart, which were mixed up with their obedience to the command to appear before the Lord in Zion. We need have no question, therefore, that He who knows what is in man sanctions the desire for recreation which is so deeply seated in our nature—a desire, however, which in our fallen state opens the door to many dangers and temptations.

Indiscriminate and inordinate indulgence in the perusal of works of fiction is, no doubt, one of these. But the occasions are many when they may afford seasonable change and refreshment which are not otherwise attainable. Life was not meant to be monotonous, but it often is so. Poverty, sickness, the overgrown cities in which multitudes are compelled to pass almost their whole existence, increase the evil, and a pleasant book which, without putting a strain on faculties already unduly taxed, refreshes the mind with a new current of thought, is a boon to be received, like our daily bread, with thankfulness to Him who gives us all things richly to enjoy. The power to produce such books is a responsible talent in the present day. The land is flooded with light literature, and the demand increases with the supply. Happily we are not without distinctly Christian writers who recognise that this is a field of labour where such as are "wise-hearted" may weave threads of imagination and present mirrors to life and fact which will not be useless, even for the service of the sanctuary. One of these, whose gifted pen is gradually acquiring fresh power and facility, is Mrs. Marshall, of whom it has been truly said, that her illustrations of the effect of Divine love upon the characters of her stories are drawn with delicate discrimination without recourse to homilies and reflections, but, as it should be in a story, by means of straightforward narrative and natural and graceful dialogue.

Mrs. Oliphant's new work, "Within the Precincts," does not witness to such high aspirations. It shows the hopeless involutions of the labyrinth of life rather than the clue by which they may be threaded; the forlornness of the tempest-tossed bark rather than the means of weathering the storm in safety; the hollowness of the world, the disappointments of "Society," the derelictions of the Church, rather than the ways of pleasantness and the paths of peace into which the door stands open.

But there are plenty of suggestions to be gathered from the book, and, on

the whole, as a work of art it maintains Mrs. Oliphant's reputation. For while there are no sensational passages, the interest never pauses; not a scene is included but conduces to the progress of events; and the story, if it does not exactly end well, at least leaves the heroine in sight of a haven, which the reader, all along better instructed than herself concerning the unsubstantial foundation of her dreams of happiness, is glad to persuade himself she eventually enters. Yet, however true to nature, and however skilfully inwrought into the fabric of the plot, are the episodes connected with the heroine's vulgar stepmother, they awaken in the reader's mind, like the details of many a Dutch interior, a sense of wonder that it was ever considered worth while to introduce such specimens of the grotesque and unattractive.

There are two ideals which ought to be fulfilled by a Cathedral or Abbey Church with its capitular body. The first is the perpetual celebration of the Service of Song, in which prayer and supplication rise into praise and worship. And this has not been lost sight of. All down the tumult and turmoil of the ages, the long-drawn aisles of these quiet sanctuaries have echoed to the sweet melody of the Psalms of David, to the visions of rapt Isaiah, to the angelic strains of glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, and goodwill towards men. The second ideal seems to suggest a fortress and garrison of the Church militant, whence supplies and ammunition should continually be available for the use of the whole line; where the defenders of the faith should be ever forging new weapons against its assailants, whence assistance should be given in emergencies to the needs of overgrown parishes, as well as where rest and refreshment should be provided for the declining years of those who have well borne the heat and burden of the day. This ideal has not been realised as it might have been, though we may hope that "Within the Precincts" gives us a picture of its failure, not often to be matched.

The Dean of Mrs. Oliphant's story "was of a great family, and belonged not only to the nobility, but, higher still, to the most select circles of fashion, and had a noble wife, and such a position in society as many a Bishop envied; and among his canons were men not only of family, but possessed of some mild connection with the worlds of learning and scholarship. The minor canons were of humbler degree; they formed the link between gods and men, so to speak, between the Olympus of the chapter and the common secular sphere below." But Mrs. Oliphant does not cover her canvas as Mr. Trollope has done, with descriptions of clerical life. We may remark in passing, it is distressing that so keen an observer as he is, seems never in his whole life to have come across one worthy specimen of the order of men whose portraits he has so frequently drawn. "To no such distinction," pursues our authoress, "can these humble pages aspire: our office is of a lowlier kind. On Olympus the doings are all splendid, if not, as old chronicles tell, much wiser than beneath, amid the humbler haunts of men. All that we can do is to tell how these higher circles looked to eyes gazing keenly upon them from the mullioned windows which gave a subdued light to the little rooms of the Chevaliers' lodges on the southern side of St. Michael's Hill."

These Chevaliers are a supplementary order of pensioners, consisting of elderly half-pay officers in the army, among whom Captain Despard, the father of the beautiful heroine of the tale, has obtained admission when not much more than fifty years of age.

The story of this girl, during the eventful months on which her future career depends, is, as we have intimated, powerfully told. She has a magnificent but untrained voice, and the organist urges her to cultivate it in order to adopt singing as a profession. From this suggestion she revolts, and when the proposal is first made to her, replies with indignation, "I don't suppose that you mean to insult me; but you forget that

I am a gentleman's daughter." Her father is, however, a very disreputable sort of gentleman; her half-educated brother is incapable of passing any competitive examination, and at last she seems to recognise the necessity under which she is thought to be placed. But she has never heard an opera, and the music which kindles her genius is always Handel's. When she was first induced to try her own power to render in the Dean's drawing-room, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," "she sang she could not tell how, forgetting everything, though she saw and felt everything, penetrated through and through by the music and the poetry and the sacredness. Oh, how did she dare to sing it, how could those commonplace walls enclose it, those men stand and listen, as if it was *her* they were listening to?" Among her auditors was a young gentleman, an Earl's younger son, who, having failed in all other enterprises, wished to set up a new opera company, and thought he had found his prima donna in Lottie Despard, she, poor girl, believing all the while his devotion was paid to herself, not only to her voice. As she sang, "by-and-by the Dean laid down his paper. Rollo [the pseudo-lover who afterwards broke her heart], gazing on her at first, in pale anxiety, then with vexed disapproval (for what did he want with Handel?), came nearer and nearer, his face catching some reflection of hers as she went on. And when Lottie ended, in a rapture she could not explain or understand, they all came pressing round her, dim and blurred figures in her confused eyes. . . . . When she came to herself, she would not sing any more. A mixture of guilt and exultation was in her mind! 'I ought not to have sung it! I am not good enough to sing it. I never thought what it meant till now.'"

We have quoted this passage because it awakens sympathy for the living, breathing women, of whom this songstress of fiction is the representative.

There is another class of workers, young dressmakers, to whom Mrs. Oliphant introduces us. The idle brother of the heroine is supposed to enliven their toil and quicken their diligence, with the connivance of a forewoman who had her own ends to serve, by reading romances aloud to them. Does not this incident supply a hint to the managers of Christian Young Women's Associations? Would it be impossible to obtain permission from right-minded employers to allow the visits of lady readers to their work-rooms, at proper times and under proper regulations?

We have been led to notice the work before us as a specimen of the literature of the day; not with any intention to recommend it as worthy to be accounted one of the books of refreshment to which those who, with Bishop Butler, have learned to look on the world as God's world, would desire to give a place in their libraries.

---

*Impressions of Theophrastus Such.* By George Eliot. Second edition. W. Blackwood & Sons.

NOT a novel, but a collection of note-book sketches, some portions of which, apparently, were intended to be set in a novel, "Theophrastus Such" will be praised by a large number of persons, probably, as a readable book, while from not a few readers it is likely to receive much higher praise. And if we ourselves could consider it from what is termed a strictly literary point of view, we should join in the chorus of commendation. The book abounds in epigrammatic, sparkling sentences; and its literary power is not unworthy of "Scenes of Clerical Life" and "Adam Bede." Some sentences in the essay on the destiny of the Jews—the argumentative portion of the work—are, in a religious point of view, truly remarkable; they follow out the line of thought in "Daniel Deronda" as to the tenacity of the Hebrew race. If, however, we regard

the book, as a whole, in relation to revealed religion, it seems melancholy and perplexing. Concerning the "ethics of George Eliot's" writings, we observe, there has been lately some discussion; and the *Nonconformist* reviews a work which actually commended her books as teaching the "doctrine of the Cross." The *Nonconformist*, however, observes:—

> If we have read her at all aright from the side of Positive teaching, nothing is more certain than that the high inducement she holds forth for self-sacrifice is not rooted in any idea either of a personal Saviour or of a personal immortality.

The drift, at all events, of the teaching, so far as her works afford "religious" suggestions, will generally be admitted to be humanistic. Certainly, the self-sacrifice inculcated in them is not the self-sacrifice taught in the Word of God; it is not "the doctrine of the Cross." On the contrary, it looks extremely like, to say the least, a Positivist merging the individual in some "ideal whole" ("Theophrastus Such," p. 340). The truth is, one finds it difficult to understand the religious teaching of several writers in these days; they take New Testament ideas and common religious expressions, but they do not apply the ideas of Scripture upon Scriptural truths, the great facts through which religious principles have power. Hence, much of their language is perplexing to the last degree.

Oh may I join the choir invisible

sounds like a Christian prayer; but what must be said of such verses as the following:—

> Oh may I join the choir invisible
> Of those immortal dead who live again
> In lives made better by their presence. So
> To live is Heaven. . . . .
> To make undying music in the world
> Breathing us beauteous order, that controls
> With growing sway the growing life of man.
> So we inherit that sweet purity
> For which we struggled, groaned, and agonized
> With widening retrospect that bred despair.
> . . . . This is life to come
> Which martyred men have made more glorious
> For us to strive to follow. May I reach
> That purest heaven, and be to other souls
> That cup of strength in some great agony.

Such verses must be dismissed as worthless rhapsody. What is meant we cannot tell. But assuredly here is no echo of a Christian hope. "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord: their works do follow them." This is the promise, the fact, of Holy Scripture. "The love of Christ constraineth us" to a life of holy usefulness, a life of hope, a life of sure reward. For this, Comtist talk about the enthusiasm of humanity and the instincts of "sociology" is, indeed, a miserable substitute.

## Short Notices.

*The Student's Commentary on the Holy Bible: founded on the Speaker's Commentary.* Abridged and edited by J. M. Fuller, M.A., Vicar of Bexley. Vol. II. Murray.

It is truly said that "the Speaker's Commentary" has won for itself a recognised place as the foremost work of its class available to English readers. The "Abridgment," in six volumes, of which the second volume is before us, will, no doubt, be similarly successful. It acquaints the reader with the conclusion of learned investigations, and supplies him with

satisfactory answers to several misinterpretations. Mr. Fuller has done his work well. The volumes, with a neat cloth cover, are handy as to size and printed in clear type.

*Carthage and the Carthaginians.* By R. Bosworth Smith, M.A. Second edition. Longmans.

This is undoubtedly an able work of high interest for historical students. The author justly observes that the first Punic war throws more light on the energies and character of the Carthaginians than the second. Further, we have the guidance of Polybius throughout the history of the first war. Dr. Arnold, however, gave only one chapter of his noble history to that war. Mr. Bosworth Smith treats it at considerable length.

*Spent in the Service. A Memoir of the Very Rev. Achilles Daunt, D.D., Dean of Cork.* By the Rev. F. R. Wynne, M.A., Incumbent of St. Matthias's, Dublin. Hodder & Stoughton.

A valuable biography. Dean Daunt was a man "of special singleness of mind and heavenliness of character;" esteemed on all sides as emphatically "a good man"—faithful, lovable, lowly-hearted. The memorial of such a Christian Minister has a value of its own.

*Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.* By F. A. Philippi, Doctor and Professor of Theology at Bostock. 2 vols. T. & T. Clark.

A translation from the third edition of Professor Philippi's Commentary on the great Epistle can hardly fail to win its way among English theological students. Sound, scholarly, and, if we may use such a word, *sensible*—not loaded with details—the work is really helpful. With "Haldane on the Romans," in its own way unrivalled, setting forth the Apostle's argument with logical lucidity, and Philippi's work, of present-day tone, with classical references, many students of the original will find all that they require.

*The Unsafe Anchor; or, "Eternal Hope" a False Hope.* Strictures on Canon Farrar's Westminster Abbey Sermons. By C. F. Childe, M.A., Rector of Holbrook. Fifth edition. W. Hunt & Co.

We are by no means surprised to read, in a brief preface, that "repeated applications have been made for the issue of a cheaper edition of this little work," "The Unsafe Anchor." Not a formal treatise upon the subject of Eternal Punishment, nor containing a complete answer to all the arguments in Canon Farrar's "Eternal Hope," it is what it professes to be, a review of that book. The style is clear and vigorous; and the argument, ably set forth, runs on sound lines. Mr. Childe's rule is to "prove all things" by the standard of God's Word, and to "hold fast" that alone which is "written therein, or may be proved thereby."

*Travels with a Donkey in the Cevennes.* By R. L. Stevenson. C. Kegan Paul & Co.

The journey which this cleverly-written little book describes was, we can understand, "very agreeable." The Churchman, however, having in view the social circle, is bound to take exception to certain expressions in the book neither witty nor wise; and, further, its religious descriptions, though here and there, from a certain *naïveté*, not without attractiveness, are by no means satisfactory. In a visit to the Trappist monastery of "Our Lady of the Snows," the author met with a monk who prayed daily, night and morning, for Dr. Pusey, who was, he believed, "very near the truth."

*Short Sketches of Wild Sports and Natural History of the Highlands.* By CHARLES ST. JOHN. New edition. Murray.

A new, cheap edition of a well-known work, now forming portion of "Murray's Home and Colonial Library," will form an amusing companion in a Scottish tour. Of Highland lakes, of salmon and seals, wild cats and tame owls, dogs of many kinds, weasels, stags, ptarmigan and eagles, and so forth, this Highland Selborne writes with zest and skill. Anecdotes abound. We quote one of a shepherd's dog. To prove his dog's quickness, the shepherd said to a friend before the kitchen fire, in the middle of a sentence about something else—"I am thinking the cow is in the potatoes." The dog, apparently asleep, was up in a moment and on the roof, where he could see the potato field; but as the cow was not there he ran to the byre, where she was "all right." The dog came back to the fire. After a short time the shepherd said the same words, and the collie repeated his look out. But when the false alarm was given the third time, the dog simply got up, and wagged his tail, and when the men laughed, he laid down, slightly growling, to show he was offended.

*The Song of Solomon, arranged for Sunday Reading. With Meditations on each Portion.* By the Very Rev. HENRY LAW, M.A., Dean of Gloucester. Hamilton, Adams & Co.

We heartily recommend this suggestive work, bright with Christian cheerfulness, firm, and faithful. The little book is tastefully got up, and is most suitable for a present. In a polished dedication to Lord Shaftesbury, the venerated Dean remarks that on all occasions the noble Earl's "adherence to the grand principles of the Reformation has been clear as the light, and high above the duplicities of compromise."

*The Holy Bible, with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary.* Edited by C. F. COOK, M.A., Canon of Exeter. New Testament, vol. 1. Murray.

The first portion of the Speaker's Commentary, New Testament, has been before the public some time, and we do not therefore review it. But purposing to review the forthcoming volumes, and express our opinion on the work as a whole, we gladly call attention to the volume before us, the Commentary on the Synoptical Gospels. The introduction by the Archbishop of York is masterly.

*The Church Missionary Atlas. Containing an Account of the various countries in which the Church Missionary Society labours, and of its Missionary operations.* New edition (the sixth). With thirty-one Maps, a Chronological Chart, &c. C. M. House, Salisbury Square.

An admirably executed volume. Originally planned by the Rev. W. Knight, the first edition of the Atlas appeared in 1857. The fifth edition, brought out by the late General Lake, in 1873, was considerably enlarged, and contained ten new maps. After the retirement of that devoted servant of God, he set himself to collect materials for an improved edition, and a memorandum was left among his Atlas papers, signed by himself in May, 1877, exactly a week before his lamented death, mentioning many friends who had rendered him assistance. The delays which have occurred in bringing out the present (the sixth) edition, have at least conduced to the completeness of the work. It is now one of singular interest and value. The maps are truly excellent. An *ad Clerum*, with the signature W. K., deserves especial praise.

*Anglo-American Bible Revision.* By Members of the American Revision Committee. Nisbet & Co.

This little book, containing twenty essays by American divines, has a peculiar interest at the present moment. In an introduction by Dr. Schaff the revision principles are unfolded; and it is added:—"If these principles are faithfully carried out (as they have been thus far), the people need not apprehend any dangerous innovations. No article of faith, no moral precept, will be disturbed, no sectarian views will be introduced. The revision will so nearly resemble the present version, that the mass of readers and hearers will scarcely perceive the difference; while a careful comparison will show slight improvements in every chapter and almost in every verse.

*Some Remarks upon a Letter to the Rev. C. J. Elliott, M.A., by the Rev. E. King, D.D., Regius Professor of Theology, Oxford.* By the Rev. C. J. Elliott. Murray.

We had intended to call the attention of our readers to this important *brochure* in our present Number, but our review is unavoidably postponed. Mr. Elliott shows the real character of the *Communicant's Manual* and other ultra-Church works in this reply to Professor King's recent "Letter." *Justæ causæ facilis est defensio.*

*Unsearchable Riches. What do the Times Require?* By the Rev. J. C. Ryle, M.A. William Hunt & Co.

We notice these sermons for a two-fold reason. In the first place, they are exceptionally good. In the second place, the doctrines vigorously and clearly set forth in them are the doctrines which will be maintained in this Magazine. They are the doctrines, we believe, of the Reformed Church of England, the Liturgy and Articles being fairly construed, and further, the doctrines set forth in the Primitive Church and in the New Testament. The Preacher *speaks out*, according to his wont (*Quicquid fecit valdè fecit:*) and his words run smoothly along the good old lines.

*Ancient Monuments and Holy Writ.* By W. Pakenham Walsh, D.D., Bishop of Ossory. Fifth edition. Dublin: George Herbert.

An interesting pamphlet, and truly valuable.

*Kept for the Master's Use.* By Frances Ridley Havergal. Twentieth Thousand. Nisbet & Co.

The proofs of this little book were revised by Miss Havergal shortly before her death, on Whit-Sunday last. Not a word of commendation is necessary.

*The Way Home.* By the Rev. Charles Bullock, B.D., "Hand and Heart" Publishing Office.

A new edition of a well-known book; it has a very pretty cover.

*A Voyage in the "Sunbeam," our Home on the Ocean for Eleven Months.* With Sixty-six Illustrations. By Mrs. Brassey. Longmans.

A really charming book; chatty, animated, with much information.

*The Odyssey of Homer rendered into English Verse.* Books I. to XII. By G. A. Schomberg, C.B., General. Murray.

A work of no small merit. We have read many pages with care, and the rendering seems to us, on the whole, exceedingly good.

*A Nook in the Apennines; or, a Summer Beneath the Chestnuts.* By L. Scott. With Twenty-seven Illustrations. C. Kegan Paul & Co.

If only this well-written, tasteful book had a Protestant tone we should gladly recommend it.

## ART. XII.—THE SESSION.

THE Parliamentary Session of 1879 was, in many respects, disappointing, and it was unusually barren of results. Much time was consumed in debates on Turkey, Afghanistan, and South Africa; and Indian affairs, happily, had a large share of attention. Lord Shaftesbury's appeal in the House of Lords for the protection of women and children in the cotton factories of India was not made in vain. The Ministerial majority remains unimpaired; and the divisions on the Liberal side of the House of Commons have been patent. That several useful measures were sacrificed is due, in no small degree, to the obstructive tactics of the Home Rulers. The Army Discipline Bill occupied the attention of the Lower House for two hundred hours. At the close of the Session, the Irish University Bill was passed, almost without opposition. Mr. Gladstone, and several ex-Ministers, had voted with Mr. Shaw, the Home Rule leader, on his denominational amendment, but "a strong contingent of the independent members of the Opposition" supported the Government. Another "grievance" was redressed. For the teachers of the Irish National Schools aid was provided in the way of pensions from the surplus funds of the Church of Ireland. Mr. Marten's Burials Act is, at all events, a step in the right direction. It proceeds on the lines of Mr. Home Secretary Cross's practical speech, and it is not unlikely to become widely useful. The circular of the Local Government Board, explaining the provisions of the Act, with other information, is published as a pamphlet by the Church Defence Institution. The chief official of the so-called "Liberation Society" has displayed a concern for the fees of the clergy which is rather amusing.

The proceedings in the Convocation of Canterbury, in the Upper House, at least, were both interesting and important. The Ornaments Rubric was the main point of debate. On June 25th the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol brought before the House a new rubric, as follows:—

> The minister at all times of his ministration shall wear a surplice with a stole or scarf, and the hood of his degree, until it shall be otherwise ordered by a canon of the Church, lawfully enacted, promulgated, and executed; provided always that this rubric shall not be understood to repeal the 24th and 58th of the canons of the year 1604.

This rubric, the Archbishop stated, had been carried in the Committee by the majority of from 10 to 5. Priests and deacons are by it expressly precluded from any other vesture than the surplice in their *ministrations*. Preaching, obviously, was not

understood to be included. After considerable discussion this rubric, slightly changed, was carried *nem. dis.* The Lower House, however, by "a triumphant majority," 68 to 13, rejected it. After further discussion, there was a Conference of the two Houses; and finally another rubric was agreed upon, allowing surplice, stole or scarf, hood, and gown, but providing that "no other ornament" shall be used *contrary to the monition of the Bishop.* The Lower House phrase had been, "*without the consent of the Bishop.*" Practically, between the two phrases, there is little difference. The compromise unquestionably sanctions the introduction and use of Eucharistic vestments when the Bishop does not interpose a veto. The new rubric is objectionable also in regard to the existing "Ornaments Rubric." Letters from Canons Ryle and Clayton, Professor Birks, Dean Close, and other representative Churchmen, were published at the time protesting against the new rubric. The venerable Dean wrote (*Record*, July 28th) in the following terms:—

> Aiming at an apparent reconciliation of contending parties, it not only misses its mark, but if carried into law would intensify every existing dissension. With Canon Ryle I believe that such an act of frivolous and mischievous legislation never could pass successfully through those "convocations" of English common sense and British independence, the noble Houses of Lords and Commons. My hope for the Established Church, as far as human support is concerned, has long rested only on its lay element, and the experience of each recurring act from other quarters confirms the truth of my impressions.

So far as concerns the Convocation of the Northern Province the matter is left in *statu quo.* The speeches of the Bishop of Durham on Ritual and on the Athanasian Creed were worthy of the reputation of that profound scholar. In the York Convocation, the importance of which is increasing yearly, Dr. Lightfoot will do good service.

The anti-Intemperance Movement is evidently making progress. Many signs, here and there, throughout the country, show clearly that the Church of England Temperance Society has been gaining influence. The Coffee House movement has been aided by the speeches of the Lord Chancellor and other distinguished personages.

To Sunday Schools attention has been recently drawn, in several ways; and their importance is becoming more and more recognised. The action of the Birmingham School Board concerning the teaching of morality has tended in no small degree to show the necessity of religious teaching in day-schools.