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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

DECEMBER, 1879.

ART. I.—FORTHCOMING VERSION OF THE BIBLE.

AMONGST the many aids by which modern scholarship and the progress of science have enabled us more clearly to discern our duty, and in many instances more efficiently to perform it, one of signal importance and incalculable value is promised during the ensuing year. The excellences of our English version of the Word of God cannot be too warmly or too gratefully acknowledged. It was the successor and the rival of several admirable translations, some of which had just claims, and were strong in possession; and yet, without either external or moral coercion, by the force of its own merits it displaced them. Our Church lost, indeed, many of her children, but they all took their mother's Bible with them, and taking that they were not wholly lost to her. Securing gradually the confidence of the scholar, it speedily won the love of the people. The style in vogue amongst men of letters in the days of Elizabeth and James was faulty and pedantic. But the religious discussions which followed the Reformation had called forth what has been happily termed a "consecrated diction," simple and direct, yet pure and dignified. Whilst glorifying God, it ennobled the tongue of the worshipper, and by its innate inspiration it elevated the whole tone of English literature. If I quote the words of one who unhappily deserted the Church of England,[1] it is only that I may adduce the confession even of an unfriendly witness in its favour—"Who will say that the uncommon beauty and marvellous English of the Protestant Bible is not one of the great strongholds of heresy in this country? It lives on the ear, like music that cannot be forgotten; like the sound of

[1] The Rev. Frederick W. Faber.

Church bells, which the convert hardly knows how he can forego. Its felicities seem often to be almost things rather than words. It is part of the national mind, and the anchor of national seriousness. . . . The memory of the dead passes into it. The potent traditions of childhood are stereotyped in its verses. The power of all the griefs and trials of a man are hid beneath its words. . . . It is his sacred thing, which doubt has never dimmed and controversy never soiled." Such being the confessed distinctions of our English Bible, it is obvious that they have rendered a new translation, as a substitute for something decaying and ready to vanish away, impossible: for it retains in itself more of freshness and vitality than anything which has sought to supplant it. But they by no means preclude a revision of it, which is happily now as practicable as it is necessary. Our version is itself a revision of revisions, and its history has revealed the path towards perfection. "Truly," said the translators, "we never thought, from the beginning, that we should need to make a new Translation, nor yet to make of a bad one a good one; but to make a good one better, or out of many good ones, one principal good one." Their example it has seemed good to our Church to follow.

Nine years ago a committee of eminent Biblical scholars was constructed for the revision of the Version of 1611, with power to add to its number learned members of other Christian denominations, by whom the Authorised Version was accepted, both in this and other lands. During their labours 101 able and eminent men have been engaged upon the work, of whom by death or resignation 22 have been lost, but 79 are still actively pursuing their patient task. Amongst those who were removed to the world of perfect knowledge were Bishops Thirlwall and Wilberforce, Dean Alford, Professors Fairbairn, of Glasgow, and Hodge, of Princeton. Amongst those who are still spared to mature the great work are men whose reputation will earn the confidence of all—Harold Browne, Ollivant, Ellicott, Moberly, Westcott, Scrivener, and Lightfoot. It is expected that the revised New Testament, at least, and possibly also parts of the Old Testament, will be published in 1880, just 500 years since Wycliffe issued the first complete version of the Holy Scriptures in the English language. An interesting account of the work now being accomplished by the Revisers has been published during the present year by Dr. Schaff, the well-known Professor of Theology in the Union Theological Seminary of New York. It consists of Papers upon different sections and aspects of the work, contributed by members of the American Revision Committee. And although the suggestions and statements respecting any particular changes are only made on the authority of the individual writer, yet as these have been

the subject of correspondence during nine years between the Committees, they possess an interest far beyond that which would attach to the speculations of any individual, however eminent in scholarship or position. It is, however, very perceptible that, so far as the New Testament Scriptures are concerned, one great mind has exercised a commanding, yet well-merited, influence upon the deliberations of the revisers. The alterations and emendations foreshadowed by the American scholars are for the most part identical with those which were issued in 1871 by the then Hulsean Professor of Divinity, Dr. Lightfoot, who has recently been promoted to the See of Durham. It is a happy augury that a mind so eminently candid, and a scholarship so extensive and accurate, should have been accepted by men of different denominations and of varying attainments, as worthy and able to moderate in the conflicts of opinion inseparable from free and honest discussion.

With respect to the expediency of revising both the original texts and the English version of the Scriptures, no one can doubt the absolute necessity of our attaining to the closest possible accuracy in our rendering of the words of everlasting life. Many of the errors of our day originated in faulty deductions from passages ambiguously or imperfectly worded. And when once a theory had thus been adopted, the Bible was searched with a prejudiced eye, to discover perforce corroborations of erroneous conceptions. Plymouthism is a conspicuous example of this evil. In other cases doctrines which were themselves soundly deduced from passages of undoubted authority have been unnecessarily buttressed by supports, which criticism has shown to be defective. And the truth has been discredited by the exposed failure of accretions which were really extraneous to it. Divergencies between Christians have been aggravated by appeals to statements apparently contradictory, but in the truth of the original consistent with each other. And the spiritual growth of many a pious soul has been checked by mistaken interpretation of phrases which describe experimental religion, or has been stimulated to more than a true sobriety of development by words too warmly rendered, or to which modern usage has attached an advanced meaning. In the interests, then, of substantial unity, of sound and sober theology, and, above all, of clear knowledge of ourselves and of our God, an accurate revision, adhering as closely as honesty would permit to the existing version, and yet faithfully correcting its errors and supplying its defects, had become a primary necessity of our times.

And, in the merciful Providence of God, there was a singular concurrence of modern facilities for the task. In the Old Testament, indeed, the laborious collations of Hebrew manu-

scripts have done little more than establish the substantial correctness of the received Masoretic text; whilst the long discussion respecting the Hebrew vowels has resulted in proving, if not their originality, at least their accuracy. But whilst the text will remain almost wholly unaltered, it must be remembered that Hebrew studies have made vast advances since 1611, and that the entire science of comparative Semitic philology has been developed since that time. The Buxtorfs, father and son, whose labours represented the first stage of scholarly investigation into the structure of Hebrew, had only just published their works in 1609. But since their day a long list of lexicographers, grammarians, and commentators, have discussed every word of the Sacred text. Palestine has been thoroughly surveyed: its topography, its archæology, its natural history have been exhaustively explored by diligent students; and the monuments of Assyria and of Egypt have been exhumed. The value of the versions which our translators collated, and of the commentaries which they consulted, has also been accurately gauged. And whilst the former, and especially those in "Spanish, French, Italian, or Dutch," to which they refer, are now held to be worthy of little credit, the commentaries which, with the exception of the Rabbinic Expositions, were the work of men generally unacquainted with Hebrew, cannot now be trusted for the solution of a linguistic difficulty, without the safeguard which modern scholarship supplies.

In the case of the New Testament the necessity for revision arises not only from its intrinsic importance as the Revelation and Charter of the Gospel Dispensation, but also from the fact that its text has required very careful recension before the attempt to clothe it in English could be made. Three of the principal editions of the Greek Testament which influenced, directly or indirectly, the text of the Authorised Version, may be traced to that of Erasmus, issued in 1527. But to him there were available for the Gospels only a manuscript of the fifteenth century, and one of the thirteenth or fourteenth century for the Acts and the Epistles. In the Revelation his manuscript was so imperfect that he was compelled to supply some of its defects by translating from the Latin Vulgate into Greek. It is not too much to say that in more than a thousand instances fidelity to the true text now ascertained requires a change in the common version, although in most cases the change would be slight. Modern research, however, has, by God's guidance, brought to light manuscripts more or less complete, ranging from the fourth to the tenth century, including twenty-seven of the Gospels, ten of the Acts and Catholic Epistles, and eleven of the Epistles of St. Paul. The Old Latin, the Syriac, and the Coptic translations, of the second and third centuries, were unknown to our trans-

lators; and it is but recently that the Church has been instructed by the labours of Griesbach, Tischendorf, and Tregelles. We are confident, therefore, that the recension of the text will be conducted efficiently and faithfully. When an important reading is clearly a mistake of the copyists, it will be discarded; when it is uncertain its doubtfulness will be stated in the margin; and the unskilled reader will inherit the wisdom of the ablest scholars of the day, and not least amongst them, of that master of textual criticism, the present Bishop of Durham. And we are assured, on the authority of Professor Westcott, "that in no parallel case have the readings of the original texts to be translated been discussed and determined with equal care, thoroughness, and candour."

The advantages to be anticipated from greater accuracy in the translation of the New Testament are, that obscure and involved passages will be made plain; that the course of many an argument will be freed from perplexing impediments; that the Bible will be liberated from the imputation of being in certain places inconsequential and illogical; and that, whilst no doctrine defined in our Articles or fairly deducible from our Liturgy will lose its support, many will be found to derive strong confirmation from passages hitherto misapprehended. Precision in rendering the force of the Article; in defining the inflexions of the verb and the delicate exactness of its tenses; in marking the true intention of the prepositions; and in correcting some unquestionable mistranslations, will tend powerfully to stamp the volume as having been inspired by One who cannot lie, and will not contradict Himself.

We may also expect much assistance from a greater observance of verbal identity. The translators of 1611 remark, in their address to the reader, "We have not tied ourselves to an uniformity of phrasing or to an identity of words. That we should express the same notion in the same particular word, as, for example, if we translate the Hebrew or Greek word once by *purpose*, never to call it *intent* . . . . . thus to mince the matter we thought to savour more of curiosity than of wisdom." This, however, was an unhappy decision. In a volume which is recognised as a supreme authority by all Christians, whilst varied renderings of a word may involve the introduction of new doctrine, the translation by one and the same expression of words which differ in the original tends to confound things that differ. The English reader suffers great inconvenience from such variations, and from such apparent but not real correspondences. He finds, for instance, in one passage the word "Atonement;" and so far as he can discover it occurs nowhere else. But a correct translation would have enabled him to recognise the term made familiar elsewhere as "Reconciliation."

He investigates the nature of Scriptural "hope," and he is baffled by the fact that eighteen times out of thirty-two the translators have rendered the verb by "trust," thus virtually confounding the first two of the triad of Christian graces. It is scarcely necessary to recall the unfortunate result of the varied renderings of the same word in the verse "These shall go away into *everlasting* punishment, but the righteous into life *eternal*;" or of the confusion occasioned by translating "Hades" and "Gehenna" identically in every instance except one. We all recognise the vital importance of St. Paul's teaching that "faith is reckoned for righteousness." Yet the proof text from the Old Testament upon which he bases the doctrine is given differently in our translation on each occasion of his quoting it. And the verb itself, which is one of his technical theological terms, and which constitutes the very warp of his great argument, receives three different renderings in its eleven occurrences within the compass of twenty-two verses. It is true that sense is infinitely more important than sound, and that the context may modify by varying shades the meaning of a well-known word. But none assuredly will doubt the obligation to make the Word of Life so plain, so vivid, so consistent with itself, that not only may the scholar trust it as "the man of his counsel," but that the "wayfaring man," though unlearned, may cease "to err therein." Moreover, the challenge uttered to every intelligent man by the issue of the new revision will compel a revival both social and private of the study of the Holy Scriptures, which, if pondered by the proffered light of the Holy Spirit, and explored by the God-given clue of faith in Christ Jesus, are able to make us wise unto salvation.

EDWARD PREST.

ART. II.—THE CHURCH IN WALES.

THE Church in Wales received at the late Church Congress a large amount of attention; her past and present condition was ably discussed; her position was considered in its various aspects. Attention, however, was chiefly directed to her external history and outward condition. Her inner life was barely touched. The religious element at work within her was not explained; and until this explanation is forthcoming, the position which she occupies among the people cannot be understood. It is an essential factor in the solution of the problem. The purpose of my remarks is to attempt this explanation, and I shall take my start from the Reformation.

Translations of the Bible and of Liturgies distinguished the age of the Reformation, and they produced great results. They were elements at work in the revolution, religious and social, which then changed the face of Europe. They sapped the power of the Papacy, and sowed the seed of Protestantism in the hearts of the people. In this great movement Wales was not forgotten. God was gracious unto the land, and He turned back again the captivity of His people. He opened in the wilderness—among the hills of Wales—fountains of living water, and disclosed unto its people of primitive simplicity, who were perishing for lack of knowledge, the riches of His saving grace by a translation of the Scriptures of truth which perhaps is not surpassed in any language; and He gave them in their churches a version of the Book of Common Prayer in their own language, which, if it had been faithfully and efficiently used where it was wanted, while it directed their devotions and trained their hearts in the service of the sanctuary, might have united them in indissoluble bonds to the Church of their fathers. Portions of the Bible and the Prayer Book were translated and printed in the time of Edward VI., but under Queen Elizabeth the work was completed. During her reign the Welsh Bible and the Welsh Prayer Book were published in their entirety; but we can well conceive that their readers were few. The people were defective in the mechanical art of reading. That art must have been confined to the higher and the better portion of the community; it must have been beyond the reach of the bulk of the people, and on this account the conduct of the services in the churches must have been left entirely to the clergyman and the clerk. They were not congregational. The people, being unable to read, could not join in the responses; and thus the Prayer Book, as an instrument of public devotion, although translated into Welsh, never, as far as I can ascertain, acquired a hold on the mind of the people; it never won their heart. Here, then, we see a screw loose—a link was missing in the chain. The Liturgy formed no bond of union between the nation and the Church; the national mind readily left its moorings, within her pale, under the influence of the disturbing elements of the religious revival which swept over the face of the country in the eighteenth century. The current of that great revival did not run in the groove of the formularies of the Church of England. There were impediments in its way which obstructed its course in that channel. These impediments were various, and they can be traced to various causes; but not the least of them arose from the deficiency of the people in the art of reading; and when the art was acquired in the Sunday Schools and otherwise, the remedy came too late: the river had then overflowed its banks and formed fresh channels; the religious fervour of the people had

been diverted from the Book of Common Prayer as an instrument of public devotion, and had found its expression in extempore effusions and in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs.

But the doctrine which kindled the revival was the doctrine of the Church of England; the live coal which had touched the lips of Rowlands of Llangeitho, and others, was taken off her altar; the truths which they preached with tongues of fire were those which are found in all their fulness and purity in her creeds, her articles, and her formularies. At Llangeitho one of the great revivals broke out when Rowlands was reading in the service the pathetic words of the Litany:—"By thine agony and bloody sweat, by thy cross and passion, by thy precious death and burial, by thy glorious resurrection and ascension, and by the coming of the Holy Ghost.—Good Lord deliver us." And Williams of Pantycelyn, the sweet singer of Welsh Methodism, in his thrilling elogy on the death of Rowlands, while describing the effects of his preaching at Llangeitho, shows the sources whence he derived his doctrine. His testimony is so striking that I may be excused for transcribing the stanzas as they were written. They read as follows:—

Mae ei holl ddaliadau gloyw
  Mewn tair credo i'w gwel'd yn glir,
Athanasius a Nicea
  'Nghyd â'r Apostolaidd wir;
Hen articlau eglwys Loegr,
  Catecist Westminster fawr,
Ond yn benna'r Bibl sanctaidd,
  Dywynnodd arnynt oleu wawr.

Ac o'r nentydd gloyw yma
  'Roedd trysorau nefol râs,
Megis afon fawr lifeiriol
  Yn Llangeitho 'n d'od i ma's;
Gwaed a dw'r nid dw'r yn unig,
  Anghau a sancteiddrwydd drud
Tywysog mawr ein iachawduriaeth
  Yw 'r pregethau sy yno gyd.

In these stanzas the poet shows that all the pure tenets of Rowlands might be clearly seen in three creeds—the Athanasian, the Nicene, and the Apostles' Creed—and that the light of dawn had shone on the old Articles of the Church of England and on the Catechism of great Westminster, but especially on the Holy Bible, and that from these pure streams the treasures of heavenly grace, as a great overflowing river, came out at Llangeitho, and that blood and water—not water only—death and precious holiness of the great captain of our salvation were all the preaching there.

This testimony is clear and it is true. No fact is more historically certain than that the early Methodists in Wales, although they abandoned the Liturgy of the Church in their public services, yet held the doctrine pure and entire, of which it was a repository and exponent, as the root of their spiritual life, and the ground of their future hope; it was the life-blood of their theology; they cherished it as a treasure of priceless value; it was the source of their strength and the secret of their power; in their mouth it was the power of God unto salvation to thousands of their countrymen. They neglected the use of the Liturgy and yet they valued its doctrine; that is the position in which the revival of last century placed the Welsh Methodists in reference to the Church of their fathers.

And another cause of the rupture which the revival produced is found in the spiritual state of the Church at the time and in the attitude it assumed with respect to the movement. The Church was cold and lukewarm; the clergy were worldly and indifferent; many of them were corrupt and immoral; there was no life in the preaching and no fervour in the worship; clergy and people alike had fallen into deep sleep; the spirit of slumber had come over them. This is graphically described by the poet in his elogy on the Rev. Daniel Rowlands, to which I have already referred. In it he says:—

Pan oedd Tywyll nos trwy Frydain
Heb un argoel codi gwawr
A thrwm gwsg odiwrth yr Arglwydd
Wedi goruwch—guddio 'r llawr;
Daniel chwythodd yn yr udgorn
Gloyw udgorn Sina fryn
Ac fe grynodd creigydd cedyrn
Wrth yr adsain nerthol hyn.

In plain English, this stanza declares that when there was dark night through Britain without any sign of the rise of the dawn, and deep sleep from God was overspreading the ground, Daniel blew the trumpet—the bright trumpet of the hill of Sinah, and strong rocks quaked at this powerful echo.

Daniel did, indeed, blow the trumpet; he and others as faithful watchmen on the walls of Sion lifted up their voices like trumpets and gave the alarm; but the Bishops and clergy of Wales understood not the sound; they mistook its meaning; they knew not the day of their visitation; they did not see in the movement the finger of God and signs of His grace and favour unto His people; they set themselves in antagonism to it; they discountenanced and opposed it; they attempted by violent measures to suppress it; the Bishop withdrew Rowlands' license and the clergy closed the doors of the churches against him; and the gentry of the country, and even the common

people, whose cry was—"The King and Church," joined the clergy; the early Methodists were roughly treated by the rabble; they were in many places persecuted and stoned; they were often in jeopardy of their lives; they were brought before magistrates who showed them no favour, but treated them as disturbers of the public peace. This was the attitude which the Church on the part of its Bishops and clergy and its laity assumed with respect to the revival of religion in the last century, and by their action became responsible for the rupture that occurred and which led to the separation of the Methodists from the Church of their fathers.

And, again, there is another point of view bearing on the subject which deserves notice; this point of view is an element in the question which assists us to explain the tendency of events which terminated in the schism which the revival of religion in the last century produced in Wales. At the Reformation and in the times of the Stuarts no man arose in Wales who through his writings or otherwise impressed his own individual character in favour of the Church on the minds of the people; men of eminence did, indeed, arise; they were men of learning and piety; they did great work in their day; and their memory is cherished with reverence by the Welsh people to this day; but no one appeared among them like John Knox in Scotland, who impressed his individual character on the minds of the people so deeply as to make his memory in subsequent generations a connecting link between the national mind and the national Church; this link was wanting to the Welsh Church, when the disturbing elements of Methodism arose in the last century. When the religious feelings of the people were aroused and set afloat under the influence of the revival there was no guiding-star among the worthies of their nation, whose memory fastened them to the Church of their fathers; no Calvin or Knox had been among them who had shaped them after his own model, and the talismanic influence of whose name would have kept the current of their religious enthusiasm within the pale of the national Church. But although no man of this commanding influence had appeared during the period to which I have referred, yet the Welsh Church at that time was not destitute of men of mark, whose writings, though not extensive, had a considerable hold on the minds of the Welsh people; among them I may name Edmund Prys, Archdeacon of Merioneth, who is said to have assisted Dr. Morgan in the translation of the Welsh Bible. He was the author of the Metrical Psalter. This book no doubt exercised great influence on the minds of the people. It was a valuable acquisition to the Church in the seventeenth century. It must have improved congregational singing, and quickened an interest in the public services of the Church;

the pure truth which pervades it must have supplied hungry souls with spiritual bread of the finest quality. But I am not aware that, taken as a whole, it ever was a popular work. I know of no proofs to lead me to suppose that it ever aroused the religious enthusiasm of the people and took a deep hold on the national mind. At the time of the Methodist revival it was soon supplanted and driven out of the field by the hymns of Williams of Pantycelyn. It formed a link of little power between the national mind and the national Church. But when I say this I apply the remark to the book as a whole. There are stanzas in it that have always been, in the highest sense of the term, popular. They have taken deep hold on the minds of Welshmen, and will doubtless be sung in public assemblies in Wales as long as the Welsh language continues to exist. Among these I may name the metrical versions of Psalms xxvii. 4, lxxxiv. 1, c. 1, cviii. 5, cxxi. 1, cxxii. 1, as an illustration of my remark. They will never lose their popularity as long as true piety breathes in the assemblies of Welsh people.

Another name was very popular at one time in Wales, and is still held in great reverence among the people. It is that of the Rev. Rees Prichard, vicar of Landovery, commonly called "Vicar Llanyinddyfri." He flourished in the time of James I. and Charles I., and was a man of mark in his day. In his younger days he was addicted to habits of intemperance, and the incident which is said to have led to his conversion was very remarkable. A he-goat was in the habit of following him to the public-house. On one occasion he gave the goat beer and made him drunk. After this treatment the goat could not be induced either to follow him to the public-house or to taste beer any more. The conduct of the goat brought him to reflection. He thought himself more brutish than the dumb animal, and made up his mind to forsake his sins and turn to God. He became a powerful preacher and a burning and a shining light among his countrymen. But he is best known as the author of "Canwyll-y-Cymry"—"Welshmen's Candle." It is a volume of songs on Scriptural and common subjects. The author was a true poet. He had, in great richness and in genuine refinement, what the Welsh call "Yr awen"—the gift of poetry. His language is colloquial, but the flow is easy, and there is harmony in the rhythm, and the sentiments are replete with sound maxims on events of common occurrence. As a repository of maxims the book stands without a rival in the Welsh language, and perhaps in that respect it is not excelled in any other language. In the last century it was very popular. The people got it up by heart, and its sentiments were ever on their lips. I can well remember the readiness with which old people, in my younger days, quoted lines from the Vicar's Book in illustration of occurrences of daily

life, and for guidance of conduct in the discharge of ordinary duties; but its songs were not psalms and hymns used in the services of the Church—it formed no connecting link between the national mind and the national Church. When the revival came, the Vicar's Book was neglected, if not forgotten. The enthusiasm of the people was raised by the hymns of Williams of Pantycelyn, and they were carried away by them.

But it is time that I should now take a brief review of the revival of last century, which terminated in the secession of a large and influential portion of my countrymen from the Church of their fathers. I shall consider the part which the promoters respectively took in the movement. God sent forth His Spirit. But human agencies were also at work. Individual men had their predilections and biasses, and perhaps their weaknesses and infirmities, as well as their gifts and excellences. The idiosyncrasies of the agencies added shape and colour to the movement. They left their impress on the result, and that impress is now visibly seen in the religious condition of the Principality.

At the opening of the scene the first that appears on the stage is the Rev. Griffith Jones, Rector of Llanddrownor, Carmarthenshire; he was first and foremost among the Welsh revivalists of the last century; he is called "The Morning Star of the Revival." He was thirty years in advance of Daniel Rowlands of Llangeitho, and Howel Harries of Trevecca; he was ordained by the learned Bishop Bull in the year 1708, and he sought, when he was yet young, the welfare of his nation, and devoted himself with earnest zeal to the service of his Church. He was a powerful preacher, an able writer in both languages, and a great promoter of elementary schools throughout the country, and he worked on the lines of the Church. He had taken in Wales in this respect the same line of action which Romaine, Newton, and Simeon subsequently pursued in England. He itinerated through the country preaching the Gospel; he does not seem to have met the severe treatment and cruel persecution which Rowlands, and especially Harries, subsequently encountered; he preached the Gospel as fully and faithfully as they did; his trumpet gave as certain a sound as theirs, but he and they went to work differently; he catechised—and took the Catechism of the Church of England as the basis of his instruction—as well as preached, but they preached and never catechised. In his preaching tours he laboured to establish circulating schools through the parishes, they confined their attention entirely to preaching and promoted no schools. The course which he thus pursued excited the interest and enlisted the sympathies of the people. In his peregrinations through the country he received as a rule friendly reception at their hands,

and I am not aware that the clergy were hostile or opposed to him. The doors of the churches were thrown open to him and he was permitted to preach within their walls. He was the honoured instrument of the conversion of Daniel Rowlands to God, and the event took place in the Church of Llanddewibrefi, which is not far from Llangeitho. Rowlands was already in holy orders and was then curate of Llangeitho; he went with the people to hear Mr. Jones preach; he was at the time a proud and self-sufficient young man, and probably full of conceit. The church was crowded and Rowlands stood conspicuously in the midst of the congregation; he assumed a defiant attitude and his demeanour attracted the eye of the preacher. In the middle of his sermon he paused and then offered up a prayer to God that he would be pleased to touch the heart of the proud young man that stood before him and to make him a chosen vessel to bear the name of Christ before his countrymen. The prayer was answered; the words fell like a thunderbolt on the ears of Rowlands; the arrow of conviction struck his heart and he was laid prostrate in the dust. From that hour he consecrated himself unto God and served Him faithfully to the end of his days in the Gospel of His Son. This incident gives us an insight into the character of Griffith Jones as a preacher; he did not, indeed, possess the extraordinary powers which Rowlands afterwards displayed, but the occurrence shows that he had "an unction from the Holy One," and that he preached with authority as "ambassador for Christ," and there can be little doubt that the Gospel in his mouth was the power of God unto salvation to thousands of his countrymen. And he was also an able writer. He made extensive use of the press in the instruction which he imparted to the people. In literary attainments not one of the Welsh revivalists can be compared to him except the Rev. Thomas Charles of Bala, one of the founders of the British and Foreign Bible Society. These two good men belonged to the same revival and had caught the same flame which kindled their hearts and inspired them for their work; the live coal which touched the lips of both was taken from off the same altar, but they were not contemporaries. There was a considerable interval of time between them; Charles was born in 1755, six years before the death of Griffith Jones, which occurred in 1761. Both made great use of the press; they wrote extensively in the vernacular language, and both paid special attention to catechising and the instruction of the young. Each brought out a manual for catechising. Mr. Jones published an exposition of the Catechism of the Church of England, but Mr. Charles published a catechism called in Welsh "Hyfforddwr," which was a new coinage. Mr Jones' manual was the Catechism of the Church of England, explained and proved by Scriptural

references, but Mr. Charles' manual in form and doctrine partook more of the Assembly's Catechism than of the Catechism of the Church of England. Mr. Jones in his manual interwove his instruction with the formularies of the Church, but Mr. Charles, on the contrary, in his catechism abandoned the formularies of the Church, and cut up for himself fresh ground and chose a new path. The tendency of Mr. Jones' manual was to attach the people to the Church of their fathers, but the tendency of Mr. Charles' manual was to detach them from her communion, and the effect of the divergent courses which they pursued is felt in Wales to the present day. Wherever the influence of Mr. Jones is felt, there a connection exists between the Church and the people, but wherever the teaching of Mr. Charles is in the ascendancy, the link is broken and the connection is lost. Both, indeed, by word of mouth, and through their writings, dispensed the bread of life pure and unadulterated to the people, but in my opinion the food which Mr. Jones distributed was more solid and better seasoned than that which Mr. Charles supplied. They both used the same flour, and it was fine flour in each case. Herein there was no difference between them; they both fetched their supply from the same lump of dough—the Scripture of Truth—but Mr. Jones, as it appears to me, baked his bread better than Mr. Charles. His method was the better and the more excellent way, because, while he taught the people the truth as it is in Jesus, he retained them under the influence of the Liturgy of the Church of England, which is so well adapted to train and discipline the mind in exercises of devotion and to deepen and refine piety in the hearts of those who worship God in spirit and in truth. Chastened and refined piety is an element that is conspicuously absent in the religion of my countrymen.

And, again, Mr. Griffith Jones was a great promoter of elementary education in his day; he established circulating-schools through the length and breadth of the land. The primary object of their establishment was to teach the children to read the Bible. Their number at the time of his death in 1761 amounted to 218. In this work of faith and labour of love, which in the service of his Lord he accomplished to his nation, not one of the Welsh revivalists came near him; not one of them approached him; he was ahead of them all and left them far behind. He appeared in this respect solitary and alone among them. Mr. Charles of Bala, indeed, followed his footsteps, but at considerable distance. He established a few day-schools in North Wales, but they did not prosper. Here, again, these two good men, while aiming at the same object, went to work in different ways and different results followed. Mr. Charles, in the schools which he established, ignored the parochial system and the parochial clergy, and attached them probably to congregations of Metho-

dists gathered in different localities, but Mr. Jones in conducting the affairs of his schools had respect to the parochial system and seems to have worked as much as possible through the parochial clergy. The clergy and the gentry to some extent assisted him. And thus Mr. Charles' day-schools were soon merged into the Sunday-schools and disappeared, but Mr. Jones' schools maintained their ground and became permanent institutions in the country. When he died they were taken up by a Mrs. Bevan, who left in her will a legacy of 10,000*l.* towards their support, and the interest of this sum is to this day applied towards the support of elementary schools in connection with the Church of England in the Principality. All this shows that Mr. Jones was a clear-sighted and far-seeing reformer. If the measures which he had initiated had been carried out by his followers in the great revival of last century, Wales would have been this day as distinguished for its learning and its intellectual attainments as for its moral qualities and religious tendencies, and the Welsh would have been behind no nation in Europe in the march of intellect and civilisation. He did great work in his day and it was a work of permanent character.

This work, in furtherance of elementary education, although not vigorously pursued after he had been gathered to his fathers, and gone into rest, yet told permanently on the position of the Church in the Principality. It placed her on vantage ground of great power and influence when elementary education became a national question. When this question came to the front, forty years ago, the Church in Wales held the key of the situation in her own hand, and she was not slow to use it. When the Minutes of the Privy Council came into operation, the Church in Wales rose to the occasion; she put on strength, worked vigorously, and covered the face of the country with schools. She achieved wonders, and her success was marvellous. Notwithstanding the prevalence of dissent and the existence of the bilingual difficulty, she marched on conquering and to conquer; and if the Elementary Education Act of 1870 had not interfered and arrested her progress, the probability is that she would have monopolised the education of the rising generation in the rural districts of Wales. This remark may surprise our friends in England; it may puzzle them; but it is true, and the solution of the riddle is found in the fact that the good and great and Apostolic Griffith Jones of Llanddowror had laid the foundation of the work in his days, and had, through the impulse which he had given to education within the pale of the Church, prepared her and the people for the occasion. The schools which had been scattered through the country, and which owed, directly or indirectly, their origin to him, had accustomed the people to look to the clergyman of the parish for the education of their chil-

dren, although they themselves had seceded from the communion of the Church. They had been accustomed to think that education was a province that belonged to the Church, and they readily and with confidence placed their children in the schools which she provided. Here lies the secret of the success which has accompanied the efforts of the Church in Wales in behalf of elementary education during the last forty years, and that secret is traced to the course which Griffith Jones of Llanddowror pursued on the question in his day. And thus, whether we regard him as a preacher, a writer, or a promoter of education, we see that in all his movements he worked on the lines of the Church, and the result of his labour, which is still felt in Wales, forms a connecting link between the people and the Church of their fathers.

But the successors of Griffith Jones in the great revival did not follow in his footsteps; they did not pursue the course which he commenced and perfect the measures which he initiated. Their position with regard to the Church was perhaps different to his. They encountered more hostility and greater opposition from the Bishops and clergy than he did, and they had not either his peculiar gifts; they did not possess his learning and intellectual culture, his discretion and penetration, his well-balanced mind and power of organisation, but they were men of great gifts and great force of character; they pre-eminently possessed the gift of preaching. Rowlands excelled in it; he had it in a manner peculiar to himself. In the pulpit he was higher than all his brethren "from his shoulders and upwards;" but Howel Harries, Peter Williams, Williams of Pantycelyn, and Jones of Llangan, who were Rowlands' immediate contemporaries, were also stirring preachers. Their preaching produced extraordinary results, and they had a great following. And Williams of Pantycelyn had the gift of poetry which he consecrated to the service of God. His hymns are very touching and beautiful. When they first came forth they added fresh impulse to the revival, and produced great effects; but these good men were not organisers, they simply followed the current of events, their whole mind was bent on the conversion of souls, and, like Whitfield in England, they paid little attention to organisation. As they were driven out of the churches, separate congregations of their adherents were formed and they supplied their spiritual wants. In these congregations the Liturgy of the Church was not used; no connection in the form of public worship was retained between them and the Church which they had forsaken. And thus, although Rowlands and his immediate contemporaries continued members of the Church to the end of their days, yet the tendency of events in their time which arose from the

course of action which they pursued, and from the treatment which they received at the hands of the Bishops and clergy, naturally led to the formal separation from the communion of the Church which occurred in the days of their successors in the year 1811, when men were set apart for the ministration of the sacraments within the connection. If Rowlands and his contemporaries had acted after the example of Griffith Jones of Llanddowror, it is possible that the rupture, which I lament as a calamity to the interest of the Church and of religion in the Principality, would not have followed. But the rupture came, and the course which becomes Churchmen and Separatists now to pursue is to study in a Christian spirit to heal and not to widen the breach, and I rejoice to add that this spirit was deeply felt and visibly seen in the discussions at the Church Congress which was lately held at Swansea.

J. POWELL JONES.

ART. III.—REPRESENTATIVE STATESMEN.

Representative Statesmen—Political Studies. By ALEX. CHARLES EWALD, F.S.A., Author of "The Life and Times of Prince Charles Stuart," "The Life of Sir Robert Walpole," &c. Chapman & Hall. 2 vols. 1879.

THE study of politics is so often associated in the public mind with want of interest and dryness of detail that when an author, as in the work before us, takes up the subject, and by dint of lightness of style and grouping of anecdote presents us with two very readable volumes we owe him a debt of gratitude. To describe the progress of political science from the despotism of the seventeenth century, to the latest development of Parliamentary government in the nineteenth century, at first sight appears to be a labour which may be useful but which must be dull. Visions pass before us of all the heavy machinery of legislation put into operation—Bills accepted or rejected, Debates more exhaustive of the auditor's patience than of the subject discussed, divisions, coalitions, dissolutions, and all that is contained in the dreary pages of Hansard. Mr. Ewald has, however, followed a course which, whilst it avoids the dryness of information pure and simple, yet preserves its utility. By recording the lives of men eminent in the political world, he has used Biography as a channel for conveying much sound historical knowledge to the reader. He presents each statesman to our notice as the representative of some special characteristic which tinges as it were the whole current of the politician's career, and gives a definite colour

to his life and actions. Thus, we have Strafford as the representative of despotism, the trimmer Halifax as the representative of "moderate" views, Sir Robert Walpole as the man of peace, Chatham as the man of war, Lord Eldon as the deliberative Minister, Pitt as the type of a noble disinterestedness, Canning as the brilliant Minister, Wellington as the man to whom the dictates of conscience were all in all, Sir Robert Peel as "the Minister of Expediency," and stout Lord Palmerston—"the English Minister"—as the man who displayed his nationality in everything he undertook.

Thus, through the fascinating medium of biography we have a survey of the last two centuries, and are bidden to mark the social and political changes that have occurred. We see despotism dissolve itself into prerogative, and prerogative give way to government by Parliament. We see Ministers absolute and independent of all Parliamentary control, and then resolving themselves into the responsible agents of the House of Commons. We see the Upper House governed by a powerful oligarchy, and then making room for a popular House of Commons elected by the nation. And, lastly, we see politics, once the pursuit of a privileged coterie, developing into the open and honourable profession of the country. Freedom has broadened down from precedent to precedent, till intolerance has been erased from the Statute Book.

Hackneyed as are the incidents in the life of Strafford, our author, from a careful consultation of the State Papers and other original documents, has been able to throw much light upon the career of "Thorough." At an early age Wentworth came up from Yorkshire, and sat in the last three Parliaments of James I. He enrolled himself as an opponent of the policy of the Court, detesting the favourite, Buckingham. On the accession of Charles I. he became one of the leaders of the popular party. After the passing of the Petition of Right, however, he attached himself to the Royalists, was made a peer, and became the staunchest ally of the King. And now the man showed the despotism that was within him. What Richelieu was planning for Louis, Wentworth endeavoured to carry out for Charles in England. As President of the Council of York,[1] and Viceroy of Ireland, he levied taxes and

[1] Peter Smart, one of the Prebendaries of Durham Cathedral, had opposed the ritualistic tendencies of the day, and had denounced them as but copies of "that painted harlot, the Church of Rome." He was heavily fined, and forced to resign his preferment. The Lord President was directed by the King to determine offences according to the course of the Star Chamber, "*whether provided for by Act of Parliament or not*," whilst he was informed that from his Court no appeals would lie to the Courts at Westminster.

made all obey the decisions of the King without appeal or remonstrance. He counselled Charles to govern without the advice of Parliament, to wring the moneys he required from his poverty-stricken subjects by illegal loans and benevolences, to support a standing army, and to lay down the law to the country not as interpreted by the decisions of the recognised courts of justice, but as interpreted by the decisions of illegal tribunals. And thus beneath the obstinacy of Charles, the bigotry of Laud, and the despotism of Strafford, England was humbled and oppressed, her trade was driven from her shores, her religion was debased by a Romanising sacerdotalism, her sister kingdoms of Ireland and Scotland were seething in tumult and agitation, and all was misery and wretchedness.

Strafford is the last of English statesmen [writes Mr. Ewald] who sought to create the sovereign independent of the law and the legislature. We have had Ministers who have ruled by exercising pressure upon the courts of justice, who have bribed the House of Commons, who have by their aristocratic cohesion made encroachments upon the power of the Throne, who have transformed the law of the land into an engine of oppression; but such tyranny and corruption were at least displayed under the recognised forms of administration. Though judges had delivered iniquitous judgments, still such judgments were uttered by the acknowledged representatives of the law. Though a House of Commons had passed measures injurious to the nation, or played into the hands of a foreign foe, its acts were at least committed by the popular branch of the national assembly. Though a House of Lords had kept the Prerogative in check, its restraints were exercised by those legally constituting the senate of the realm. Though kings had endeavoured to mould the wishes of the nation to their own arbitrary views, they yet acknowledged the maxim that the law was above the sovereign. But the policy of Wentworth was one utterly at variance with all such restraints, flimsy and frangible though they often were. He declined to act within recognised limits, or to be tied and bound by forms of precedent. He had, he said, the welfare of the nation at heart, and he knew better than the lawyers, than the peers, than the country gentlemen what was the best course to adopt. He would give England his brains, and the people would have but to carry out his instructions. . . . . Aware that to establish a despotism a military Cæsarism must be instituted, Strafford stoutly advocated the existence of a standing army. Aware that there can be no absolutism where justice is pure and free, Strafford sought to poison its administration by his own biassed interpretations and the high-handed proceedings of illegal Courts. Aware that tyranny and parliamentary institutions are opposed to each other, Strafford supported Laud in counselling the King to rule without the advice of an English House of Commons. Happily his evil policy was overthrown, and its defeat was the first step towards the consolidation of that freedom and happiness which we now enjoy.

The biography of Halifax, the representative of "moderate" principles in government, is interesting, because so little is known of the man, and so few materials exist by which we can be let into the secret of his character. We see him proud of his name of Trimmer, occupying the post of counsellor of moderation to the country. His voice was always raised in favour of the persecuted; now he was on the side of the Court, then on the side of the Republicans; now in favour of the Papists, then in favour of the Dissenters; opposing the bitterness of the Commonwealth, the profligate levity of our second Charles, and the bigotry of the avowed Romanist, his brother James. Apparently inconsistent, he was always an advocate of toleration, justice, and sound freedom. He lived in an age of passionate excitement, when the most opposite feelings were surging around the bark of the Constitution. Weighing down the frail vessel to her gunwale on the one side were Popery, French influence, bribery, a vicious Court party, injustice, oppression, and despotic measures; on the other side, acting as a counter-weight, were a vindictive patriotism, burning with fierce and dangerous hate of France, free thought, with a strong leaven of Republicanism, and the schemes of the dynastic intriguer. Between these two sections stood Halifax the trimmer. To use his own simile he was neither the sails nor the oars of the boat of the Constitution, but the ballast.

In the monograph upon Sir Robert Walpole, "the Minister of Peace," based upon the author's larger work on that Prime Minister, we have perhaps the most complete of these sketches. Every event in the career of the great Georgian adviser is laid before us—his sudden rise to power, his skill in finance, his cleverness in intrigue, his hatred of rivalry in the Cabinet, the dexterity with which he avoided war, the diplomacy by which he succeeded in keeping himself in power in spite of all opposition, the hold he exercised over our first two Georges, the cynical views he entertained, the sweeping accusations made against him of bribery and corruption which failed to bear investigation, his coarseness, his jokes, his love of sport, all stand out, clear and distinct, like the lines of a figure in relief. We see the hard sarcastic worldling who believed in nothing, and the purity of no intention, who considered that every man was to be bought, who thought the world revolved upon the axis of self-interest, and between the poles of venality and corruption. Yet Mr. Ewald, though he does not attempt to conceal the real character of Walpole, ably defends him from many of the grave charges that were brought against him. On the resignation of Walpole a Committee sat to inquire into the political conduct, and on investigation it was then discovered how powerfully the Tories and the Whigs he had spurned had magnified his offences.

The homely English proverb [writes the author], "Give a dog a bad name and you may as lief hang him," not inaptly illustrates the fate of Walpole. History had conferred upon him her bad name, and the result was that everything in his disfavour was remembered and exaggerated, while his good deeds were carefully and maliciously forgotten. It was known that he had bribed, therefore he was accused of continuous and wholesale corruption. It was known that he had paid for the services of certain of his political hirelings, therefore he had tampered with the virtue of the whole body of his supporters. It was known that he had been accused, no matter how unjustly, of deriving profit from Government transactions, therefore much of his acquired wealth had been obtained by presents from interested merchants and by the pillaging from State contracts. It was known that he made no pretensions to scholarship, therefore he was deficient in education, a man of very moderate ability, who compensated for the deficiencies of intellect by cunning, intrigue, and the most lavish system of venality. It was known that he was in favour of peace, therefore he was a coward, a traitor to English interests and a servile courtier of foreign Powers. It was also known, but wilfully suppressed, that this same Minister, who was all baseness and incapacity, had kept the country, without any loss to her prestige, free from war longer than she had ever been kept since the days of James I.; that at the time when the nation was on the verge of ruin, at the collapse of the South Sea Scheme, he had been implored to come forward, and in the most skilful manner had weathered the financial storm; that he had been the first to relieve commerce from its heavy and mischievous taxation, and that under his long rule the trade of the country had been prosperous, the revenue increasing, and the landed interest eased of its burdens.

The Article on Chatham, the representative of the warlike policy, labours under the disadvantage of having been made the special subject of an essay by the brilliant Macaulay. Mr. Ewald, aware that he is trespassing upon the domain of the historian, endeavours to avoid going over the same ground, although he does not always succeed in his efforts. We have speeches which are not to be found in the essays of Macaulay, and incidents brought prominently forward which the historian has kept in the background, but which in the opinion of our author tend to reveal the hot, imperious character both of the statesman and his policy. The conduct of Chatham in opposing hostilities with America is well described, and no one can read the splendid speeches of the great statesman without feeling that he was a true Minister of War—because he knew so well when to advocate peace. The portrait of the man strikes us as good.

Nature had cast Chatham in one of her severest moulds. He possessed in an eminent degree those gifts which create fear, inspire respect, and repel love. Stern, unbending, proud with the consciousness of a lofty nature that is incapable of mean acts, endowed with an intellect which was inspired by the sacred fire of genius, a sound and quick judge of character, ceaseless in his efforts till the end he put

before him had been reached, passionate, impetuous, eloquent, he was one of those men born to command and to whom submission is instinctively given. He posed as the superior being, and never descended from his pedestal. There is but one step from the sublime to the ridiculous; but the narrow borderland was never crossed by Chatham —he was always sublime, He knew the danger to dignity which the great man incurs by lowering himself in his tastes, his pleasures, his social converse to the level of those around him. Chatham never unbent; he was always the stately personage, always in full dress. When he entered society, his bearing, his smile, his cold, haughty courtesy so deeply impressed the guests, that his appearance at once hushed gaiety and silenced the most flippant. The House of Commons trembled at his frown, and listened awe-struck to his impetuous eloquence and to his fierce and ready rejoinders. Even the bravest felt his heart grow sick and chill when those savage eyes were turned upon him, causing the jest or malicious interruption to be crushed at its very outset. Who does not know the story? "Sugar, Mr. Speaker," began Chatham, on one occasion, when so abrupt an introduction of the subject created a laugh. The eagle glance of the Minister swept the House, and the usual expressive silence ensued. "Sugar, sugar, sugar," he slowly repeated, looking the while at his interrogators, who were hushed as schoolboys detected by their master; "who will now dare to laugh at sugar?" "His words," says Lord Lyttelton, "have sometimes frozen my young blood into stagnation, and sometimes made it pace in such a hurry through my veins that I could scarce support it."

If Mr. Ewald is not so fortunate in his sketch of the sire, he is very nearly at his best in his description of the son. The Article on William Pitt, the representative of the disinterested politician, is most readable. The "heaven born" Minister stands before us as posterity loves to remember him, devoting his whole life and talents to the good of his country, indifferent to office unless the measures he considers right are advocated, and ready at any moment to resign the seals and the salary of power, and go back to his chambers in the Temple, and his modest 300*l.* a year. *Non sibi sed patriæ* was his motto. When in office he gave titles and grants from the Treasury to others, yet no coronet glistened on his own brow, no fortune swelled his own slender estate. To feel that he had done his duty, to keep his country free from the poison of a mischievous socialism, and to crush the dangerous ambition of Napoleon, were the objects and rewards of his life. Let us listen to the eulogistic, yet discriminating remarks of Mr. Ewald:—

Of all the Ministers of England who have ruled supreme in the councils of the Cabinet, none have been more bitterly and generally hated than Pitt. There have been statesmen, such as Walpole, who have been as much hated as liked; others, such as Newcastle and Portland, who have been deemed beneath the dislike of their fellows;

others, again, like Chatham, who have been too much feared to be cordially hated; whilst of the political mediocrities, the Rockinghams and the Percevals, their very want of individuality and of marked capacity has kept them free from the malice and all uncharitableness of their colleagues and opponents. But with Pitt it was different. He was one of those minds which dawns at rare intervals upon the world; yet with the exception of his lofty intellect and his splendid sense of independence, which commanded the homage of all, he possessed few of the qualities which Englishmen admire in their rulers, and many of the faults which they detest. He was intensely proud, and save in the bosom of his family, where he was warmly loved, stiff, cold, and ungenial. When he appeared in public, even when he was cheered and fêted, his harsh features seldom relaxed their haughty, repellent expression. Kings bowed and smiled, but Pitt, the commoner, the son of a newly-created peer, took scant pains not to show that he held such homage in contempt. His conduct was irreproachable. In an age of much profligacy he wore the white flower of a blameless life; his private morals were so pure that they were often thrown in his teeth as a reproach; he did not gamble; scandal could find no fault in him, yet the warm heart of the ruined spendthrift Fox made all who came in contact with him love him, whilst the virtues of Pitt were so hard, so austere, so cold, that they grated upon the sensitiveness of mankind. . . . . He wanted humility, toleration, charity. . . . . But separating the man from the policy, we find in Pitt statesmanship of the highest order. He had the great gift which is often more allied with common sense than with genius, of seeing what was the right course to be pursued precisely at the right moment. In seasons of crisis, his judgment was seldom at fault, or clouded by the sense of fear or responsibility. His control both of our domestic and foreign affairs, during times of grave peril, was firm, judicious, and far-sighted. A great mind lives in advance of its age, but no one more anticipated the future than Pitt. He saw and endeavoured to remedy the evils that were afterwards removed by Parliamentary reform, Roman Catholic emancipation, and by the establishment of the principles of Free Trade. His patriotism was pure, lofty, and jealous. He was loyal to the Throne, but, though acrid and ungenial, he was also a warm friend of the people. There have been on the bead-roll of English Ministers men more popular, more kindly, more generous, but none more able, more straightforward, or more worthy of the high position he held, than the great, the disinterested, the severe William Pitt.

The biographies of the great lawyer, Eldon, and the great soldier, Wellington, in a work of this kind we cannot but consider as a mistake. The object of Mr. Ewald, however, may have been to show how men may be educated in politics, may work their way to a high position in Parliament, may be raised to power, and yet be wanting in those qualities of prescience, judgment, soundness of decision, and well-balanced sympathy, which go to make the typical statesman.

Whilst offering every tribute of praise to Wellington's de-

votion to duty,[1] Mr. Ewald indulges in some severe criticisms touching the political conduct of the Great Duke, and especially with regard to his desertion of Canning. If Canning is not Mr. Ewald's political hero, he is certainly depicted in these pages in the most flattering colours. He was, according to our author, in the first rank as a politician, a statesman, and an orator. He did nothing which he did not adorn. The chief features in his career are his loyalty to Pitt, his dislike of Addington, and his consistent advocacy of R. C. emancipation. To Pitt, Canning was united by every tie of friendship and gratitude, and when he saw at a season of grave crisis a political mediocrity like Addington usurp the place and power of the "heaven-born Minister," his indignation knew no bounds. Addington was the son of a physician, and the wags had nicknamed him "the Doctor;" this title was now to be made the most of by Canning in many a bitter squib. "Ridicule," said Lord Chesterfield, "if thrown by a skilful hand, will stick for ever." From the full quiver of Canning's satire, these were two-barbed arrows—

Old Rome in times of danger sought
Dictators from the plough,
And prosper'd; we in England take
A different practice now;
For when compell'd with modern France
And Buonaparte to wrestle,
We borrow our Dictator from
The mortar and the pestle.

AN INSCRIPTION.

As sick in her cradle poor Britain was laid
Between two silly nurses that rock'd her,
O Pitt! she exclaim'd, prithee haste to my aid,
Or you see I shall die of the doctor.

Of all the politicians of his time Canning was the one who pre-eminently distinguished himself in his advocacy of "Catholic relief." No one more rejoiced than he that we had separated from the Church of Rome, and had purified our Church from Papal glosses and corruptions; but he failed to see that there was sufficient in the creed of the Roman Catholic to justify Protestants in denouncing Popery as incompatible with the discharge of the duties of a good and loyal subject. He, therefore,

[1] "I was marvellously struck," writes Charles Greville in his Memoirs, after a ride through St. James's Park with the Duke of Wellington, "with the profound respect with which the Duke was treated . . . . every appearance of his inspiring great reverence." Mr. Ewald tells a good story of a boy dining with the Duke (it was his valet's son); after dinner, the Duke said, "Now, go to your father, be a good boy—*do your duty.*"

considered the exclusion of the Papist as unjust, and not to be persevered in. He held that by emancipation the discontent in Ireland would cease, and that, therefore, it was not only just, but sound policy to press the legislature to pass the measure. Such were his views, and whether they were right or wrong, or have been justified by subsequent events, he consistently maintained them. Within a few months after his death, those who had opposed him found themselves compelled to maintain his views, and to pass the measure he had so strenuously supported. Discontent in Ireland, however, has certainly not ceased.

Few statesmen have so rapidly declined in the estimation of public opinion as Sir Robert Peel, termed the representative of expediency. Sir Robert's mind lacked those statesmanlike gifts which can to a certain extent anticipate the course of events. He was always being led and not leading; now he was under the wand of Lord Eldon, then he was the fond disciple of the Great Duke, and, again, he was led by the country instead of giving it a policy and directing its issues. It is a curious fact that in every one of the great measures with which the name of Peel is connected he was indebted to others. Mr. Horner had introduced the Currency Bill, it had been opposed by Peel, then it had been advocated by him, and, finally, it was by Peel and not by Horner that the Bill became law. Canning had warmly fought for Catholic emancipation, Peel had as warmly opposed it; yet it was through Peel, and not through Canning, that the Papists obtained relief. Cobden had upheld Free Trade, Peel had laughed it to scorn; yet it was by Peel, and not by Cobden, that the Corn Laws were abolished. Were the terrible sneers of the then Mr. Disraeli wholly unjustified? Was not the political career of Peel "one long appropriation clause?" Did he not see the Whigs bathing, and steal their clothes? Was he not a man "who never originated an idea;" a mere watcher of the atmosphere—"a man who, as he says himself, takes his observations, and when he finds the wind veers towards a certain quarter trims to suit it?" Was he any more a great statesman than the man who gets behind a carriage is a great whip? "Both may perhaps get a good place," laughed his terrible assailant, "but how far the original momentum is indebted to their powers, and how far their guiding prudence regulates the lash or the rein it is not necessary for me to notice."

Sir Robert Peel [writes Mr. Ewald] has been stigmatised by many as a "turncoat" and a "traitor," but to those who carefully study his political career, he will appear more in the light of a conscientious convert than of a self-seeking apostate.[1] That he was a statesman in

[1] To Sir Robert's "high tone of honour, his love for truth, and the purity and disinterestedness of his ambition," Mr. Ewald does full justice.

the highest sense of the word—in the sense of a man whose genius offers a practical creed to his party, who inspires his followers with the spirit of his ideas, and whose tact and temper keep even discordant elements in harmony—it is idle, in the face of such open changes of opinion, to attempt to make Sir Robert Peel appear. There are authors who only want originality for their works to be brilliant successes. Give them a plot or a leading idea, and their beauty of style, their knowledge of human nature, and their powers of description will create a novel or a play which will deeply interest all its readers or spectators. What such men are in literature Sir Robert Peel was in politics. Give him a policy, and none knew better than he how to make it acceptable to his followers, how to excite the approval of the country, and how to work upon the sympathies and prejudices of the House of Commons. . . . . The purely receptive character of the intellect of Sir Robert Peel failed to raise him to the position of a great statesman, but his abilities, his eloquence, his powers of debate, his subtle knowledge of all the strategies of political warfare have caused him instead to be handed down to posterity as the greatest member of Parliament, next to Walpole, that England has ever seen.

Of all the monographs contained in these volumes, the one which in our opinion is the best done is the sketch of Lord Palmerston. The author calls him the "English Minister," and he has certainly grasped those characteristics of the statesman in his portrait which we identify with the English nation. We see Lord Palmerston depicted as we all love to remember him—as the man who hates shuffling and double dealings, who speaks out his mind and acts up to his words, who will "stand no nonsense," and declines to be intimidated, who is a thorough Englishman in his tastes and ways of thought; an earnest partisan, but not so earnest as to forget that he is an English gentleman first and a politician afterwards. It is like feeling the breezes of the moorland after a confinement in a hot-house, to read how stout "Old Pam," when Foreign Secretary, stood up to France in the different disputes that arose, and silenced her "swagger;" how frankly he refused to let her interfere with Egypt or with Belgian independence; how plain was his language of disapproval with regard to the iniquitous Spanish marriages, and how throughout the long period during which he held the seals he never permitted the England he so dearly loved to be slighted by a foreign Power, or anything that could minister to the comfort and welfare of her people to escape his attention. "The history of Lord Palmerston," says Mr. Ewald, "is that of a man who attained to power and kept it, not by a birth more illustrious than that of many of his contemporaries, nor by an industry which was insatiable, nor by talents of the very highest order: but because his patriotism was undaunted, his honour and good faith undoubted, his tact consummate, his knowledge of the world accurate and varied, his sympathy with the people over whom

he ruled ready, sincere, and never at fault—because in tastes and characteristics he was the most representative Englishman of his day. On the list of our Premiers he will be remembered as he himself would wish to be remembered, not as the greatest, but as the most English of our statesmen."

ART. IV.—CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY—ITS EARLY DIFFICULTIES.

IT is one of the great advantages of such a Magazine as THE CHURCHMAN, that it supplies a means of communication through which facts may be elicited. I have experienced this advantage since the publication in the October Number of my Article on the origin of the Church Missionary Society. I have received two letters from valued friends, pointing out that in tracing the early history of the movement I did not go back far enough, as the idea had originated long before the formation of the Society with that eminent servant of God, the Rev. Charles Simeon. So far back as the year 1788 the subject of missions lay very near his heart. There were at that time some devoted men in India, the Rev. David Brown, Mr. Chambers, Mr. Grant, and Mr. Udny, who were anxious to establish a mission in India, and having heard of Mr. Simeon's zealous labours at Cambridge, wrote to him requesting him to act for them in England. This letter Mr. Simeon carefully preserved to the end of his life, and in the year 1830 he endorsed it with the words, "It merely shows how early God enabled me to act for India,—to provide for which it has now for forty-two years been a principal and incessant object of my care and labour." In a subsequent letter he was requested to send out two missionaries, Mr. Grant undertaking to provide 300 rupees a month for their support; but whether no missionaries could be found, or whether obstacles were interposed by Government, we do not know: all we know is that for some reason or other nothing was done. But when men are called of God to a great and important service they do not give up because of difficulties, and accordingly we find Mr. Simeon at a clerical meeting, held at Rauceby, seven years afterwards, earnestly pleading for missions. A gentleman had left 4000*l.* "to be laid out to the best advantage of the interests of true religion." Once more the missionary work was proposed, and two years afterwards a letter was actually written to the Bishop of London to ascertain whether he would ordain a missionary to the heathen, if a suitable person were put before him? But the Bishop declined, and again for the time the effort failed.

But the discouragement did not come altogether from

without; for, in the following year, 1796, Mr. Simeon earnestly endeavoured to arouse the Eclectic Society to some vigorous and distinctive effort. But timid counsels prevailed, and of seventeen who were present on that occasion, there were only three who voted for action. Three more years passed slowly by. and nothing was done till, in February, 1799, Mr. Simeon, to his great joy, received a letter from the Rev. J. Venn, informing him that the subject was once more to be discussed in the Eclectic, and inviting him to attend a meeting of that Society about to be held on the 18th March. At that meeting there were only fourteen present, but they were men of faith and determination, and with one consent they resolved, God helping them, to begin. This was the meeting referred to in the Number for October, and the result of their resolutions was that the Society was formed on the 12th April.

It is important to bear this history in mind, as it illustrates in a remarkable manner the subsequent progress of the Society. Many of its most important movements have resulted from the steady and untiring perseverance of some one individual, whose heart had been led by God Himself to take a special interest in some particular sphere of labour. So in the foundation of the Society we see how the mind of Mr. Simeon was directed to India by the letter of Mr. Brown, and how for eleven years he steadily persevered through a series of difficulties, never losing sight of his object till God gave him his heart's desire, first in the formation of the Society, and afterwards in the establishment of an Indian Mission. May we not regard the signal blessing which God has given to these missions as an answer to the many prayers of patience and faith which were offered during those eleven years?

But we must not suppose that all difficulties were overcome by the formation of the Society, or that a series of resolutions passed by twenty-five gentlemen could of themselves evangelise the world. Eighty years have since elapsed, and we have not done with difficulties yet. There was work to be done, and the new committee proceeded at once to endeavour to do it. The Rev. J. Scott acted as their secretary, and the Rev. W. Goode lent them his study in St. Ann's Rectory as a committee room. Over the fireplace of that room there is to this day a white marble slab with the following inscription:—

Laus Deo per Jesum Christum.

CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY,
Instituted April 12, 1799.

In this room the committee meetings of the Society were held from June 17, 1799, to January 3, 1812; and here on January 2, 1804, its first Missionaries were appointed to preach among the Gentiles

The Unsearchable Riches of Christ.

In that room, therefore, we may picture to ourselves the little company of earnest men meeting in the Lord's name to consider what could be done for the evangelisation of the world, and kneeling down in reverent faith to spread out before their God what seemed to be insuperable difficulties. On the committee there were twelve clergymen, including William Goode, John Newton, Josiah Pratt, Thomas Scott, John Venn, and Basil Woodd, and eleven laymen, including Mr. Charles Elliott—the father of those two talented brothers, Henry Venn Elliott, of St. Mary's, Brighton, and Edward Elliott, author of that great work the "Horæ Apocalypticæ"—and Mr. John Bacon, the sculptor, whose inscription prepared by himself for his own monument may teach a most important lesson to all those who are living for the world. The inscription was as follows :—

> What I was as an artist
> Seemed to me of some importance while I lived :
> But what I really was as a believer in Christ Jesus
> Is the only thing of importance to me now.

It was in that study, and amongst those few, but faithful, men, that the whole work took its rise.

But we who have entered on their labours can have very little idea of the obstacles that beset their progress, and it is happy, indeed, for us if we show the faith and courage by which these obstacles were overcome.

The first was with the ecclesiastical authorities at home. Being true and loyal Churchmen, they did not wish to act without the sanction of those in authority. They therefore drew up a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops of London and Durham, submitting a copy of their rules, and respectfully requesting them "favourably to regard their attempt." They also appointed a deputation, consisting of Messrs. Wilberforce and Grant and the Rev. John Venn, to wait upon their lordships and explain to them the object of the movement. This was done on July 1, 1799. But month after month passed by, and no answer was received to the letter, nor was any audience granted to the deputation. Even Wilberforce with all his influence could not obtain an interview. The committee met again and again, but nothing could be done, as there was no answer from the Bishops. Possibly their lordships did not know what answer to send, and therefore sent none at all. This may have been the cause of their delay, for nothing makes people so dilatory in their correspondence as a difficulty in decision. There are many who answer letters with great promptitude if only their own mind is decided, but who shrink from the effort of decision, and so keep their unfortunate correspondents in a state of long-continued and most disheartening sus-

pense. So the newly-formed committee was kept from July 1, 1799, to August 4, 1800, on which day a letter was read from Mr. Wilberforce, in which he said that he had obtained an interview with the Archbishop, and that his Grace "acquiesced in the hope expressed that the Society would go forward, being assured that he would look on their proceedings with candour, and that it would give him pleasure to find them such as he could approve." This was but cold comfort, and some of the committee thought it too slight to proceed upon. But they had amongst them two men of great decision—the Rev. John Venn, a man, like his son, Henry, pre-eminent for wisdom, and the Rev. Thomas Scott, the first secretary, a man to whom the Church of England owes as much as to any of the noble line of confessors for Christ that have in successive centuries adorned its ministry. He was a profound student of Scripture, as proved by his invaluable commentary, which, though, of course, deficient in the results of modern research, is still I believe unsurpassed —I might almost say unequalled—in its exhibition of the real sense of the Sacred Book. He had a wonderful personal grasp of the great doctrines of the Gospel, as witnessed by his essays, and above all his "Force of Truth," a book which is by far the best I know as exhibiting the struggles of a strong, manly, hard-headed thinker in receiving the supernatural doctrines of the Gospel. And he was a person of the most indomitable and patient perseverance, as witnessed by the fact that after he had set his heart on ordination, and gone up to London for the purpose, and been refused examination as a candidate, he travelled home, a great part of the way on foot, and the rest in various vehicles. At length he reached Braytoft, in Lincolnshire, after walking twenty miles in the forenoon. Having dined, he put off his clerical clothes, resumed his shepherd's dress, and sheared eleven large sheep in the afternoon.

To a man of such a spirit we can easily understand that the delay of thirteen months, while they were waiting for an answer, was a sore trial of faith and patience. On July 12, 1800, when they had waited a year, he wrote to his son, "The Missionary Society lies off 'the Bishop and his Clerks,'[1] where, if not wrecked, it may rot, for what I can see. They return no answer, and, as I foresaw, we are all nonplussed." We cannot be surprised, therefore, that when the answer came, such as it was, he earnestly advocated immediate action. He contended "that it was their duty to go forward, expecting that their difficulties would be removed in proportion as it was necessary that they should." His colleagues happily agreed, and resolved, "That in consequence of this answer from the Metropolitan,

[1] Some rocks off the coast of South Wales.

the committee do now proceed in their great design with all the activity possible." The first obstruction had at length been removed, and the way was open for work. The little vessel had weighed anchor, and was no longer rotting by the rocks.

Yet the whole work was still before them. The way was clear for action, but nothing had been done, and there were most important questions still to be decided.

The first was where they should begin. Their difficulty was the exact opposite to that which now almost overwhelms the Committee. Now the difficulty arises from the impossibility of entering on the many spheres which God Himself is opening in all parts of the world. But then there was no opening at all, and the whole world seemed closed against their attempts. In the memorable discussion in the Eclectic, Mr. Venn had laid down as a principle, "God's providence must be followed, not anticipated. We must wait for His motion." Acting on this principle, they were led to make their first effort on the West Coast of Africa. A few devoted men, deeply impressed with the horrors of the West African Slave Trade, had formed a Company called the Sierra Leone Company, for the establishment of a free settlement on that coast, in the hope of counteracting the Slave Trade, by means of lawful traffic and civilisation. There were some gentlemen of a world-wide reputation for philanthropy amongst the members, such as Granville Sharp and Wilberforce. There were others connected with it who, though less known, contributed quite as much, if not more than any, to the accomplishment of this great and righteous end. There was Thomas Clarkson, who, as a young man at Cambridge, wrote a Prize Essay on the subject of the Slave Trade, and was so deeply impressed by his own essay that, as he was riding up to London, he stopped on the hill overlooking Wadesmill, turned aside from the road, and there solemnly devoted his life to the abolition of slavery. And above all, there was Zachary Macaulay, who gave up a lucrative situation in the West Indies in order to join the Settlement, and was subsequently appointed its Governor. He was a man of vast information, of never-failing accuracy, of the most untiring diligence, and of so quiet and unostentatious a spirit that he was content to remain in the background, and supply more conspicuous men with the material which made their reputation. So great was his devotion to the cause of abolition that, in order to be perfectly certain of the accuracy of his facts, he actually crossed the Atlantic in a slave-ship laden with slaves, and so made himself an eye-witness of the horrors of the middle passage.

It was not unnatural that these men should press on the

new Committee the claims of West Africa, and that the Committee should regard their Settlement as an opening made for them by the providence of God. But still it seemed a desperate enterprise, and must have required men strong in faith to undertake it. In the year 1768 the Moravians had sent nine missionaries to commence a mission on the Coast of Guinea, but in two years all had died, and the attempt had been abandoned. In 1798, six missionaries had been sent out to the neighbourhood of Sierra Leone by other Societies, but in the course of two years three had died, one was murdered, and the remaining two had returned. Yet in the face of such grievous calamities, these men had the holy daring to select that country as the sphere of their first effort, because they believed it was the one marked out for them by the guiding hand of God. There were giants in those days, and men not afraid of following Christ.

But where were the missionaries? The whole Church was dead, cold, and apathetic; and where were they to find men prepared to go forth in the Lord's name, when they knew that out of fifteen who had already gone to the proposed Coast, only two had survived as much as two years? When Shergold Smith and O'Neill were murdered last year at Ukerewe there were no less than forty men who volunteered to take their place. But things were very different then. Mr. Simeon brought the subject before the young men at Cambridge, and the Committee made their wants known as well as they could throughout the country, but it all ended in failure. Not a single individual came forward, and the whole Church of England could not produce one man to volunteer for the evangelisation of the world.

But then occurred one of those curious instances in which God prepares different agencies without any communication with each other, and afterwards brings them together by His own Divine Providence. The missionary spirit had been springing up on the Continent; and it turned out, in a most remarkable manner, that while the English Committee was preparing for work, a small institution for the training of missionaries was founded at Berlin, and at this very time contained six students under the care of that devoted man, Mr. Jænicke, but without the means of sending them abroad. Thus, then, were the two movements brought together by the good hand of God. The English Committee had the means, but wanted the men. The institution at Berlin had the men, but wanted the means. The two were now brought together, and two of the students, Renner, a native of Wirtemburg, and Hartwig, a Prussian, had the honour of being engaged as the first missionaries of the Church Missionary Society, and of opening the way as the first pioneers of the Church of England in its great effort to spread the Gospel through the extra-colonial heathen world.

But, as we learn from the tablet in the rectory of St. Ann's, it was not till the 3rd January, 1804, nearly five years after the formation of the Society, that the two first missionaries were sent forth on their arduous enterprise. To leave home then was a very different thing to what it is now, for there were no railways, no steamships, no running to and fro on the earth, no regular posts, and no telegraph. But the two men and the devoted young bride of one of them, went forth bravely in the name of the Lord. In these days we can form very little idea of their dangers or their difficulties. The fever that hovered on the Coast was enough to terrify anyone who loved his life more than Christ. Some idea may be formed of it from the following facts. In the first twenty years of the mission no fewer than fifty-three missionaries, or missionaries' wives, died at their post. In the year 1823, out of five who went out four died within six months; yet, two years afterwards, six presented themselves, three being English clergymen, for that mission. They went to Africa, and two fell within four months of their landing, while a third was hurried away in extreme illness. In the next year three more went forth, two of whom died within six months, so that in the course of four years, fourteen men had gone out, of whom more than half had died within a few months of their landing.

Such were the physical dangers of the Coast, and yet, glory be to God! since the first formation of the mission there have never been men wanting, true heroes for the Lord Jesus Christ, who have willingly offered themselves for the blessed, though deadly, service. In the first forty years of the mission there were no less than eighty-seven missionaries and catechists sent out, besides a considerable number of holy and devoted women, who, as loving wives, shared their danger, and encouraged their faith.

But if we wish truly to estimate the faith and heroism of these devoted men, we must remember that for the first eleven years they toiled on under the greatest possible discouragement. They were settled, at first, in two or three stations to the north of Sierra Leone, at the mouths of rivers which were the headquarters of the slave trade. The result was that they aroused the bitter opposition of the slave traders and of the native chiefs who supplied the cargoes. As they could not reach the adults, they laboured chiefly amongst the children, some of whom they ransomed from slavery in order that they might bring them up as freemen in the Lord. Two of them—Renner and Butscher—were anxious to induce the Committee to raise a fund for the maintenance of the children, and, in order to lead the way, wrote to them, saying:—"We think to offer 100*l.* out of our salaries for the support of twenty children, and live both on the other

100*l.*" But with all their self-denial there were no visible results. The faith of the Committee was sorely tried, though not shaken. They saw one after another going to a probable death, and all without the least sign of fruit. All that could be said was that the children were hopeful and some of the chiefs friendly. Timid spirits would soon have given up. Those who seem to think that because Popery is making a powerful assault, the battle is lost, and the victory won by the enemy, would soon have struck their colours. So those who reduce the work of missions to a matter of account, and calculate the cost of a convert in pounds, shillings, and pence, would soon have discovered that the work did not pay. But the little Committee in the study of St. Ann's were men of another spirit. They knew they were carrying out the will of God, and they trusted Him. And so they steadily met their discouragements by sending out fresh men. But, although they were thus decided, there was no obstinacy in their conduct—for there is a vast difference, though it is not always easy to define it, between decision and obstinacy. When Peter had toiled all night and taken nothing, our Lord said unto Him, "cast in thy net on the other side of the ship." And so it became a question whether the time might not be come for a change of plan. A great change had taken place in their circumstances. The slave trade had been made unlawful in the year 1807. In 1808 the Company had given up the Sierra Leone Settlement to the Government, and they had made use of it as a depôt for the cargoes of slaves rescued by the cruisers from the captured slave ships. It was right to consider whether this alteration of circumstances did not involve an alteration of policy, and, accordingly it was decided to give up the outposts and concentrate all their strength on the liberated slaves in Sierra Leone.

But the change, though a wise one, could not produce the long-desired fruit. Many people hope to bring about ministerial results by means of changes, and by so doing fritter away their power, while they alienate the confidence of their people. It is the spirit of God alone that can give life to the dead, and so at length He gave it in West Africa. In the report of 1817, eighteen long years after the formation of the Society, and thirteen after the commencement of the mission, there is the joyful intelligence of "the baptism of *twenty-one* adults in one day from among the recaptured negroes in the colony of Sierra Leone." God's time was come; the windows of Heaven were opened; showers of blessings were poured forth on the patient labourers; the hearts of those who had laboured under such terrible trials and discouragements were filled with joy; the brave Committeemen at home did not know how to give utterance to their thanksgiving; and all could unite in the language of the

psalmist—"Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto Thy Name give the glory."

And now what is the present position of that mission? and what the fruit of all that toil and self-denial? It is right that the question should be asked and answered. Sixty-three years have passed since the seed began to spring in that memorable baptism, and we may fairly ask What sign is there now of harvest?

In the first place the mission in Sierra Leone is given up, and that for the simple reason that its work is done, and there is a self-supporting native Church with its parishes, schools, churches, all under the care of African clergymen, missionary associations, and complete parochial organisation. But not only has the African Church in Sierra Leone become self-supporting, it is also leading the way as a Missionary Church. I doubt whether there is any Church in Christendom in which a larger proportion of the ordained clergy are engaged in missions. There are sixteen working at home, and twenty-six in missionary labour, some in the large district surrounding Abbeokuta, and some under an African Bishop along the banks of the Niger. In the native church at Sierra Leone there are no less than 5000 communicants; I believe a larger number in proportion to the population than would be found in any town in England. Nor have the converts been what I have heard called "rice Christians." Many of them have been remarkable for holy lives and peaceful deaths, and some have adorned the Gospel even by martyrdom. There are many professing Christians who might learn a lesson from a convert on the shores of the river Bonny, who, when promised that his life should be spared if only he would return to his idolatry, replied, "Tell the master I thank him for his kindness; but as for turning back to heathen worship that is impossible, for Jesus has taken charge of my heart and padlocked it. The key is with him, so you see it is impossible for me to open it without him." And so saying, like Stephen, he fell asleep in the Lord Jesus.

But these are only the visible results, and who can number the invisible? My late friend Mr. Oakley, Rector of St. Paul's, Covent Garden, told me once of a merchant, I think from Timbuctoo, whom he met in Algeria. That merchant was a Christian, and the history of his Christianity was as follows:—There were two brothers, one of whom was accustomed to travel to the south, and one to the north, returning at certain times to meet in their common home. On one occasion the merchant to the south came home a believer in the Lord Jesus, having heard the Gospel preached by an African on the banks of the Niger. He taught his brother when they met in their home, and Mr. Oakley met that brother in Algeria and found him a true

believer in the Lord. Who can calculate the invisible spread of the truth of God? and who knows but that some of us may live to witness the day when the wave of the Gospel spreading from the Niger on the west shall meet the wave from the Victoria Nyanza on the east, and the voice of a great multitude, like the sound of many waters, be heard rising from the centre of Africa to the praise and glory of a faithful and promise-keeping God?

Thus wonderfully have old Scott's words at the commencement of the enterprise proved true:—"What will be the final issue—what the success of the mission, we know not now. I shall know hereafter. It is glorious and shall prevail. God hath said it, and cannot lie."

EDWARD HOARE.

ART. V.—THE ROYAL SUPREMACY AND THE FINAL COURT OF APPEAL.

THREE hundred years ago the question of the Royal Supremacy, and the Final Court of Appeal in causes ecclesiastical, was a leading subject of controversy between Cartwright, the celebrated Puritan, and Hooker.

The ground taken by the Puritans, who wished for a further reformation in the Church, and are styled in the following quotation "authors of Reformation," is thus stated by Hooker:—

> This power being some time in the Bishop of Rome, who by sinister practices had drawn it into his hands, was, for just considerations by public consent annexed unto the King's Royal seat and Crown. From thence the authors of Reformation would translate it into their *National Assemblies or Synods;* which *Synods* are the only help which they think lawful to use against such evils in the Church as particular jurisdictions are not sufficient to redress. In which case our laws have provided that the King's supereminent authority and power shall serve.—*Eccles. Polity,* Book VIII. chap. viii. 5. Oxford. 1850.

Again, Hooker says:—

> Unto which supreme power in kings two kinds of adversaries there are that have opposed themselves; one sort defending "that supreme power in causes ecclesiastical throughout the world appertaineth of divine right to the Bishop of Rome;" another sort, that the said power belongeth "in every national Church unto the clergy thereof assembled." We which defend as well against the one as the other, "that kings within their own precincts may have it," must show by what right it may come unto them.—Chap. ii. *ut supra.*

It is remarkable that the same ground is now taken in the controversy which has broken out on this subject during the

last few years. Dr. Phillimore, in his paper read at the late congress in Swansea, says:—

> Let the appeal be to the Synod of the Province presided over by the Metropolitan. And if further appeal be required, let the appeal be, while Christendom unhappily remains divided, to a Synod of the whole Anglican communion.

Our present system of ecclesiastical judicature is the same in all its essential principles as that which was assailed by Harding, the Jesuit, and Cartwright, the Puritan, and which was defended by Jewel and Hooker. If the suggestions of Dr. Phillimore, and those whom he represents, were carried into effect, the establishment of the episcopate as a final court of appeal would form a new point of departure for the Church of England. In order to prove this, it is only necessary to give a brief statement of historical facts.

A supremacy in causes ecclesiastical as well as civil had been exercised by Christian kings from the earliest days of the union of Church and State. And so the 37th article ascribes to the Crown "that only prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in Holy Scripture by God himself;" and the second canon of 1604 attributes to the Crown "the same power and authority in causes ecclesiastical that the godly kings had amongst the Jews and Christian emperors of the primitive Church." Hooker, in reply to Cartwright, who objected to the Royal Supremacy, contends that such power was exercised by "David, Asa, Jehosaphat, Ezekias, Josias, and the rest." "They made those laws and orders which sacred history speaketh of concerning matters of mere religion, the affairs of the temple, and the service of God."—*Eccles. Polity*, chap. i. *ut supra*. He adds:—"According to the pattern of which example the like power in causes ecclesiastical is, by the laws of this realm, annexed to the Crown."—Ibid.

The Bishop of Rome had infringed upon the rights of the Crown, and usurped the supremacy in England as in other lands; but he was not permitted to exercise an undisputed sway. The Constitutions of Clarendon in the 12th century are an evidence of the energy with which the Royal rights were asserted even in days of darkness and superstition. "It will be observed," writes Dr. Hook, "that these Constitutions contained nothing novel; they were only the ancient principles of the realm and Church of England, as laid down by William the Conqueror and enforced by Lanfranc." The *Quarterly Review* quotes these words of Dr. Hook, and remarks that "the stringent enactments of Henry VIII. were the final and violent solution of a controversy which had existed in England for centuries."—No. 296. October, 1879. P. 549.

The usurped supremacy of the Bishop of Rome was finally abolished in this realm of England by the statutes 24 and 25 of Henry VIII. The 24th enacted that ecclesiastical causes, and causes relating to matrimony, divorce, tithes, and oblations should be finally determined in the ecclesiastical courts; the same Act, however, provided that in such causes above specified as related to the Crown, appeals should be made to the Upper House of Convocation. But the 25th statute aforesaid abolished the appeal to Convocation, the effect of which is that all appeals must be carried to the Crown. That the laws do not admit of an appeal to Convocation was ruled in the case of Gorham *v.* Bishop of Exeter. Sir Fitzroy Kelly moved in the Queen's Bench, April 15th, 1850, for a rule to show cause why a prohibition should not be issued to the Dean of Arches and the Archbishop of Canterbury to prohibit them from requiring the institution of the Rev. Gorham to the Vicarage of Bramford Speke. Sir Fitzroy contended that in matters touching the Crown the appeal lay to the Upper House of Convocation. The rule was refused by the Queen's Bench unanimously. Lord Campbell, in pronouncing judgment, said that the statute of Henry VIII. "enacts that from the Archbishop's Court a further degree in appeals for all manner of causes is given to the King in Chancery where a commission shall be awarded for the determination of such appeal and no further."—*Brooke's Six Judgments*, p. 40. This decision was confirmed in the Court of Common Pleas and Exchequer.

The Supremacy of the Crown is exercised by delegation. Dr. Stephens says:—

> Henry VIII. assumed the whole supremacy in England which had been vested in the Roman Pontiff; and delegated this authority to a single person with the title of "Lord Vicegerent." In the reign of Elizabeth, Parliament entrusted the jurisdiction to a body of men, and empowered the Queen to appoint a commission for the exercise of it. —*Preface to Book of Common Prayer, with Notes*, p. 127.

In hearing appeals, the Crown exercised its jurisdiction until the reign of William IV. through "the Court of Delegates." This Court was constituted, as Dr. Stephens says, "for each separate case by commission under the Great Seal." The Court was empowered to give a definitive sentence, an option being reserved to the Crown of rehearing the case on petition. Hooker gives the rationale of this:—

> As, therefore, the person of the king may for just considerations, even where the cause is civil, be notwithstanding withdrawn from occupying the seat of judgment, and others under his authority be fit, he unfit himself to judge; so the considerations for which it were haply not convenient for kings to sit and give sentence in spiritual courts where causes ecclesiastical are usually debated, can be no bar to that

force and efficacy which their Sovereign hath over these very consistories, and for which we hold, without any exception, that *all Courts are the King's.*—Chap. vii. *ut supra.*

The King acts by delegation in civil and ecclesiastical courts, it not being "convenient" for him to sit in person.

It is important to observe that the delegated authority of the Crown was not confined in ecclesiastical courts to ecclesiastics. It is a remarkable fact, as shown by Fremantle, that from the year 1619 to 1639, a period during the greater part of which Laud was at the zenith of his power, the Court of Delegates consisted of laymen exclusively in 982 cases out of 1080.[1] But the High Commission and Courts of Delegates through which the King exercised his authority were, notwithstanding, regarded as ecclesiastical courts. King Charles I. issued a proclamation in the thirteenth year of his reign, declaring that the proceedings of his Majesty's ecclesiastical courts and Ministers are "according to the laws of the realm." This proclamation expressly refers to "the High Commission, and *other* ecclesiastical courts" (Sparrow's collections). The declaration of King Charles I., prefixed to the articles, refers to "the Church's censure in *our* commission ecclesiastical."

The Royal Supremacy, acting through the High Commission and Court of Delegates, was received with a general consent by the Church of England, the Puritans alone objecting. The Convocation in 1562 set forth the thirty-nine articles which require the clergy to accept the Supremacy. The Puritans, in 1571, complained of the imposition of the articles, and petitioned Parliament against the action taken by the High Court of Commission in this matter. In their petition they state that "the ministers of God's Holy word and sacraments were called before her Majesty's High Commissioners and enforced to subscribe unto the articles, if they would keep their places and livings. The petition states that "some, for refusing to subscribe," were "from their offices and places removed." In the presence of these facts, without a word of reservation, the canons of 1604, and even those of 1640, affirmed the Supremacy. The latter gave the following threat:—

If any parson, vicar, curate, preacher, or any other ecclesiastical person whatsoever, any dean, canon, or prebendary of any Collegiate or Cathedral Church, any member or student of College or Hall .... shall publicly maintain or abet any position or conclusion in opposition or impeachment of the aforesaid explications, or any part or article of them, he shall forthwith *by the power of his Majesty's Commissioners* for causes ecclesiastical, be excommunicated till he repent, and sus-

[1] See Introduction to the "Six Judgments," by Brooke, p. 39. London. 1879.

pended two years from all the profits of his benefice, or other ecclesiastical, academical, or scholastical preferments; and if he so offend a second time, he shall be deprived from all his spiritual promotions, of what nature or degree soever they be.

Amongst the explications enforced by the threat of "the power of his Majesty's Commissioners" is the following:—"A supreme power is given to this most excellent order (of kings) by God himself in the scriptures, which is that kings should rule and command in their several dominions all persons of what rank or estate soever, whether ecclesiastical or civil."

The Bishops in their articles of visitation inquired whether there were any who denied the Royal Supremacy. The following is an example from the articles of Archbishop Laud:—

Whether any parson in your parish . . . . do write, or publicly or privately speak . . . . against the King's supremacy, or against the oath of supremacy or allegiance.

Bancroft, Bishop of Oxford, inquired whether the minister before the sermon—

Prayed for the King *as* King of Great Britain and Defender of the Faith, and in all causes, and over all persons within his Highness' dominions, as well ecclesiastical as temporal next and immediately under God, supreme Governor.—*Second Ritual Report.*

After the secession of the Puritans from the Church, inquiries relating to the Royal Supremacy gradually ceased, as no longer necessary. Unhappily, in these our days, they need to be revived.

In 1830 a Royal Commission recommended the transfer of authority from the Court of Delegates to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The Commission consisted of the Primate, Dr. Howley; the Bishops of London, Blomfield; Durham, Van Moildert; Lincoln, Kaye; St. Asaph and Bangor, and several laymen, including Dr. Lushington, the Dean of Arches. This Commission in its Second Report, gave full consideration to the question of clerical offences, and refers to the advancing of doctrines not conformable to the articles of the Church. Mr. Joyce could hardly have given due consideration to this fact when he attributed to a mistake the referring of ecclesiastical appeals to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. By statute 3 and 4 Victoria, all Archbishops and Bishops being Privy Councillors were placed on the committee for hearing appeals ecclesiastical. The reasons for the abolition of the Court of Delegates were very forcible. The constitution of the Court was fluctuating, and considerable expense as well as delay attended the issue of separate Commissions. Moreover, the judges were not required to give reasons, and their judgments on appeal to the Crown were reversable.

It is important to remember that the Court is limited in its jurisdiction, as it appears from the following passage in the Gorham judgment, quoted with approval in subsequent judgments :—

> This Court, constituted for the purpose of advising her Majesty on matters which come within its competency, has no jurisdiction or authority to settle matters of faith, or to determine what ought in any particular to be the doctrine of the Church of England. Its duty extends only to the consideration of that which is by law established to be the doctrine of the Church of England upon the true and legal construction of her articles and formularies.—*Six Judgments*, p. 35 *ut supra*.

Hooker refers to this fact as follows :—

> What Courts there shall be, and what causes shall belong to each Court, and what judges shall determine of every cause, and what *order* in all judgments shall be kept; of these things the laws have sufficiently disposed; so that his duty which sitteth in every such Court is to judge *not of* but *after* the said laws.—Ibid. chap. viii. 3.

In passing, it may be remarked that Hooker ascribes to the laws the right of settling the question of courts and modes of procedure.

Another change was made on the occasion of the enactment of the Judicature Bill, which had been introduced in 1873. It was provided that the Bishops should sit as assessors. By an Order of Council, Nov. 28, 1876, it was settled that the presence of at least three Bishops should be necessary, one of whom must be the Archbishop of Canterbury, or the Archbishop of York, or the Bishop of London.[1] During the discussions which

[1] The following quotation from the Order of Council shows that care has been taken for impartiality in the attendance of the Bishop :—

"1. The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Archbishop of York, and the Bishop of London shall be *ex officio* assessors of the Judicial Committee of her Majesty's Privy Council on the hearing of ecclesiastical cases according to the following rota, that is to say, the Archbishop of Canterbury from this day until the 1st January, 1878; the Archbishop of York from the 1st of January, 1878, till the 1st of January, 1879; and the Bishop of London from the 1st of January, 1879, to the 1st of January, 1880, and so on by a similar rotation for the period of one year each.

"2. The other bishops of dioceses within the provinces of Canterbury and York shall attend as assessors of the Judicial Committee on the hearing of ecclesiastical cases according to the following rota, that is to say, from this day, until the 1st of January, 1878, the four bishops who on this day are the four junior bishops for the time being; seniority for the purpose of this order to be reckoned from the date of appointment to the episcopal see; from the 1st of January, 1878, till the 1st of January, 1879, the four bishops who on the 1st of January, 1878, shall be the four bishops next in order of seniority; and from the 1st of January, 1879, till the 1st of January, 1880, the

took place in the Legislature, an attempt was made to exclude the Bishops from the Final Court of Appeal, but the Primate and others successfully resisted the effort. Here, as in other cases, at this juncture, Dr. Stephens rendered valuable service to the Church by an able pamphlet which he addressed to the Archbishop of York on this subject.

As now constituted the Court is the best which has yet existed.

It combines men who are learned in the law with Bishops as assessors. The rubrics are intimately connected with Acts of Parliament. The ornaments rubric until 1662 expressly referred to the Act; its interpretation involves an elaborate legal investigation, for which the judges are best qualified. The judgments already given bear evidence of this. The law judges, from their mental training, are the least likely to give a partial decision. Dr. Pusey goes so far as to say that even "those without the Church are often better, because more disinterested, judges of the Church's doctrine than biassed members of the Church." Who can suggest a better? The Bishop of Oxford in his paper on "The Ecclesiastical Courts and final Courts of Appeal," read in the late Congress, does not venture to make a positive suggestion. He says:—

> Again, there must be an appeal in the last resort;—to whom? To the Privy Council, as now? or to the Upper House of Convocation? or to the whole Bench of Bishops? or to judges specially appointed by the Crown? How difficult it is to meet with anything like agreement in the answer to be given to these questions, or to any one of them! Yet, until we are agreed, it is idle to expect that any improvement in the constitution of the Courts can be obtained.

Dr. Pusey, in a letter addressed to Canon Liddon in 1871, expresses his difficulties as follows:—

> But as to the Court itself, my friend, Sir J. T. Coleridge, reminds us of the difficulty in which we are placed; if we would get rid of this Court, we must be subject to another; and alludes to some of the difficulties in the Court to which we once looked, a Provincial Council of Bishops. Certainly I felt the difficulties which he suggests when we proposed it twenty-one years ago. If the Provincial Synod should decide wrong, the consequences would be far graver.—Letter to Canon Liddon, appended to Canon Liddon's letter to Sir J. T. Coleridge, p. 63. London, 1871.

The Doctor abandons the idea of constituting the Provincial Synod as a Court of Appeal, and says:—

---

four bishops who on the 1st of January, 1879, shall be the four bishops next in order of seniority, and so on by a similar rotation until the senior bishop for the time being is reached, when the rotation shall be carried back to and again commenced with the junior bishop."

I should myself prefer that the Church of England should volunteer to place itself herein on the same footing as every other religious body in England. The State will interfere in every case where property is concerned; and no harm would have ensued had the State, as the State, retained to Mr. Wilson or Dr. R. Williams their respective incomes and parsonages. The mischief in all these decisions has been the quasi-ecclesiastical character of the Court, given to it by the presence of Archbishops or Bishops. Any increase of the ecclesiastical element, any reference to irresponsible theologians as assessors, any selection of Bishops as judges, would only make things worse. No one would have been disturbed by any judgment which Lord Campbell or Lord Westbury, or Lord Cairns might have thought right to give, as civil judges. What shook minds through and through, when our eyes were opened by the Gorham judgment to the claims made by this Court, and what sent so many of our friends from us, and turned servants and sons of the Church into its deadliest antagonists, was that a State-appointed Court claimed, in the name of the Church, the supervision and determination of its doctrine. A judgment in the Court of Queen's Bench might injure discipline; it could not in any way commit the Church. It would be an interpretation of her formularies by civil judges pronouncing upon her teaching, but not in her name. In such case it would not matter whether the judge was of some dissenting body (as the lay members of the Judicial Committee may, anyhow, mostly be). Those without the Church are often better, because more disinterested judges of the Church's doctrine than biassed members of the Church.—Ibid. p. 63.

In accordance with these views the effort was unsuccessfully made to exclude the Bishops from the Court. Dr. Pusey does not hesitate to say that his objection to the Court arose from the Gorham judgment, and does not disguise his motives in recommending that the Court should be divested of its ecclesiastical character. Such a Court could not, he thinks, "commit the Church," or possess any force in *foro conscientiæ:* in plain language, this is to say that the Church ought not to have such a court of final appeal as would speak in the name of the Church, and fairly claim the assent of her clergy! This is certainly a startling position. The admission of such a principle would indeed be calculated to turn "sons and servants of the Church into its deadliest antagonists;" it would act in favour of Dissent on the one hand, and the Papacy on the other. But a fallacy lies at the bottom of the Doctor's argument when he refers to "a State-appointed Court," as claiming "in the name of the Church the supervision and determination of its doctrine." He ignores the fact that the Church *has sanctioned* the Royal Supremacy, and the Courts by which it acts. We have already shown that the Church of England in her Synods, having before her the Royal Supremacy as it was exercised in the Courts of High Commission and Delegates, gave her sanction. Dr. Pusey seems

to forget that the Bishops of the Church have not only accepted, but supported, the action taken by the Crown in the Courts. Their very visitation articles bore upon the subject. The Doctor himself has solemnly assented to the discipline of "this Church and realm."—*Ordination of Priests.*

In every way the Church of England is identified with the Royal Supremacy. Reception is the highest sanction which a Church can give to its laws and Courts. Hooker says that "the canons even of general councils have but the force of wise men's opinions concerning that whereof they treat *till they be publicly assented unto* where they are to take place as laws, and that in giving such public assent as maketh a Christian kingdom subject unto those laws, the King's authority is the chiefest."—Book viii. chap. vi.

Dr. Newman, now Cardinal, on the occasion of the definition of the Pope's infallibility, said: "This (reception), indeed, is a broad principle by which all acts of the rulers of the Church are ratified. But for it we might reasonably question some of the past council or their acts."—*Letter to the Duke of Norfolk.*

There is, therefore, no valid ground for the protests of the English Church Union which passed the following resolution:—

That any Court which is bound to frame its decisions in accordance with the judgments of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, or any other secular Court, does not possess any spiritual authority with respect to such decisions. That suspension *a sacris* being a purely spiritual act, the English Church Union is prepared to support any priest not guilty of a moral or canonical offence who refuses to recognise a suspension issued by such a Court.

The Court with its Episcopal Assessors is not "a Secular Court," but the Council advising the Crown which is supreme in all causes ecclesiastical. The protests of the *English Church Union* would apply with even greater force to the Court of Delegates, which in numerous instances consisted simply of the law judges, but which was defended by Hooker and other champions of the Church against Puritanists and Romanists. The High Commission, as representing the Crown, suspended *a sacris* clergymen who did not conform to the laws, and yet in the presence of this fact the Canons of 1604 ratified the Supremacy, and the Canon of 1640 threatened against the disobedient the power of his Majesty's Ecclesiastical Commissioners. In point of fact, the government of the Church is now much more favourable to the clergy than it was under the Tudors or Stuarts. The High Court of Commission was abolished in the year 1640, and has never been revived.

The position assumed by the English Church Union is utterly inconsistent and untenable. The Bishop of Bath and Wells truly says:—

It was important to note further that if the arguments of the President of the English Church Union were sound, the Church of England is at this moment in a state of anarchy; there is actually no tribunal of any kind whatsoever which by its judgments can protect her doctrines or discipline or the rights of her members to have the authorised services performed in the parish church. A devout English Churchman might go to his parish church any Sunday morning, and find the worship of the Virgin Mary going on, or the celebration of mass according to the Roman canon; or, on the other hand, a Socinian or infidel service, and he could get no redress, because the appeal might be carried to the Privy Council, and the decisions of the Privy Council forsooth are not binding on the consciences of Churchmen. Whether or not that was consistent with any theory or practice that had been known in the Church of England since the Reformation, he left to all men's common sense to decide.

These remarks of the Right Reverend Prelate are very forcible, and deserve special attention. The present system of judicature is in accordance, as the Bishop of Gloucester observes, with "the long descended relations of Church and State.[1] It is too late in the day for clergymen to turn round and repudiate the judicature of Church and State. Have they not solemnly promised at their ordination to minister the doctrine, sacraments, and the discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and *realm* hath received the same?" The words of Whitgift, addressed to the Puritans who were unwilling to conform, are applicable in this case:—

You complain much of unbrotherly and uncharitable entreating of you, of removing you from your offices and places. Surely in this point I must compare you to certain heretics that were in Augustine's time, who most bitterly, by sundry means afflicting and molesting the true ministers of the Church, yet for all that cried out that they were extremely dealt with and cruelly persecuted by them; or else unto a shrewd and ungracious wife, which, beating her husband, by her clamorous complaints maketh her neighbours believe that her husband beateth her; or to him that is mentioned in Erasmus' Colloquies, that did steal and run away with the priest's purse, and yet cried always as he ran, "Stay the thief! stay the thief!" and thus crying escaped, and

[1] The Bishop of Lincoln says:—

"In England the supreme human authorities, under Christ, over all powers, spiritual as well as temporal, and in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil, is vested in the Sovereign.

"This is affirmed by the Church of England in her Articles (Art. XXXVII.), and also in her Canons (Canon 1, 2, 36).

"Therefore, they who appeal to the authority of the Church and to her Canon Law are bound to acknowledge the Royal supremacy, properly understood, and he that resists that authority in anything which is not plainly repugnant to the law of God, not only resists the law of the State, but of the Church; he resists God, from whom all the authority of rulers and laws is derived."—*Letter to Canon Hole.*

yet he was the thief himself. You are as gently entreated as may be, no kind of brotherly persuasion omitted towards you, most of you as yet keep your livings, though some one or two be displaced, you are offered all kinds of friendliness, if you could be content to conform yourselves, yea, but to be quiet and hold your peace. You, on the contrary side, most unchristianly and most unbrotherly, both publicly and privately, rail on those that show this humanity towards you, slander them by all means you can, and most untruly report of them, seeking by all means their discredit. Again, they, as their allegiance to the Prince and duty to laws requireth, yea, and as some of them by oath are bound, do execute that discipline, which the Prince, the law, and their oath requireth; you, contrary to all obedience, duty, and oath, openly violate and break those laws, orders, and statutes, which you ought to obey, and to the which some of you by oath are bound. If your doings proceed indeed from a good conscience, then leave that living and place which bindeth you to those things that be against your conscience; for why should you strive, with the disquietness both of yourselves and others, to keep that living which by law you cannot, except you offend against your conscience? Or what honesty is there to swear to statutes and laws, and when you have so done, contrary to your oath to break them, and yet still to remain under them, and enjoy that place which requireth obedience and subjection to them? For my part, I think it much better, by removing you from your livings, to offend you, than by suffering you to enjoy them, to offend the Prince, the law, conscience, and God. And before God I speak it, if I were persuaded as you seem to be, I would rather quietly forsake all the livings I have than be an occasion of strife and contention in the Church, and a cause of stumbling to the weak and rejoicing to the wicked. I know God would provide for me, if I did it *bona conscientia* ["of good conscience and unfamed zeal."] Yea, surely I would rather die than be the author of schisms, a disturber of the common peace and quietness of the Church and State. There is no reformed Church that I can hear tell of, but it hath a certain prescript and determinate order, as well touching ceremonies and discipline as doctrine to the which all those are constrained to give their consent that will live under the protection of it; and why then may not this Church of England have so in like manner? Is it meet that every man should have his own fancy or live as him list? Truly, I know not whereunto these your doings can tend, but either to anabaptism or to mere confusion."—*Works*, vol. iii. p. 320, P.S.

What the Church of England now needs is not organic change, but submission to the laws and obedience to authority. Without this, we have reason to apprehend the most lamentable results.

R. P. BLAKENEY.

ART. VI.—REVIVAL IN THE GALLICAN CHURCH.

1. *Charles de Condren, &c.* By H. SIDNEY LEAR. London: Rivingtons. 1877.
2. *Bossuet and his Contemporaries.* London: Rivingtons. 1874.
3. *Fénelon, Archbishop of Cambrai.* London: Rivingtons. 1877.
4. *Bossuet Dévoilé par un Prêtre de son Diocèse en* 1690. 2e edition. Paris: Sandor. 1875.
5. *L'Intolerance de Fénelon.* Par A. DOUEN. Nouvelle edition, augmentée. Paris: Sandoz. 1875.
6. *The Gallican Church.* By the Rev. W. H. JERVIS, M.A. London: Murray. 1872.

THE Gallican Church is a subject of considerable interest just at present. The recent Pan-Anglican Synod was moved with compassion for its forlorn condition. Men like Mr. Gladstone and Dean Stanley have deemed it worth their while to manifest interest in M. Loyson's (Père Hyacinthe) effort to resuscitate it. For it must be carefully kept in mind that, in the proper sense of the term, the "Gallican Church" has now no existence; it is a thing of the past. In its room, mainly through the inability of the First Napoleon to cope with the mingled finesse and obstinacy of the Papal authorities, there has in lieu of it been introduced into the heart of France a Roman garrison, owning all allegiance to a foreign Power, and only nominally French. This Frenchmen understand; those especially who seek to be free from foreign interference. But neither the present nor the past Church have any real hold upon the French nation. The yoke of priestly observance has for a long time been most reluctantly submitted to. That yoke is now broken. What will be the future even of religion is a problem. Meanwhile, amongst ourselves there are some persons who imagine that it would be a good thing for France if the old Gallican Church could be reproduced. They are for this reason disposed to augur favourably of M. Loyson's experiment, as though a married priesthood, the participation of the laity in the Cup and Mass in French, had been possible features of that Church. Some imagine that it was in certain respects superior to our own Church; at any rate, that it produced more conspicuous instances of saintly life. They would like to have something corresponding to what they fancy it was in England. Those who have studied French history know that for a very considerable portion of its existence it was remarkable for disorder and corruption. They know also that the Gallican liberties, although there was

an amount of deference ostensibly paid to the Pope, meant really an interference of the State—that is, the Monarch—with the Church quite us great, if not greater, than what now exists in England. Some, however, point to a revival period in it commencing in the reign of Louis XIII. and extending through that of Louis XIV., and would fain avert contemplation from the rest of the Church to this restricted portion; if they could, they would like to suppose that this part was the whole.

It would be impossible to treat the subject exhaustively in the pages of a magazine; still some comments upon the Gallican Church at the height of this revival may be profitable and interesting. It is a fair period for viewing the influences of choice Roman Catholic teaching in a Church. We see the system at its best, selecting a peculiarly favourable development out of the mass of surrounding corruption. General readers can study the main incidents of it in Mr. Lear's writings, the chief object of which is through the medium of the past in France to shadow out what he considers would be profitable in England now. English Churchmen, therefore, are specially interested in all this. He is, we suppose, an English Churchman himself, but his writings are purely derived from Romish sources; there is nothing in them but what might have been written by an intelligent and liberal-minded Roman Catholic. As written for English readers, they are carefully expurgated from the more stimulating absurdities congenial to unreformed or vitiated palates. The absence of these peculiarities detracts, however, from the faithfulness of the portraitures, and is calculated to leave a most erroneous impression. Mr. Lear is a courtly painter. He presents rather the aspects which he would wish his sitters to assume than what they really presented in all respects to the men of their generation. His disposition towards unqualified eulogium has been encouraged by the admirable qualities, in many important particulars, of those whom he commemorates.

A very brief retrospect of the religious condition of France before the period of the priestly revival will be necessary. Three parties existed in the country from the time of Luther and Calvin. There were the Huguenots, who, partly by force of arms, but mainly under the influence of religious zeal, formed a section of the community remarkable for strictness of life and purity of religious doctrine. As a body they framed their lives in conformity with this doctrine, and were conspicuous for many excellent qualities, rendering them most valuable citizens, deeply inspired with the love of freedom and filled with hatred of Romish superstitions. In marked opposition to them were the adherents of the Catholic League. These were what we would nowadays describe as Ultramontane fanatics of the most unscru-

pulous character. Some idea may be formed of the lengths to which the Leaguers were prepared to go when we state that it was in contemplation to dethrone Henry III., to confine him for life in a monastery, to require the complete submission of the States-General of France to the See of Rome, to take decisive measures for the total suppression and abolition of the Reformed religion, revoking all edicts favourable to it, and to secure the complete recognition of the sovereignty of the Pope by abrogating for ever the so-called liberties of the Gallican Church. This plot was "viewed with cordial sympathy by many of the prelates and a large majority of the parochial clergy of France."[1] Subsequent history proves with what undeviating tenacity the objects of the League have been pursued from that time to the present hour. Beyond both these parties was the bulk of the French nation, steeped, for the most part, in abject poverty and the most profound ignorance. The biographer of St. Vincent de Paul describes them as like "scattered sheep without spiritual pasture, without sacraments, without instruction, and with scarcely any external aids to salvation. They scarcely knew whether or not there was a God. Of the mysteries of the Trinity and of the Incarnation they had no apprehension whatever." Yet the Church of France was in the possession of princely revenues. Religious foundations of all sorts abounded throughout tbe land. Glorious cathedrals reared themselves in magnificence. But, except amongst the Huguenot congregations, there was spiritual death. The French clergy especially were dead. It would be hardly possible to conceive anything more frightful than the sad condition of the French Church in the seventeenth century, viewed as a Christian institution. In his "Revival of Priestly Life" (p. 43), Mr. Lear quotes the authority of a French bishop for the fact that there were "seventy thousand priests in his diocese either drunkards or of impure life." Another bishop did not think that with one exception there was "a priest in his diocese capable of any ecclesiastical office." The name was held to be synonymous with ignorance and debauchery. There is no reason to believe that the dioceses referred to were peculiarly exceptionable. In France altogether there were one hundred and thirty sees. Even making the most enormous deductions there must have been five hundred thousand of profligate and ignorant priests in France during that century.[2] Very many of the

[1] For an account of this, *in extenso*, see "Church of France," vol. i. p. 174.

[2] It would be utterly impossible in these pages to justify this statement. One anecdote may, perhaps, without breach of decorum, be related. The Bishop of Langres, M. Simiane, by no means the worst of his order, commonly termed "le bon Langres," was a gambler, fond of playing for heavy stakes. He lost at Court large sums

bishops were little better, if at all better, than the priests. What must have been the condition of convents and nunneries, the inmates of which found in these priests their confessors and directors? There was confessedly most pressing need for a revival if religion was not to perish altogether out of the country, beyond the pale of the Reformation.

But what was the nature of this revival when it did occur? Mr. Lear has, with singular propriety, defined it as a "revival of priestly life." In some respects this was a benefit to France. But was it what she needed? The definition, though strictly correct, is, after all, too limited. What France then needed, and what might have saved her from the calamities which overtook her in the days of the eighteenth century, was the "revival of Christian life." Between this last and the "revival of priestly life" there is a wide distinction. This religious movement, was then, and still is, a failure.

In considering this failure, it is but justice to admit that Mr. Lear's heroes were possessed of many admirable natural qualities, and were remarkable for many Christian graces. It would be a grievous want of charity to question the sincerity of their personal piety or the fervour of their zeal. There is a good deal in the display of their religious life which jars with Protestant belief and with the plain teaching of the Word of God. Superstition and false doctrine are commingled with their most devout aspirations. So far, Mr. Lear, almost unconsciously, presents them in their weakness as well as in their strength. It would be a deplorable thing for England if there was a reproduction of such personages amongst us. Their erroneous teaching would completely counterbalance the holiness of their lives. This may not prove a popular statement, but it is a truth. Whoever would set them up before him as examples ought to have spiritual discernment, enabling him to winnow the chaff from the corn; otherwise he, too, may be led into serious error. Indiscriminate admiration of them, even as presented by Mr. Lear, would be a fatal mistake. Still more so would this be the case when it is borne in mind that his statements are partial and defective.

But to what is their failure to be attributed? Most unquestionably at no period did they influence or enlighten the mass of the French people. Success of this description is not claimed for

---

at billiards. Thereupon he withdrew quietly into his diocese, where for six months, in profound retreat, by constant practice he studied all the intricacies of the game. On his return to Paris, by arts familiar to professional gamblers, he inveigled his former antagonists into playing for large sums which he won, and, indeed, more than he had lost. He had been chief almoner to the Queen of Louis XIII., one of the principal promoters of the revival of the priestly life.

them, while to a limited extent they produced some improvement in a portion of the clergy. Even in Paris and in Versailles they wholly failed to stem the torrent of corruption. What success they had was with individuals who were persuaded by them to join their religious communities, and, according to the French phrase, to become "dévots."[1] Steadily, however, they alienated from religion all that was enlightened and intellectual in France beyond their own narrow precincts. Jansenism they persecuted to the death, though it formed part of their own Church. They arrayed, too, against themselves, the deadly hostility of the French Parliaments, over which, at times, they triumphed, but by which, eventually, they were crushed. When the Revolutionary period commenced, the French clergy were left utterly friendless; nowhere could they find partisans, nor was there one eminent name among themselves to shed lustre upon them at the period of their extinction.

The failure of such excellent men as De Condren, De Berulle, Saint Vincent de Paul, M. Olier, Bossuet, Fénelon, in establishing any permanent influence or extensive reformation in France may in part be attributed to the endless religious squabbles in which they were constantly engaged. There is a mistaken notion afloat that Rome, like the Jerusalem of the Psalms, is a city that is "at unity in itself." Nothing can be a greater delusion. Some years ago an inexperienced young man, in quest of religious unity, joined the Plymouth Brethren. He was much startled, but not shaken in his purpose, when asked, "Which sect of them?" The same question might most pertinently have been put in the seventeenth century. There were Jesuits and Oratorians, Jansenists and Quietists, all disputing and jangling with one another, sometimes invoking the King, sometimes the Pope, sometimes the Parliament, to settle their disputes and to discomfit their adversaries by violent means. In the opinion of a very favourable critic, Mr. Jervis, those who at the commencement of the eighteenth century exercised the chief influence upon ecclesiastical affairs in France "were men of a very different stamp from the Arnaulds and Nicoles, the Fénelons and Bossuets of the preceding generation." But exhausting controversy had so long been preying on the vital powers of the Church that intellectual and spiritual growth

[1] This change of pursuits, after a life of worldliness, is a recognised phase of Romish religion. It will be best illustrated by an amusing incident recorded in St. Simon's Memoirs, which abound with illustrations of it. A courtier of Louis XIV., after a life of dissipation, joined the Camoldolensian Brotherhood. A friend visiting him inquired how he managed to pass his time? The reply was, "Je m'ennuie, je fais ma pénitence; je me suis trop diverti." He died shortly afterwards of jaundice and of ennui. But his penitence had been a set-off against his dissipation.

was stunted. The revival of priestly life in France produced no more substantial effect upon the nation than, to use an expression of Napoleon, *œufs à la neige* to satisfy hunger. In the eighteenth century Cardinal Dubois was the ruling ecclesiastic, the Jansenists were busied over the miracles wrought at the tomb of M. Paris, and Archbishop Languet was giving currency and vogue to the hallucinations of Marie Alacocque! The Cardinal de Rohan, and Talleyrand figuring as Bishop of Autun, were conspicuous ecclesiastics towards its close. As Lord Macaulay says, "No Bossuet, no Pascal came forth to meet Voltaire," but the squabbling of Jesuits and Jansenists lasted unintermittingly till the deluge came. At that time impiety was rife among the higher order of ecclesiastics, and ignorance had far from disappeared from among the inferior clergy.

A more serious cause of failure was the persecuting spirit so largely fostered by this "revival of the priestly life." The era of this revival was also the era of the Dragonnades and those religious persecutions which have rendered the reign of Louis XIV. infamous, despite all its glories. There had been, at a previous period, religious persecutions and religious wars in France, but in the early part of the sixteenth century these last had terminated. The strongholds of the Huguenots had been surrendered; the last vestige of independence was taken from them. Henceforward they could have subsisted only as a religious, not as a political element in the kingdom. Excuses might be put forward for forcible measures against a political party suspected of embroiling France; but when the Huguenots were overthrown by arms, and powerless to resist, clemency would have been policy. It certainly would have been consistent with any true revival of Christianity. Now, no reader forming his conclusions from Mr. Lear's volumes would connect the revival which he treats of with the persecutions to which the Huguenots were subjected. This is one main defect of his publications. He parades before the public a number of saintly or quasi-saintly personages overflowing with Christian graces, with words in their mouths "smoother than butter," intent apparently on heavenly things, and seeking only, in the most affectionate manner, the welfare of the poor and wretched. But there is a reverse side to his picture. Religious intolerance, which produced the most deadly perils to France, and eventually to its Church, sprang mainly, if not exclusively, from the revival of the priestly life. The chief promoters of this revival possessed enormous influence in the courtly circles of Paris and Versailles. As confessors and directors they had the ear of the King, who declared, *l'Etat c'est moi*, and of all his mistresses and

chief counsellors. In the midst of all the splendid harlotry of the Court of France there were constantly, at intervals, compunctions of conscience, and remains of religious fervour. The piquant description given by the Duke of Noailles, of the sick favourite, with one eye turned to God and the other to the King, describes in a most lively manner the religious condition of the upper classes in France, upon whom this revival of priestly life chiefly operated. Whenever these intervals of religious excitement prevailed, by skilful management the direction of repentance was turned upon the extirpation of what was termed heresy. Zeal for the conversion of Huguenots took the place of charity; in everything but an apostolic sense it covered the multitude of sins. When religion presented itself in this aspect, in Louis XIV. a new Constantine, a new Theodosius was proclaimed to the world. We cannot pretend to follow the story of the Huguenots in all its frightful details. It would be difficult for the readers of Mr. Lear's books to imagine that there even had been such a story simultaneous with, and intertwined with, the saintly lives he enumerates. We must venture to assume that our readers believe in the story of Huguenot sufferings, and that they have some information about its chief horrors. Our business is simply to connect with it the most eminent names signalised by Mr. Lear in his "Revival of the Priestly Life in France."

It was in 1622 that the Pope, Gregory XV., established the "Society for the Propagation of the Faith." Eleven years earlier the Congregation of the Oratory was created by M. de Bérulle, afterwards a cardinal, in the Faubourg St. Jaques, at Paris. According to Mr. Lear, he had great success in converting Huguenots. Cardinal du Perron had said of him, "If you want both to convince and convert a heretic, take him to M. de Bérulle. In the opinion of Henri IV., "he had never lost his baptismal innocence!" There is a cursory allusion to M. Bérulle being mixed up a good deal with political affairs, in which multitudes lose a great deal of baptismal innocence; his zeal for convincing and converting heretics displayed itself strangely. We do not gather from Mr. Lear with whom the design and execution of the siege of Rochelle originated. Though usually ascribed to that most mundane of Churchmen, Cardinal Richelieu, it was mainly the project of the saintly De Bérulle! It was his influence in the Council of State that finally determined the King to besiege La Rochelle, contrary, in the first instance, to the advice of Richelieu. He embarked in this scheme from "the strongest conviction of the necessity of annihilating the power of the Huguenots." His earnest entreaty to Richelieu was that he would not thwart the prayers he was offering for the success of the siege. Beyond a question, he did crush the

Huguenots. How many of them were convinced and converted by his saintly counsels and prayers is not on record, but the Royal camp was filled with a well-disciplined array of priests, monks, and missionary preachers. De Bérulle might have taken for his motto, on this memorable occasion—

Flectere si nequeo superos Acheronta movebo.

In his apologetic memoirs of Madame de Maintenon,[1] the Duc de Noailles remarks, with singular truth, but apparently without being conscious of the danger of his statement—"Dès la prise de Rochelle il se forma comme une croisade spirituelle pour les conversions." This is most accurate. We get a right understanding of the horrors of the reign of Louis XIV. when we estimate them as another and, we trust, a last Crusade. When Urban II., at the Council of Clerment, preached the first Crusade, he exhorted the multitude to "redeem their sins, their rapine, their burnings, their bloodshed, by obedience." He dwelt upon the easiness of the remedy for sin now proposed—plenary indulgence of all sins for Crusaders. God, it was then said, had instituted a new method for the cleansing of sins. Some remedy for sin was as urgently needed in the reign of Louis XIV. as in that of Philip I. Religious wars and religious persecution by which spiritual favour could be ensured through tormenting heretics, real or imaginary, was always a cherished priestly nostrum in France. The condonation of sensuality, by the sufferings of heretics, was a convenient creed, constantly preached and implicitly believed in. It suited the policy of Rome; it supplied a pressing necessity of French kings. What has been wittily termed "La pénitence au dépens d'autrui," was never more needed than by Louis XIV., nor was it ever more practised. In immediate connection with his theory of the Crusades, De Noailles adds, "En 1626 St. Vincent de Paul institua le Congrégation des Prêtres de la Mission." Throughout the persecution of the Huguenots, until toleration was reluctantly yielded in 1787, the worst features of a Crusade in dealing with them were retained. There was the union of preaching and persecution; of frocked and booted missionaries. The spectacle witnessed at La Rochelle confronted the Huguenots at every turn.

Now, what was the attitude of eminent prelates and priests, conspicuous in the revival of priestly life, who might have been deemed superior to the base passions which influenced the vulgar herd, from the King, with his mistresses and courtiers, downwards to his dragoons? Fléchier is a celebrated name in the Church of France. He has been described as "a pious, tolerant, charitable Bishop, almost canonised by the

[1] "Mémoires de Madame de Maintenon," vol. ii. p. 312.

Protestants of his diocese." For his missionary services he was made Bishop of Nîmes. At first his apparent success was great, but when the Cevennes rose in revolt, and he saw "the fruit of seventeen years of labour lost," in which he had been assisted by the dragoons of Baville, and the fiendish ingenuity of the archpriest Du Chayla, he cried out to God and to the dragoons, beseeching them "to crush the cruel heads of the rebellious, and to annihilate the wretches" in his diocese. Bourdaloue was engaged on a similar mission in the South. Great hopes were entertained at Paris that "the dragoons and the Bourdaloues" would give the *coup de grâce* to heresy.

Bossuet had his share in these mixed operations. In his life of Bossuet (pp. 310, 311), Mr. Lear mentions one or two instances of the great prelate's interference on behalf of the Protestants of his diocese; he remarks also that he "studiously avoided any military support, and used every effort to give the Protestants as full liberty as was possible after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes." The Cardinal de Bausset, in his life of Bossuet, upon whom, no doubt, Mr. Lear relies, states that "he never applied to the King for any act of severity against a single Protestant." He adds that "there is no proof that he had any share in what preceded or immediately followed the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes." He asserts that he never persecuted a single Protestant; that he alleviated their sufferings. It is probably by this testimony that Mr. Lear has been misled. But an eye-witness has described how all the Protestants of the villages of Nanteuil, Quincy, Condé, &c., were converted in less than two hours by Bossuet, when brought forcibly into his palace! He has recorded how, escorted by the cuirasseurs of M. de la Chaise, nephew of Père la Chaise, the King's confessor, the Protestants of La Claye were summoned to the house of M. d'Herouville, the King's maître d'hôtel, and were told by Bossuet that if they did not sign the Act of Abjuration next day the "troops would turn their heads for them." A more cruel case still is adduced. At Claye there was a person, Isaac Cochard, on his death-bed. The official despatch of the Minister is still extant, recording that, "at the prayer of the Bishop of Meaux, orders were issued to arrest the Sieurs Cochard, father and son; these orders were issued solely on account of their religion." Bossuet stands charged with going himself to the house of the dying man with the Intendant and with the Lieutenant-General le Valery, holding a *lettre de cachet;* a guard and a cart were in waiting to carry away the dying man. On this occasion Bossuet is charged with exclaiming, in a rage, that "as soon as the breath was out of his body he should be cast into the sewers, and that his only son should be taken from him." In Meaux, two women, Marie Clavel and Jeanne Rossignol (1688),

had their heads shaved and were shut up in the General Hospital. Three years afterwards the King, not the Bishop, wrote to inquire whether they could conveniently be released. Whatever Mr. Lear's judgment may be, it is quite certain that, in preference to acquiescing in the tender mercies of Bossuet, the non-Catholics of Meaux emigrated in all directions. Abundant official evidence of this, and of far more than we can find room for, will be found in the "Pièces justificatives," attached to the brochure on Bossuet at the head of our Article. We recommend Mr. Lear to study and to refute them—if he can. Perhaps he may be led, on reconsideration, to modify the statement that Bossuet always pursued the line of gentleness and tolerance (p. 536) in his own diocese. What we have adduced cannot by him or any one else be reconciled with gentleness and tolerance.

There is, however, still behind one great and illustrious name, perhaps altogether the most illustrious in the revival of priestly life in France; "the most attractive and lovable among the many stars which shone in the Church's dark sky during the seventeenth century," Fénelon, the Archbishop of Cambrai. Must he, too, find his celebrated name confounded with religious intolerance? was he, too, a persecutor of the saints of God?

Who would not weep, if Atticus were he?

In many respects Fénelon was above his contemporaries. Admirable qualities distinguished him as a man and as a prelate. But when the full truth is told, it will be manifest that the spirit of sacerdotalism, especially when it has free scope, as in the Church of Rome, brings the noblest spirits to be participators in what must be stigmatised as the most atrocious crimes. Few probably are acquainted with the early history of Fénelon until he shone forth conspicuous in the Church and Court of France. By what steps did he make his way into favour? How came he to bask in the light of the King's countenance for a season, and for a season only—a light afterwards completely and for ever eclipsed. Young Fénelon, a member of a noble family, was not without friends ready and willing to push the fortunes of one so capable and deserving. It came to pass that about 1634 two establishments for the instruction and conversion of the sons and daughters of Protestants were established in Paris. Mr. Lear describes them as "a protection for women converted from Protestantism, and as a means of propagating Church teaching among those yet unconverted." We will add to this too brief description.

Very curious details have been preserved of some of the earlier of these establishments, especially when d'Argenson was, in 1679, at the head of the police, but we cannot decently advert to them.

One was founded by Anne de Croze, a disciple of St. Vincent de Paul. The rules and constitutions, drawn up by Bossuet, deserve some attention. Among them were the following:—"Wives can be received without the consent of their husbands, children without that of their father, and servants without that of their masters." We quote part of another:—"If the New Catholics persist in disobedience, the mother superior will impose punishment (*pénitences*) suitable to their weakness; if they prove incorrigible Christian care will be taken of them." What is implied in this? Another of Bossuet's articles to which particular attention should be paid is:—"If it happens that among the scholars there are any deprived of reason, the sisters and scholars are most expressly forbidden to loiter about them or to amuse themselves," &c. Now, about 1676, Louis XIV. was seized with one of his fits of devotion and remorse. He dismissed Madame de Montespan for a season, and began to fall under the influence of Madame de Maintenon. He embarked vigorously in the last most cruel crusade attempted by the old monarchy of France. In 1679 Madame de Maintenon was able to write:—"The King is thinking seriously about the conversion of heretics, and will apply himself shortly to it in good earnest." Convents for New Catholic children were multiplied. It was two days after the death of Mademoiselle de Fontanges, in 1681, that the Royal penitent, who thus had a fresh twinge, expiated his crimes and gave an edifying example of remorse by a fresh edict declaring that children seven years old might embrace the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman (there is nothing said about holy) religion! Upon no pretext were fathers and mothers to hinder them. Then arose throughout the length and breadth of France what has pathetically been described as the "*cri des mères.*" There were many Rachels in that unhappy land when priestly life and royal penitence revived in it. It was the fashion of the day, in a land where fashion reigns supreme, to fill these convents with Protestant children of tender age, torn from their families. Madame de Maintenon, by an act of wickedness which her biographer deplores, set a conspicuous example. The King busied himself in it. What more promising situation could be found for a young man whose friends were anxious to push his fortune than to place Fénelon at the head of the chief of these establishments?

Accordingly, while he was yet under thirty years of age, he was made superior of the convent in the Rue Sainte Anne, which the King filled with proselytes. A Madame Garnier was the lady superior. According to his admirers he became "the father, the counsellor, the soul of the teachers and the scholars." If these words mean anything they simply imply

that he was the life and soul of the establishment. He held this office for ten years. Of late, not only in England but in France, considerable use has been made of State Papers to rectify history. Admission to this convent, which Mr. Lear so pleasingly describes, was by order of the Marquis de Seignelay, Secretary of State, who instructed the head of the police as follows :—"His Majesty orders you to arrest (prendre) Magdalen Resoul, at Charente, and to place her among the New Catholics." The Attorney-General de Harlay writes to the Archbishop of Paris : "My Lord, I have only two or three left of your orders to admit women into convents. I beg you will send me a dozen." Orders of the same have been preserved threatening women who refused to listen to instruction after they had been arrested and imprisoned "with disagreeable consequences if they refused." In point of fact obstinate women and children were passed on to the Bastille, or to the General Hospital, the receptacle of thieves and prostitutes. By a Royal Ordinance of 8th April, 1686, if those who had been shut up for a fortnight and sufficiently instructed in that time (?) refused to be converted, notice was to be sent to the King, who would "see to it." Who gave the instructions ? Who certified that in a fortnight children and women were sufficiently instructed ? What befell those who were obstinate and for whom his Majesty undertook to care ? An analysis of a list of a hundred and twenty-five names will be worth perusal. All that is known of thirty-one is that they were in the convent. Twenty-five, at least, under Fénelon's instructions, abjured their religion ; but of these, eight only feigned assent to Romanism, and as soon as they were set at liberty escaped abroad. Five seem to have been sincere in their recantation. Sixteen of those who were intractable were placed in other convents. Nineteen were shut up in citadels and dealt with as criminals among the criminal classes. Ten were banished. Nine who had abjured and relapsed were shut up again. One of these, a Madame Paul, who had been twice converted and had relapsed, was imprisoned at Loches. After three years' imprisonment she was converted for the third time ! The lot of two young Turkish girls, Maria and Ursula May, six and seven years old, was very hard. They had been for two years under Fénelon's instructions, but according to the list sent from the convent to the police they set a bad example and "ne payaient pas," so the order from the convent to the police was "les mettre à l'Hôpital Général," where, as we have said, prostitutes and all the worst criminals were incarcerated. One of the young women transferred to the prison ranks lost her hearing through the damp of the dungeon in which she was placed. One little creature, four years old, but "très déraisonnable," was sent abroad ! Mademoiselle Le Coq lost her reason.

Mademoiselle des Fages, after much suffering, recanted, and was set at liberty. Immediately on her return home she threw herself out of her window and was killed. The "Dame de la Fremaye" was reported (May 7, 1686), after being four months in the convent under instruction as "having lost her reason." In the Registers of the Secretariat, 21st November, 1689, there is an order that "if she will not be converted she is to be banished." It was in labours of this description that Fénelon was engaged until 1689. They formed the chief stepping-stone to his promotion. It is *mutatis mutandis* as though Bishop Ken had risen to eminence by assiduous labours in the Court of High Commission, or Archbishop Leighton had been promoted for worrying Presbyterians.

During the period, however, that he was thus on promotion, there was a brief interlude. He was sent by the King as a missionary to the district of Aunes and Saintonge. Mr. Lear states that there was a good deal "of confusion and irritation" in these districts. This we must explain. It is stated that Fénelon stipulated that "the troops, together with all that survived of military terrorism, should be withdrawn before he entered upon what should be a work of peace and mercy." After a short stay he reported to Bossuet that the converts were getting on very slowly. Soon afterwards he returned to Paris. It will be well to place the exact truth fully before the public. It is quite true and little wonder that there was considerable "irritation." For more than four years before Fénelon's mission, as early as 1681, the district had been the scene of constant dragonnades. The result was a large number of conversions. Through the medium of the most horrible brutalities there were a thousand converts in six months in the diocese of Saintonge. But so zealous were these "missionaires bottés" that a large number of the best sailors in the kingdom emigrated. The King was alarmed at so serious a loss, and milder measures were enjoined. Still the dragonnades continued up to the very time when Fénelon set out on his mission. Very picturesque accounts of his interview with the King find place in his life. But were the troops withdrawn? Was there no violence during his mission? The pitiless accuracy of State records proves that after Fénelon was on his mission, and while he was there, troops were quartered in the houses of Huguenots who had fled to the woods "because they could not continue there during the severe winter." The houses of those who would not return were demolished, and an intimation was sent that there was no better way to persuade the Huguenots "que de bien maltraiter ceux de Barbesieux." Persecution was carried on simultaneously with persuasion in the districts where Fénelon laboured.

But how did he carry on his mission? In a letter addressed by

him, 7th February, 1686, to the Secretary of State, he urges the importance of increasing the guards at spots where emigration was lively. He adds further—it will be best to quote his own words —" Il me semble aussi que l'autorité du roi ne doit se relacher en rien." Again, he adds that " authority must be inflexible in keeping men's minds in order." He also dwells with satisfaction on a little visit which M. l'Intendant paid at Marennes, which worked wonders and made the people more tractable. Mr. Lear will not find these passages in Cardinal Bausset's life, although the letter in which they occur is there, and is quoted by the Cardinal professedly *in extenso*. In a later letter, dated March 8, Fénelon informs the secretary that " rigorous and ever watchful authority is necessary. No harm should be done to them, but there should always be a hand uplifted to do it if they resist." In another communication he suggests besides New Testaments, guards to hinder desertions, and rigorous penalties against deserters! We must refer our readers to M. Douen's book for the most crushing exposure we have ever read of a prevalent delusion which has misled Protestants as well as Romanists. The proofs rest on Fénelon's own statements suppressed by his eulogising biographers. His stay in this mission was very short and very fruitless. He sighed and pleaded with Bossuet to intercede for his return to Paris, from which he may have been altogether about six months absent. His short mission, which had been preceded by years of dragonnades, was followed up by a frightful massacre, ordered by the King (March 1, 1688), in which " women were not to be spared, in order to intimidate." Fourteen years after his mission, there were more than 60,000 heretics in the diocese of Saintonges. The Jesuit Quirbœuf, differing from Mr. Lear, explains that Fénelon's failure kept him from appearing at Court for two years; it also hindered his elevation to the Bishopric of Poitiers and as coadjutor to the Bishop of Rochelle. Four years elapsed before he was appointed preceptor to the Duc de Bourgogne. Six years after that he was made Archbishop of Cambrai, but two years afterwards he was banished from the Court, and was never restored to favour. His success as a courtier was as transient as it was brilliant.[1]

[1] Fénelon's promotion to Cambrai deserves some comment. In the opinion of French ecclesiastics, basking in or hoping for Court favour, sees distant from Paris were viewed as banishment. The Archbishopric of Bordeaux was refused by Bissy, Bishop of Toul; he was wise in his generation, and he afterwards became a Cardinal. Sees like Soissons, Chartres, or even Meaux, were much coveted, for the Court was still accessible. When Fénelon was made Archbishop, Harlay, the notorious Archbishop of Paris, who closed an impure life by a shameful death, was in a precarious state, Fénelon's friends were most anxious that he should succeed. His nomination to Cambrai, a " diocèse de campagne," was a thunderstroke (un coup de foudre) to them. Just after his consecration,

It is not without a purpose that we have dwelt at length upon this crucial instance of Fénélon. Of late years there has been a confused notion that although there is much in Romanism which it is difficult to justify, yet that it has produced instances of sanctity of a type very much more exalted than can be found in Reformed Churches. This is a most utter delusion. Books such as those of Mr. Lear tend largely to foster it, and do much mischief. The productions of Romish saints and other writers are carefully expurgated, and the most objectionable portions withdrawn from the too curious inspection of Protestants. Ignorant people are thus led to suppose that Romanism is what is submitted to them. The revival upon which we have been commenting was the best type of Romanism, but, for the reasons we have assigned, its influence was neither lasting nor extensive. Worst of all, by the outbursts of fanaticism which it encouraged, it alienated the Church still further from the nation, which identified clericalism with every species of barbarity and horror. The mistake was a deadly one, which left it to Voltaire and to his infidel crew the show of preaching charity and tolerance, a lesson never practically inculcated during or by the revival of the priestly life. We say the show, for we have not forgotten the horrible cry, however interpreted, "*Ecrasez l'infame!*" This was too faithfully acted upon in the horrors of the French Revolution, and has never been forgotten by mankind. Is it not, however, a horrible but most significant fact that, whether intentionally or accidentally, the fearful saying of the arch-infidel is but the echo of Fénelon's own[1] words in his last charge, "*Ecrasez les loups!*"—*i.e.*, the Huguenots and Jansenists. Probably both Voltaire and the Archbishop would have disclaimed any intent of physical violence, of murders and plunder; but both were taken at their word by those whom they hounded on. Mr. Lear refers to two "mandements" as among Fénelon's last public exercise of his Archiepiscopal office,

---

Harlay died and was succeeded by de Noaillesa, a thoroughly respectable man, hated by the Jesuits. His promotion was, however, quite as much due to Court intrigues as to merit. These events occurred in 1695; two years afterwards Fénelon was ordered by the King not to quit his diocese again. This order was never revoked. His appointment to Cambrai was the first step to his perpetual banishment. If the Duc de Bourgogne, Fénelon's old pupil, had survived the aged Louis XIV., Fénelon might, indeed, have been a power in the French Court.

[1] It is worth while contrasting with Fénelon's "*Ecrasez les loups*," as applied to those he deemed heretics, our Lord's words. He said, "Beware of ravening wolves," so St. Paul knowing that grievous wolves would come, told the elders of Ephesus to "Watch." The spirit of Rome finds its expression through the mouth of Fénelon; that of Christianity through our Lord and St. Paul.

but, with much discretion, he only alludes to and does not quote them. Our readers must decide whether any interpretation can be affixed to Fénelon's words which will not exculpate Voltaire; surely both sentiments were equally revolting and pernicious.

Upon an impartial review of French ecclesiastical history during the seventeenth century, the following conclusions must be come to:—First, that the state of religion among the clergy of the French Church was then one of the most appalling profligacy and ignorance. Again, that the vicious system in which the Roman Church glories, affixing merit to ostentatious asceticism and seclusion in religious communities, encouraging also as meritorious a spirit of the most intense bigotry, went very far to neutralise whatever value pious souls might otherwise have derived from the revival of priestly life. Sacerdotalism in a most evil form, aiming not only by fair, but also by foul, means at subjugating consciences, became, in proportion to its development, yet more fruitful in unnumbered evils. Upon internal dissensions, and the persecution of heretics, zeal was wasted which, rightly directed, might have enlightened the ignorance of the masses, conciliated love to the clergy, and raised the love of morality throughout the kingdom, with some prospect of the Church finding defenders in the hour of its great need. There is mournful truth in the saying of Voltaire, that "the quarrels of Jansenists and Molinists did more harm to the Christian religion (in France) than could have been done by four emperors like Julian one after another." It was in this way that the best energies of the revived priestly life were expended, with Bossuet and Fénelon as Achilles and Hector, the leaders and champions arrayed against each other. As unfortunate was the crusade against the Huguenots. The clergy, as a body, were wholly unable to cope with the Reformed in argument. The Duc de Noailles admits that when conferences were proposed in Languedoc between Catholic priests and Protestant ministers, none of the former could be found competent to maintain the cause of God. Despite the vauntings concerning Bossuet and the missions of Fénelon, Bourdaloue, and others, there would have been, without State interference, no conversions. Sir Walter Scott says that Louis XI. mentioned Quentin Durward's assistance slightly, as a sportsman of rank who, in boasting of the number of the birds which he has bagged, does not always dilate upon the presence and assistance of the gamekeepers—so the Church of Rome, in her successes against heresy, makes faint allusion to the help of the civil powers. But her faith is great, whenever she can command them, in the aid of what Napoleon terms "les gros bataillons." They were no small help to St. Francis de Sales when extirpating heresy in

Savoy; they were no despicable assistants to Fénelon, to Bossuet, and Bourdaloue. But there is a Nemesis in all this. In his "France before the Revolution," M. de Tocqueville remarks that "at that period nowhere but in France had irreligion become a general passion, fervid, intolerant, and oppressive." He labours hard to account for it, but fails signally. He has left the true elements out of his calculations. With halt foot punishment was then overtaking the evildoers. As Louis XVI. was more guiltless than his predecessors, so at the eleventh hour a more tolerant spirit had possessed the clergy; but had the persecuted Jansenists, the oppressed Huguenots, no memories? Revived or unrevived, the Church of France had made itself hated of the nation. De Tocqueville remarks that the Church of England, in spite of what he terms the defects of its constitution, and the abuses of every kind that swarmed within it, supported the shock of infidelity victoriously. The clergy combated manfully in their own cause. Precisely the reverse was the case in France. She became meek in the presence of her adversaries. "It seemed at one time that, provided she retained her wealth and rank, she was ready to renounce her faith."

What, then, is the moral for ourselves? There are many just now who seem disposed to pursuade the Church of England to sell her lamp for specious Roman gewgaws and fancied superior articles of Romish manufacture. It would be a sorry and an evil exchange. A higher tone and more increased spirituality, both among clergy and laity, are infinitely desirable. But we have no call to go to Rome for them. What is wanted is not a "revival of priestly life." It would be woe to England if that were resuscitated amongst us. The less the clergy are isolated from their fellow-citizens, the more they are united with them in all honourable social relations, the greater will be their strength when the hour of trial comes. Can use be made of Mr. Lear's writings? If they are perused with judgment and with spiritual understanding, if we read between the lines, it is possible to gather from them considerable warning. It is a terrible loss to the Church of Christ when a spiritual revival proves an utter failure. It is mournful to contemplate learning, talent, zeal, piety, diverted from profitable ends upon foolish and mischievous enterprises. It might make angels weep to see spirits such as he has delineated wasting their energies upon inhuman strife and cruel persecution. Those who are wise will ponder these things; they will seek sedulously to avoid the errors which frustrated what might have been the salvation of a great country. The present condition of that which professes to be the Church of Christ in Romish countries is plain evidence that

where the system of Rome is upheld, and where the spirit of Romanism prevails, hatred of religion is the attitude of the nations. Will any well-wisher to England seek to encourage these delusions amongst ourselves? No; without travelling to Rome we can find models of spiritual excellence, true saints in the annals of our Church. It will be our wisdom not to undervalue them, but to rejoice in following them even as in their day and generation they have followed and are following Christ.

GEORGE KNOX.

Reviews.

With the Armies of the Balkans, and at Gallipoli in 1877-78. By Lieut.-Colonel FIFE-COOKSON, late Military Attaché to Her Majesty's Embassy, Constantinople. Second Edition. Pp. 194. Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.

COLONEL COOKSON was appointed Military Attaché in May 1877, and soon after joined the head-quarters of the army of the Balkans. General Gourko had just commenced his raid, and the army of Suleiman Pasha was being rapidly transported from Montenegro by sea and rail. Confident of success, Suleiman's troops were in good spirits, healthy, and well-disciplined. While waiting for movement to the front, many of them plundered neighbouring Bulgarian villages, but their loot was taken from them and they were flogged. Abdul Kerim's plan, presumed to be one of pure defence in the Quadrilateral with concentrated forces, favoured the Russians, and in deference to public opinion he was recalled. In the meantime Osman Pasha had occupied Plevna, driving out Russian cavalry. On the 20th July he defeated with great slaughter a Russian attack. This crippled the movements of Gourko, who had passed the Balkans and wanted reinforcements. The Russians therefore turned all their available strength against Plevna. But Osman meanwhile had strongly entrenched it, and the attack of July 30th was a damaging failure.

Reouf Pasha, commanding against Gourko's advance, failed to bring up the bulk of his force, and an opportunity was lost. When Suleiman's army joined, Eski-Zara (before the war a town of 18,000 inhabitants) was taken and nearly destroyed. Soldiers engaged in plundering even the burning houses in Eski-Zara were punished; some were shot. Suleiman appears to have determined that Reouf's share of the battle should not be won. At all events Reouf was defeated in the wood of Choranlu. Had Reouf been victorious, he could have pursued the retreating Russo-Bulgarians towards the Hain Bogaz, while Suleiman could have marched at once to the Shipka Pass. Valuable days were lost. It is clear, however, that on the part of Reouf a want of military skill was shown.

Shocking stories were told by fugitives. "Wholesale massacres and outrages" were perpetrated by the Bulgarians. Accounts agreed that Cossacks looked on or incited the Bulgarians to the deeds, and were themselves conspicuous in outrages on Turkish women. On page 53 we read:—

The enormity of the crimes committed in this and other districts, made it difficult to credit them. But the proofs were undeniable. . . . . Owing to want of time, I was only able to visit a very small proportion even of such scenes of massacres as were near the halting place.

The following extract shows the opinion of the gallant author as to the invasion by Russia :—

The tract of country along the southern slopes of the Balkans yields a rich harvest, and is altogether one of the most fertile in soil and favoured by climate in the world—a very garden in Eden. This is the district in which every evil passion has been let loose, to the ruin and destruction of an industrious, peaceful and contented population. Here, before the war, a good feeling existed between the two races. The Bulgarians had their schools and churches just as the Mohammedans had, and possessed a great deal of indirect political power, owing to their greater wealth. Reform had not yet given them a direct voice in the Government. Still, had the choice rested with them, they would have undoubtedly preferred to await the inevitable effects of time and circumstances, rather than that a war, which must destroy or ruin so many of them, should have been undertaken on their behalf. Owing to their exemption from the conscription, their great industry, and other causes, the Bulgarians were rapidly gaining on the Mohammedans in numbers and wealth.

Colonel Fife-Cookson writes that the news of the defeat of the Russians at Plevna did not reach Yeni Zara till after a week.

I do not think the Turkish Government had at that time a true idea of the disorganisation of the Russians north of the Balkans, caused by this reverse, which, coupled with the long delay that must elapse before the arrival of reinforcements, and the chaos amongst the Russians south of the Balkans, created by the defeat at Eski Zara, formed for the Turks, perhaps, the greatest opportunity of the war.

The Turkish arrangements for obtaining information of the Russian movements by means of spies, newspapers, reconnaissance, &c., were throughout this war most defective. The Turks also suffered under the disadvantage of there being no correspondents or doctors with the Russian armies, to supply newspapers written in Turkish with information. Valuable intelligence was freely and impartially sent to the European papers about both armies, by the strangers accompanying them, and was thus made available to the Russian officers, who can nearly all read French, while only two or three of even the Turkish military pashas can do so.

The Russians were weak everywhere after these defeats, and Suleiman, co-operating with Mehemet Ali, should have marched against their flank, north of the Balkans, while he sent a detachment to make a demonstration against Shipka. But the Turks, probably, did not realise their own strength. Mehemet Ali Pasha, Commander-in-Chief in European Turkey, approved of the decision to march direct against Shipka, and he promised to assist, which promise he failed to perform. The Seraskeriate, or War Office, sent instructions direct, adding to the confusion, and jealousy between the generals often brought on disasters. Still, the march direct on Shipka ought not to have proved fatal to success; its effect might have been relieved by tactical skill.

Three weeks after the victory at Eski Zara, Suleiman arrived at Shipka. One week would have been ample time. The Russo-Bulgarians, having regained confidence, had constructed elaborate field-works for the defence of the Pass. A great opportunity was lost. Of the struggle at Shipka our author gives an animated account. During a week of continual fighting

the Turks lost, he thinks, 12,000 men, and the Russians 8000. The character of the struggle was embittered by the fact that the Mohammedans, from the first, gave no quarter to Bulgarians, whom they regarded as rebels. The loss of life in the fighting at Shipka, from first to last, must have been frightful. Suleiman Pasha's tactical blunder of hurling his battalions against intrenchments, instead of investing and starving the garrison, a mistake made by the Russians before Plevna, was, no doubt, very serious; and yet it was only by little that he failed to capture the position. The Russian defence was magnificent; but had the Turkish flanks been connected with the centre, by field telegraph, or signalling arrangements, the troops forming the latter might have been informed, on the critical day, that the coveted post had been abandoned, and "this would probably have decided the fate not only of the Shipka but of the whole campaign." Upon the arrival of Radetsky's column, Suleiman's position became very different. After a series of "mad rushes," came delays and disheartening failures. "A strong feeling of discontent gradually arose amongst the long-suffering and submissive Turkish soldiery." All hope of victory, in fact, passed away. On the 28th of September, Suleiman Pasha was summoned to succeed Mehemet Ali on the Lom. It was on the 20th of August he had arrived at Shipka. On the 12th of October our author paid a visit to the Turkish advanced positions, and three days later was recalled to Constantinople.

The story of the disasters on the Turkish side, after the fall of Plevna, is well told. But our space is exhausted. We can only add that the work is printed in clear type, and has several illustrations and maps.

A History of the Church of England, pre-Reformation Period. By T. P. Boultbee, LL.D., Principal of the London College of Divinity, St. John's Hall, Highbury, and late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. Pp. 460. Longmans, Green & Co.

THE Church of England is at once old and new. It has been Reformed, but its heritage has come down to it through more than a millennium. To trace the main lines of national Church life, ever leading on stedfastly towards the Divinely foreknown new birth at the Reformation, and at the same time to gather up, step by step, by the wayside, notes, personal, legal, or antiquarian, which might serve to illustrate the past or to account for the present, has been the object of Dr. Boultbee in preparing the work before us. He has allowed, as far as seemed possible in so limited an area, some writer of each age to speak his own words and breathe his own sentiments. In selecting, in condensing, and in reporting, Dr. Boultbee has kept consistently in view the history of national rather than ecclesiastical life; and thus he has brought before his readers no *disjecta membra* of past ages, but a collection of facts grouped into an organised body of history which possesses life and advances ever steadily onwards to the end. His desire has been not to set forth his individual opinions, though these are not dissembled, but to represent in lucid narrative how things came to be as they are in the Church of England.

The work bears out the statements of its Preface. Written from a sound standpoint, with considerable literary skill, with good judgment, and—to adapt Mr. Disraeli's phrase—"historical" calmness, sufficiently brief and sufficiently full, Dr. Boultbee's History deserves to be widely read. Works of this class, scholarly, critical, and yet not dry, giving the results of recent investigations in a form which may interest the general reader, are certainly not numerous.

In writing on the origin of Christianity in this island, Dr. Boultbee wisely avoids extremes. Certain writers have accepted legends. Others, as a recent *Quarterly Review* remarks, will hardly credit Roman Britain with a Church at all. Dr. Boultbee is neither credulous nor sceptical. "It was known," he says, "to Christian writers, soon after the year 200, that Christianity had penetrated into Britain." To say more than this would not be writing history:—

This impenetrable darkness can be strange only to those who have never asked themselves how much they really know of the history of the propagation of the Faith in the first and second centuries. Men wrote, suffered, and laboured for the truth, and were content to be forgotten. Who can tell the name of the first Christian missionary who entered the gates of the mighty Rome itself, and, looking up to the temple of the great Capitoline Jove, knew that the day must come, though centuries yet intervened, when the tutelary Roman idol must fall? Who can tell the history of the foundation of leading Churches of old, of Alexandria, of Carthage, of Spain, of Gaul? The grain of mustard seed had been cast into the earth, and its produce was springing up and spreading, but none knew what was to be the girth of its trunk, or the ample sweep of its branches; so none registered its progress, or noted the labours of those who tended it.

In the chapter headed "The Saints of the Anglo-Saxon Church," Dr. Boultbee remarks upon St. Aidan, St. Chad, St. Augustine of Canterbury, and St. Erkenwald, consecrated Bishop of London in 675 by Archbishop Theodore. St. Swithin, Bishop of Winchester 852–862, we read, has fared better than St. Erkenwald in the popular recollection. His legendary history is of the usual character of such compilations. William of Malmesbury, writing about fifty years after the Conquest, dwells with admiration on a story with which he illustrates this prelate's merciful disposition:—"Workmen were repairing a bridge on the east side of Winchester, and the Bishop had seated himself near them that he might urge on the loiterers. And there came along the bridge a woman bringing eggs for the market. The workmen, with the usual rudeness of such people, in sheer mischief broke every egg in her basket. In her miserable condition, the little ragged old woman was brought before the Bishop, who heard her complaint with pity. And not in vain, for he forthwith made the sign of the cross over the wreck, and every egg became whole again." If St. Swithin left behind him the traditions of a character in harmony with this legendary tale, he deserved not to be forgotten. To redress wrongs, and to care for the helpless, is a part well becoming the Christian statesman and Bishop. Though alas! the larger part of the evils wrought, whether by petulance or carelessness, is as much past remedy as the broken eggs; and there is not to be found a St. Swithin to make them whole again.

As a last request, we learn on the same authority, continues Dr. Boultbee, he pledged those who stood round his dying bed to lay his body outside the church, where his grave might be exposed to the feet of the passers-by and to the rains from heaven. So he died, and this "pearl of God lay in inglorious concealment about a hundred years." Then the saint changed his mind, and appeared in a vision requiring the removal of his remains. So they were enshrined at Winchester with great pomp. The 15th of July was kept as the anniversary of this "translation." The popular belief still connects that day with the copious rainfall which the dying Bishop had willed to fall on his humble grave. In his true history Swithin was an active statesman, the trusted servant of King Egbert, and the chief adviser of King Ethelwolf. Whether the skies wept or not, England had cause to mourn when he was removed, and homestead and shrine were scorched with the Danish fires. P. 94.

The chapter on the later history of the Anglo-Saxon Church has many points of interest. "The payment of tithe," we read, "was gradually established. It is referred to by Archbishops Theodore and Egbert, and appear to have been gradually changed from a voluntary payment into a customary one, and finally to have received legal confirmation." "Church lands were liable, like all others, to the dues for military service, repair of roads, and other public duties. Nor was there any exemption of the clergy from the civil law. The clerical immunity for which Becket died, and which Henry VIII. with so much difficulty destroyed, was unknown to the Saxon Church." Concerning parishes, Dr. Boultbee writes as follows:—

The very rapid organisation of parishes, and endowment of parish churches, has been thought to point to a more generally available source than that of private munificence. Blackstone's theory is that the parish boundary coincided with that of the ancient manor or manors. He would thus identify each parish with some lordship of early times. But it does not appear that the manors described in the Domesday Survey coincide, except occasionally, with the parishes. Hence another theory has to be discovered. Mr. Kemble identifies the English parish in general with the original communal divisions of the early Saxons, which are called Marks. These possessed complete social organisations and defined territorial limits. It is also believed that in heathen times they had their places of worship and local priests, with land for their support. The suggestion is, that on the adoption of Christianity these were transferred to the service of the Church. Hence by a natural and rapid process the parochial boundaries and the Church endowment would be at once constituted. If we understand that in addition to these not a few churches were founded by private liberality, and if we allow for various changes and modifications, we shall find the principal facts of early organization fairly accounted for.

The chapter on Wycliffe is well written, and full of interest. Lack of space, however, prevents us from even touching upon it. The learned author affirms, of course, that Wycliffe first gave the whole Bible to the people. Professor Lechler's exhaustive work, recently rendered in English, establishes this point.

The Classic Preachers of the English Church. With an Introduction by J. E. KEMPE, M.A., Rector of St. James's. Murray.

Classic Preachers. Second Series. Murray.

Masters in English Theology. With an Historical Preface by ALFRED BARRY, D.D. Murray.

Representative Nonconformists. By the Rev. ALFRED B. GROSART, LL.D. Hodder and Stoughton.

THE practice of delivering what might be termed biographical sermons, or lecture-discourses, in special seasons, is, probably, a growing one; and, if regulated by sober judgment and earnest Scriptural piety, it may prove, no doubt, beneficial. The Scripture taken as a text, however, ought not to be merely mentioned, and, after a few sentences, forgotten. In the season of Epiphany the present writer—such an allusion may be pardoned—is wont to deliver a series of missionary sermons; and one way of exciting a profitable interest in missionary work is to take some eminent missionary, whose life and labours seem practically to illustrate and enforce some special Scripture, and preach a biographical discourse.

The discourses in two of the volumes before us were delivered at St. James's Church; and the rector, Prebendary Kempe, writes:—"The aim was that in their effect upon the congregation they should be *sermons* in accordance with Hooker's description" (Eccl. Pol. v. xxii. 1). The Classic

Preachers are Donne, the Poet Preacher; South, the Rhetorician; Barrow, the Exhaustive Preacher; Beveridge, the Scriptural; Wilson, the Saintly; and Butler, the Ethical; and, in the second series, Bull, the Primitive; Horsley, the Scholarly; Sanderson, the Judicious; Tillotson, the Practical; Andrews, the Catholic; and Jeremy Taylor, the English Chrysostom. In thus *ticketing* Preachers there is, clearly, a danger. Nevertheless, these discourses, preached by distinguished divines, are, as a rule, suggestive and exceedingly interesting.

"The Masters in English Theology"—subjects of the King's College Lectures, and these are not sermons—are Hooker, Andrewes, Chillingworth, Whichcote, J. Taylor, and Pearson.

The Representative Nonconformists on whom Dr. Grosart lectures, with considerable ability are, J. Howe: Intellectual Sanctity; R. Baxter: Seraphic Fervour; S. Rutherford: Devout Affection; and Matthew Henry: Sanctified Common-Sense.

"*Faithful unto Death.*" *Memorials of the Life of John Gregg, D.D., Bishop of Cork, Cloyne, and Ross, and formerly Minister of Trinity Church, Dublin.* By his Son, ROBERT SAMUEL GREGG, D.D., Bishop of Cork. Pp. 304. Dublin: George Herbert.

THESE Memorials have been prepared with pious care, with literary skill, and good judgment; they will be studied with pleasure and profit by all devout and unprejudiced readers. For those Churchmen, whether in the Church of England, or in sister and daughter churches, who, like ourselves, are keenly interested in the Church of Ireland, its history and progress during recent years, this tribute to a most devoted and distinguished Irish Churchman will have an especial value.

John Gregg was born in 1798. He entered Trinity College in 1819; and at once he formed a friendship with Mr. Singer, afterwards Regius Professor of Divinity, which continued unbroken until the death of Dr. Singer, then Bishop of Meath, in 1866. In 1824, Mr. Gregg went in for his degree and for the Classical Gold Medal, but was beaten by John McCaul, afterwards Chancellor of the University of Toronto. He was second, and obtained his Degree on very distinguished answering. Concerning his early University years, his son, Bishop Gregg, writes as follows:—

> These were years of hard work and real progress—work so hard that at one time he was supposed to be dangerously ill; but his constitution was good, his mode of living simple and regular; he regained his usual health, and was still foremost among his fellows in every manly exercise. In contests of leaping and stone-throwing he was ready to challenge all comers. The dyke, which at that time was open, across the College Park, faced with stone as it was, was a trouble to many, but to leap across and back again was for him an easy thing. Twenty-one feet three inches over water was his measured jump. Dr. M'Ilwaine, of Belfast, told me that, having entered College before my father left it, he remembers taking a walk one day to see a ploughing match in the neighbourhood of Dublin; when he came up he saw the farmers and others pointing out foot-marks in the soft ground. He asked whose marks they were, and they pointed to the retreating figures of two young men, whom he at once recognised as John Gregg and Nicholas Armstrong. Mr. Armstrong was one of his greatest friends, was ordained the same day, and entered upon work in a curacy close to him, a man of great power and of original eloquence, but, unhappily, after some years, he became a follower of Mr. Irving. His great powers were lost to the Church, although he lived respected by those with whom he thought well to worship.

The newspapers recently announced the death of the Rev. Nicholas Armstrong, which took place at Albury Heath, and which is said to mark the last stages of a crisis in the creed of the "Catholic Apostolic Church," popularly known as "Irvingites."

We heartily recommend the volume before us, which, it may be mentioned, is printed in large clear type.

A Popular Commentary on the New Testament. By English and American Scholars of various Evangelical Denominations. With Illustrations and Maps, edited by PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., L.L.D., Baldwin Professor of Sacred Literature in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. Vol. I. Pp. 500. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1879.

THIS Commentary aims to present, in an evangelical, catholic spirit, and in popular form, the best results of the latest Biblical scholarship for the instruction of the English reader of the Word of God. It embraces the Authorised Version, marginal emendations, brief introductions and explanatory notes on all difficult passages, together with maps and illustrations of Bible lands and Bible scenes derived from photographs and apt to facilitate the understanding of the text.

The work, writes Dr. Schaff, "has an international as well as an interdenominational character. It is the joint product of well-known British and American scholars who have made the Bible their life-study." The plan of the work, continues the learned editor, was conceived some thirty years ago, but indefinitely postponed, when he undertook the English translation and adaptation of the *Bibelwork* of Dr. Lange, now nearly finished, in twenty-four volumes.

From the English edition of Dr. Lange's "Bible-work," also published, as our readers are aware, by Messrs. Clark, this new Commentary differs both in plan and aim. "The Popular Commentary" is purely explanatory, and is intended for laymen. The new Testament will be completed, we read, in four volumes. When the second volume comes before us we shall notice it, we hope, at some length. Meantime, we heartily recommend the present portion of what promises to be a really valuable work. The notes are terse, fresh, suggestive, and in tone and temper all that a devout reader could desire. The maps and illustrations are of a high order. The Introduction, and the comments on Matthew, Mark, and Luke, have been written by Professor Schaff, and Professor Riddle.

The Later Evangelical Fathers. By M. SEELEY. Seeley, Jackson, & Halliday. Pp. 356.

AS to the term Evangelical, the author of this most interesting collection of biographical sketches observes that "its origin as a name given to the leaders of the revival in the eighteenth century is uncertain." They did not, as they were charged with doing, arrogate "to themselves the exclusive title of Evangelical;" for names, generally speaking, are given or inherited, not self-assumed; but when they are noble or worthy, they are borne with quiet satisfaction, and a desire to do them honour. So is it with this word "Evangelical."

John Thornton, 1720–1790; John Newton, 1725–1807; the Poet Cowper, 1731–1800; Richard Cecil, 1748–1810; Thomas Scott, the Commentator, 1747–1821; William Wilberforce, 1759–1833; Charles Simeon, 1759–1836;

Henry Martyn, 1781–1812; Josiah Pratt, 1768–1844; are "the later Evangelical Fathers," the story of whose lives is here given with a force and freshness of style, and a complete sympathy with their principles and their work, which cannot fail to awaken and sustain the reader's interest.

In the course of an introductory chapter devoted to a retrospective view of England in the eighteenth century, specially with regard to religion, it is remarked that the commencement of this period was in this respect "the worst in our modern history." Archbishop Secker declared "that an open disregard for religion had become the distinguishing feature of the age," while Bishop Butler adds his testimony that "it had come, he knew not how, to be taken for granted by many that Christianity had been at length discovered to be fictitious, and that nothing remained but to set it up as a principal subject of mirth and ridicule." Too often the London churches were all but empty; "in some country parishes where there was a good squire things might be better, but a good conscientious pastor in town or country in the Church of England or out of it was in those days a great rarity." Then, in the midst of prevailing ungodliness, arose and wrought with zeal and energy the "early Evangelical Fathers," Grimshaw, Venn, Fletcher, Berridge, and others.

After glancing at the lives and labours of these "early Fathers" of the last century, the author introduces us to the later ones, commencing with John Thornton, "known as the richest merchant in England," and better still, as one who, in no common degree, "honoured the Lord with his substance."

Miscellanies, Literary and Religious. By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln. 3 vols. Rivingtons.

FOR the highly esteemed Bishop, a collection of whose writings lies before us, we have a sincere and great regard. On certain points, doctrinal as well as ecclesiastical, we cannot agree with him; but we always listen to his remarks with respect. As a Cathedral Dignitary, and as a Bishop, Dr. Christopher Wordsworth has had the courage of his convictions. His courtesy, however, and his candour, have been not less conspicuous than his courage. Hence it is that among loyal Churchmen of every class his name is held in honour. Many passages in these "Miscellanies" we have read with pleasure. Here and there, it is true, occurs a statement concerning the Sacraments, or an expression of opinion in regard to the Church of Rome and the Greek Church, to which an Evangelical, Protestant, Churchmanship, as we think, must take exception. That these writings are Protestant, however, in a certain sense, is perfectly true, for Bishop Wordsworth, as is well known, is in unison with great High Churchmen of other days with regard to Rome.

In the first volume appear Notes in France (1844) and in Italy (1862); chapters on Pompeian Inscriptions (1832), the Old Catholics, and the Vatican Council. In answer to the query, *Is the Babylon of the Apocalypse of St. John the Church of Rome?* the Bishop writes with clearness, concluding thus:—

Heathen Rome, doing the work of heathenism, in persecuting this Church, was *no* Mystery. But a Christian Church, calling herself the Mother of Christendom, and yet drunken with the blood of the saints—this *is* a Mystery. . . . . The golden chalice in her hand, her scarlet attire, her pearls and jewels, were seen glittering in the Sun. Kings and nations were displayed prostrate at her feet, and drinking her cup. Saints were slain by her sword, and she

excelled over them. And now the prophecy became clear—clear as noon-day; and we tremble at the sight, while we read the inscription, emblazoned in large letters, "MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT," written by the hand of St. John, guided by the Holy Spirit of God, on the forehead of THE CHURCH OF ROME.

The prophecies contained in Rev. xiii.—xix., therefore, according to Bishop Wordsworth, have been partly accomplished, and are in course of complete accomplishment, in the Romish Church.

In vol. iii. appear papers on Religion and Science, the Mission of Horace as a co-worker with Augustus, the Condition of the Continental Clergy, Bishop Sanderson in connection with Conscience and Law, Diocesan Synods, and other interesting subjects. On every page, almost, appears an apt quotation; and whether the reader agree or disagree with the good Bishop's arguments, he is sure, at all events, to admire his suavity and scholarship, while with devout readers of every School, the profound reverence for Holy Scripture, a chief characteristic of the Bishop's writings, will be gratefully acknowledged. The papers on Mohammedanism—as, *e.g.* argument on behalf of the application of Rev. ix. to this subject—will have, for students of Prophecy, an especial interest at the present moment. We read:—

> The inveterate internal corruption of the whole Turkish Empire and the utter hopelessness of its recovery, seem to show that the prophecy of the Apocalypse will be fulfilled at no distant time, and that by a process of intestine decay, disorganisation, and dissolution, the power of Mohammedanism will *pass away*.
>
> The decline of the Mohammedan Power will, it is probable, be coincident in time with a great extension of Christianity, and will conduce to it.

On the condition of the Roman Catholic Clergy of France, Dr. Wordsworth quotes from *Où allons-nous?* by the Bishop of Orleans (in 1876), *La Question Religieuse*, by M. Eugène Reveillaud, and from *Le grand Péril de l'Eglise de France*. In the last-named publication, the Abbé Bougaud, a year ago, stated that not less than 2568 parishes in France are now without parish priests, so that their populations are in danger of lapsing into heathenism. In an essay reprinted from the *Courrier de Lyon*, September, 1878, the truth of the Abbé's alarming pictures is admitted; but the Essayist affirms that the condition of the French Church is due in a great measure to itself. If it is to exercise a moral and religious influence over the nation the Church must reform itself, and, in particular, the system of clerical education must be greatly altered. Of the unwholesome system of education in France, Charles Kingsley, if we remember right, in one of his letters, several years ago, made some pungent remarks, contrasting it with our English system; and, without question, the results of Jesuitical or Ultramontane direction, even in regard to the laity, are most deplorable. Bishop Wordsworth's quotations from the Abbé Bougaud's book, obviously, from lack of space, are of the briefest. We add a few striking sentences, quoted recently in an ultra-Church contemporary, describing the life of a French priest in the country as things go at present. We give the extract simply because it bears upon one question just now debated amongst us, viz., that of Sunday "recreations." M. Bougaud (*Le Grand Péril de l'Eglise de France au XIX^e^ Siècle*) writes:—

> I one day asked a young priest how he got on in his little parish. "During the week," said he, "fairly. But the Sunday, it is frightful. I go to celebrate mass; I find there some thirty women and two or three men. What can I say to them? I am more in the mood to weep than to speak. At vespers, nobody.

All the evening I shut myself up in my parsonage; but I cannot contrive to shut up and guard myself in such wise as not to hear the song of men who are brutalising themselves in the public-house, and the fiddle and the dancers, which are carrying off the women and the girls. It is heart-breaking.

And this quasi-heathenism prevails in a country where "Puritanism" has no power.

At the close of vol. III. appears a letter to the Oxford University Commissioners (Jan. 1879), from the Bishop of Lincoln, as Visitor of two Colleges, Brasenose and Lincoln, concerning the Statutes to be made. It is a weighty letter, and the religious character of the Colleges will, we trust, be maintained.

Short Notices.

Is Life worth Living? By W. H. Mallock, Author of the "New Republic," &c. Pp. 245. Chatto & Windus.

This is an able argumentative work; it shows acuteness, logical power, and literary skill. To the Positivists—not only the followers of Comte, but to members of "the scientific school," such as Professor Huxley—it offers questions which they cannot answer. The quotations from George Eliot's writings are melancholy in the extreme. "The Positivists think," writes Mr. Mallock, "that they had but to kill God and His inheritance shall be ours. They strike out accordingly the Theistic beliefs in question, and then turn instantly to life. They sort its resources, count its treasures, and then say, 'Aim at this, and this, and this. See how beautiful is holiness, how rapt is pleasure; surely these are worth seeking for their own sakes, without any reward or punishment looming in the future.'" In the concluding part of the work, however, the author places before doubters an Infallible Pope or Church, instead of the Infallible Word of God with the light of the Holy Spirit.

The Best Wish, and other Sunday Readings for the Home. By the Rev. Charles Bullock, B.D. Pp. 250. "Hand and Heart" Publishing Office.

Eighteen "Readings;" sound and practical.

Zechariah and his Prophecies, considered in relation to Modern Criticism. With a Critical and Grammatical Commentary and New Translation. By C. H. H. Wright, B.D., Incumbent of St. Mary's, Belfast. Second edition. Hodder & Stoughton.

This is a learned and ably-written commentary on an important portion of Holy Scripture. Mr. Wright, Bampton Lecturer last year, has shown considerable scholarship in his previous writings; and the present work will add to his well-earned reputation. We do not endorse every expression; but regarding the work as a whole it seems to us a truly valuable addition to theological libraries. Lack of space prevents us from noticing it at length.

The Story of the Cheh-Kiang Mission of the C.M.S. By the Rev. Arthur E. Moule, B.D. Second edition, with illustrations. Pp. 170. Seeley's; and Church Missionary House.

A valuable book for parish missionary libraries; earnest, cheerful, devout, and—what even a reader prejudiced against Missions might add—sensible.

The Home Life of the Prince Consort. By the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D. With portraits and illustrations. "Hand and Heart" Publishing Offices.

In a prefatory note to this pleasing volume, Mr. Bullock observes that his desire has been "to illustrate and commend the spirit and character of our national Christian loyalty." He has done his work, we think, remarkably well. The extracts are happily chosen, and the thread connecting the whole is thoroughly good. A more tastefully got up book, a better book of the kind in every way, is seldom seen.

A Contribution to the Cause of Christian Unity. By SIMEON WILBERFORCE O'NEILL, M.A. Pp. 258. Hayes.

Mr. O'Neill is one of "The Cowley Fathers," and his book contains "the thoughts of an Indian missionary on the controversies of the day." One chapter, *e.g.*, advocates Asceticism in missionary work. Here and there we have noticed questions and statements which, we confess, surprised us greatly. Mr. O'Neill may take it for granted that all "Evangelical and orthodox Protestant" bodies hold firmly the scriptural doctrine of the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ. For English readers it is unnecessary to quote the *Indian Evangelical Review*.

Steps through the Stream. By MARGARET STEWART SIMPSON. Pp. 112. James Nisbet & Co.

An attractive little book, arranged for daily reading during a month. A Scripture locality, or an emphatic phrase, serves in each case as a starting point, from which the author strives to lead her readers, by means of sweet and persuasive exhortations, mingled with anecdotes and illustrations, into the way of peace, or to a closer following after those things which accompany salvation. The introduction is, we observe, written by the author of "The Way Home," an affecting narrative of crushing bereavement, which may be remembered by some of our readers. Christmas gifts are of various kinds, and this thoughtful little volume may, with advantage, have a place among those of the graver sort, bestowed with other thoughts than that of amusing a leisure half-hour.

Northcote Memories. A Book for Watch and Ward. By the Author of "Copsley Annals," "I must keep the Chimes going," &c. Pp. 280. Seely, Jackson, & Halliday.

Better stories can hardly be seen—simple, affectionate, thoroughly real. Primarily intended for the Sick Watch and the Hospital Ward, this book is very suitable for the Mothers' Meeting and the Parish Lending Library. Clear, large type.

Musings in Verse on the Collects. By the Lady LAURA HAMPTON. With an Introduction by the Right Hon. Lord Selborne. Pp. 137. W. Kent & Co.

Evidently a labour of love. Tender and thoughtful, deeply reverent.

Family Readings on the Gospel according to St. John. Short Consecutive Portions, comprising the whole Gospel, with a simple Exposition for daily use in Christian Households. By the Rev. FRANCIS BOURDILLON, M.A. Pp. 340. Religious Tract Society.

Mr. Bourdillon's writings are happily well known. The present book, like his "Readings on St. Matthew," is exceedingly good. We warmly recommend it. Few men have the same gift of clear, crisp, affectionate explanation. Really practical.

The Gospel according to St. Mark. With Notes and Introduction by the Rev. G. F. MACLEAR, D.D., Head Master of King's College School. London: Cambridge Warehouse, 17, Paternoster Row.

This is a part of a valuable series, "The Cambridge Bible for Schools," of which the general editor is Dr. J. Perowne, Dean of Peterborough. We hope shortly to comment on several volumes of this series. Meanwhile we gladly recommend the volume before us, an admirable little manual for school use. Dr. Maclear's notes are short, suggestive, and scholarly. In his remarks on xvi. 9-20, might well have been inserted a reference to Dean Burgon's masterly work.

The Three Witnesses: Scepticism Met by Fact; in Fresh Evidences of the Truth of Christianity. By STEPHEN JENNER, M.A. Pp. 235. Longmans, Green, and Co. 1879.

The evidence from "Undesigned Coincidences," or the surface facts of one set of documents, compared with the surface facts of another, is undoubtedly of great value as proof of the genuineness of the respective writings, and of the truth at the foundation of them. But the evidence that *underlies* written records, and that is of their very *texture*, being more intrinsic, and coming less within the possibility of fabrication, is, one may argue, of even greater value. Such is the kind of evidence set forth in the ably-written book before us, evidence which the author thinks has been hitherto overlooked, brought out chiefly as it is from Scriptures which have not been examined with a view to Christian Evidence. His "Three Witnesses" are Peter, James, and John; and in examining their writings the Epistles are compared with the Gospels and the Acts. Mr. Jenner shows scholarship and sound judgment; his argument, though full of details, is interesting all through, clear, and cogent. In the second part of the work, "Special Forms of Evidence," we are particularly pleased with the chapter on tenses. In 1 John i. 1, *e.g.*, he shows the difference between the perfects and the aorists, unhappily hidden from the English reader. In chapter i. 10 the use of the perfect tense lies against the doctrine of so-called "perfection," thus, "if we say we *have not sinned and do not sin.*" (And here Mr. Jenner aptly quotes ἀφήκαμεν, Matt. vi. 12, "we *have forgiven and do forgive.*") In chapter ii. 1, the perfect is changed to the aorist, to intimate that the sin then spoken of must be a *single act* and not a *habit* of sin, and it might be more correctly rendered, "If any man sin a *sin.*"

Coming Events and Present Duties. Miscellaneous Sermons on Prophetical Subjects. By the Rev. J. C. RYLE, M.A. Second edition, enlarged. Pp. 226. W. Hunt & Co.

A new and enlarged edition of Mr. Ryle's book on prophecy needs but few words of commendation in these columns. The title was happily chosen; and the work—which is not always the case—well answers to it. In the chapter on Idolatry occurs this sentence: "Romanism in perfection is a gigantic system of Mary-worship, saint-worship, image-worship, relic-worship, and priest-worship."

Biblical Things not Generally Known. A Collection of Facts, Notes, and Information concerning much that is rare, quaint, curious, obscure, and little known in relation to Biblical Subjects. Second series. Pp. 380. Elliot Stock.

This is an interesting work, evidently prepared with diligent care, and it will be found of real use, we think, by several classes of Bible students. No opinions are expressed in it. The numbers of the paragraphs are continued from "the first series," and the indices cover both volumes.

La Vérité Chrétienne et le Doute Moderne. Conférences Données à Paris pendant l'Exposition Universelle, 1878, par la Société de Londres pour la Défense du Christianisme. Avec une préface [par EDMOND DE PRESSENSÉ. Pp. 320. London: Christian Evidence Society, 13, Buckingham-street, Strand, W.C. Paris, G. Fischbacher, 33, Rue de Seine.

The contents of this interesting book are:—*La Méthode Expérimentale et le Christianisme*: par E. DOUMERGUE, Pasteur Auxiliare de l'Église réformée de Paris. *La Terre et le Récit Biblique de la Création*: par B. POZZY, Pasteur, Membre de la Société d'Anthropologie de Paris. *La Royauté de l'Homme*: par EDMOND DE PRESSENSÉ, D.D., Paris. *La Destination de l'Homme*: par F. GODET, D.D., Professeur de la Faculté de Théologie de l'Eglise Neuchateloise indépendante de l'état. *Les vraies Conditions du Bonheur*: par EDOUARD MONOD, Pasteur suffragant de l'Eglise réformée de Marseille. *Les Livres du Nouveau Testament*: par JEAN MONOD, Professeur de la Faculté de Théologie de Montauban. *Le Miracle et les Lois de la Nature*: par CHARLES BOIS, Doyen de la Faculté de Théologie Protestante de Montauban. *La Divine Autorité de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ*: par FRANK COULIN, D.D., Pasteur, Genthod près Genève. In a characteristic preface, Dr. de Pressensé remarks:—"Ce n'est pas en courbant l'homme devant une autorité extérieure quelconque qu'on l'amène à la foi salutaire, c'est en le conduisant au pied du Crucifié et en lui disant: Regarde et adore! Sans doute il faut bien lui répéter en lui offrant le livre divin, *Tolle et lege*, mais à condition d'ajouter, *Viens et vois*, et de lui montrer avant tout la personne du Christ dans le livre du Christ."

Thorough. An Attempt to show the Value of Thoroughness on several departments of Christian Life and Practice. By the Rev. Sir EMILIUS BAYLEY, Bart., B.D., Vicar of St. John's, Paddington. Pp. 386. Second edition revised and corrected. Hatchards.

We are by no means surprised to see a second edition of this valuable work so soon called for. In its tone and temper, as well as in its treatment of the subject, it deserves unstinted praise. "Personal Religion in relation to the Church," and "the Churches," and in relation to Culture, and "Typical Conversions," are excellent chapters, but every chapter is practical and sound. We heartily recommend the book as of real value at a time when there is much religious excitement with—it must be feared—much mere surface-work. If we must make a criticism, in view of a third edition, we should venture to suggest that on page 46, in showing the difference between regeneration and conversion, a sentence or two might be added for the sake of many readers, concerning στραφῆτε, Matt. xviii. 3, and the literal translation of ἐπιστρέφω in such passages as Acts iii. 19, Matt. xiii. 15 (cf. Isai. vi. 10: "*convert.*") Conversion is spoken of in Holy Scripture as the work of man, and it is commanded by God: not so with Regeneration.

Songs of Heaven and Home. Written in a foreign land. By ARTHUR E. MOULE, B.D., Minister of the Church Missionary Society at Ningpo and Hangchow. Pp. 100. Seeley's.

A tiny, tasteful volume; verses tender, and full of trust.

The Quiver. Vol. XIV. Illustrated. Cassell, Petter, & Galpin.

We have always had a kindly feeling for the *Quiver*; it is an evangelical magazine, interesting and of good tone. The attractive volume before us is quite up to the usual standard. A capital book for parish libraries.

Beneath the Cross. Counsels, Meditations, and Prayers for Communicants. By the Rev. GEORGE EVERARD, M.A., Vicar of St. Mark's, Wolverhampton. Pp. 140. Sixth Edition. W. Hunt & Co.

That this clearly written book was needed, is proved by the fact that it has in a short time reached a sixth edition. Like all the esteemed author's writings, it is thoroughly scriptural, with a decidedly Protestant tone. At a time when erroneous teaching concerning the Lord's Supper is widely circulated, it is incumbent upon Evangelical churchmen to recommend books which are both sound and practical. We are pleased to see that another of Mr. Everard's valuable little books, "The Holy Table," has reached a third edition.

The World of Prayer. By Dr. D. G. MONRAD, Bishop of Lolland and Falster, Denmark. Translated from the fourth German edition. Pp. 236. T. and T. Clark.

It is intimated in the German preface to this interesting treatise upon prayer that Dr. Monrad is one of the most active of the Danish bishops. St. Paul's τῇ προσευχῇ προσκαρτερεῖτε was joined, we know, with his περισσεύοντες ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ τοῦ Κυρίου πάντοτε. It is pleasing to notice that Bishop Monrad's call to prayer has been so welcome in Germany.

War and Peace. A Tale of the Retreat from Cabul. By A. L. O. E. Pp. 230. T. Nelson and Son.

A new edition of the well-told story of the Retreat of 1841 will be found especially interesting at the present time. The value of the A. L. O. E. series is widely known. Excellent books.

Every Boy's Annual. Every Girl's Annual. Routledge.

Two most attractive volumes, well illustrated and beautifully bound. Happy will be the boys and girls who are fortunate enough to get them. Stories and interesting Articles, all good and wholesome, so far as we have examined, are of a high class. Delightful Christmas gift-books.

Little Wide Awake. An Illustrated Magazine for Good Children. George Routledge and Sons.

"Little Miss Patty," whose charming picture appears as a frontispiece to this Annual, would always claim, no doubt, to be one of the "good children" for whom the volume is prepared. It is, perhaps, the prettiest, most tasteful book of the kind. The story by Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen, we must confess we have not read; but a juvenile critic praises it most warmly; and the right hon. gentleman's fairy stories are known to be good.

Was I Right? Mrs. O. F. WALTON. Religious Tract Society.

A pleasing story, giving with great attractiveness the experiences of a young lady who went out as a "companion." Thoroughly religious in the best sense. We can heartily commend it.

From Messrs. Nelson and Sons we have received three capital gift-books:—A tale for boys, by Mr. W. H. G. Kingston, entitled *In New Granada*; a story for elder readers, *True to his Colours*, by the Rev. T. P. Wilson, M.A., Vicar of Pavenham; and *In the Woods*, or *Chats with Young Folks about Birds and Wild Flowers*, a charming volume beautifully illustrated and got up in Messrs. Nelson's well-known style.

Home Workers for Foreign Missions, by Miss Whateley (R.T.S.), is really interesting, and withal a very practical book. The anecdotes—it is stated—are all from life, and they show how stingy are many professed supporters

of missionary work. From the Tract Society we have also received *Bible Readings from the Gospels*, suitable for Mothers' Meetings; and *The Epistle to Philemon*, a carefully written work, by the Rev. A. H. Drysdale.

We have received from the Advertising Art Agency copies of two of their very beautiful groups of flowers with texts, one of these is called *The Lily Group* and the other *The Rose Group*—both are exceedingly artistic, and will well bear close inspection as to workmanship. They are excellently adapted for decoration of schoolrooms or mission-halls, while with the addition of a frame (which they are honestly worthy of) a drawing-room would not lose caste by their presence. The low price charged for them places them within every one's reach.

From the Oxford University Press Warehouse (7, Paternoster Row) we have received two new editions of *The Oxford Bible for Teachers*. The larger one, printed with the border lines and headings of chapters in red, is a really beautiful book: as to workmanship throughout, style, and finish, it deserves the highest praise. With the smaller copy, a thin edition for pocket use, printed on paper marvellously good considering its extreme thinness, we are much pleased. The value of this Teachers' Bible *fac-simile* series is well known. Notes, Summaries, Concordance, Maps, Dictionary of Proper Names; a treasure-house, trustworthy.

From the R. T. S. we have received several packets of charming cards, coloured, large and small. *Heart Melody*, *Morning Joy*, *Evening Blessing*, are really splendid; the first-named is particularly pleasing and exquisitely finished. The R. T. S. has this year surpassed itself. *Birds and Blossoms*, *Precious Promises*, with New Year and Christmas Cards, in small packets, are also excellent. The Pocket Books, Almanacks, and Reward Cards, are, as usual, both cheap and good.

A pamphlet entitled *Consumption*, or "*Practical Hints*" *on Lung Diseases*, by H. S. Purdon, M.D. (J. Hutchinson: Belfast), is well worth reading. Pulmonary consumption, says Dr. Purdon, occasions fifteen per cent. of the mortality of Great Britain.

From Mr. W. Wells Gardner (2, Paternoster Buildings) we have received the Annual of *Sunday*, an interesting magazine for little folks. The volume is well illustrated and cheap; a capital gift-book, and a very desirable addition to parish lending libraries.

We have received from the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge several of their new publications, too late—we regret—to notice them in the present number as fully as they deserve. *Narcissus*, a tale of the early Christian times, by the Rev. W. Boyd Carpenter, carefully written, is both interesting, and instructive. Another volume of the new S.P.C.K. "Home Library," is *The Military Religious Orders of the Middle Ages*. Of *The Fathers for English Readers*, four volumes have been published; Gregory the Great, St. Ambrose, the venerable Bede, and St. Basil; an attractive series, neatly got up and cheap. With those passages which we have been able to read, we are much pleased. *The Child's Gospel History*, and *The Child's Acts of the Apostles*, are simple, pleasing commentaries for little folks. In some respects, indeed, they surpass all other books of a similar sort, sound in doctrine, with which we are acquainted. Some excellent little books on Health have recently been published by the S.P.C.K. The latest, *The Habitation in regard to Health*, is an admirable manual; short, and thoroughly practical. We heartily recommend it.

ART. VIII.—THE MONTH.

Those who believed that the Prime Minister would make some startling announcement at the Lord Mayor's banquet were greatly disappointed. The speech, however, was a success, equal in point and polish to the great statesman's happiest efforts. As to Afghanistan and the Turkish Question, it was discreetly silent. The aspect of public affairs, said the noble Earl, is much more satisfactory, and the revival of trade, which is unmistakable, is likely to prove of a permanent character. *Imperium et Libertas* is a "programme" from which Lord Beaconsfield's Ministry "will not shrink."

The English fleet has remained at Malta, and the Sultan will probably yield to diplomatic pressure in regard to the promised reforms both in Europe and in Asia Minor. Baker Pasha has been appointed Inspector-General of Turkish Reforms in Asia Minor. After the visit of the Czarewitch to the Courts of Vienna and Berlin the Triple Alliance, it is supposed, has been renewed between the Sovereigns if not between the Chancellors. The Treaty of Berlin will be upheld.

At Birmingham, the leading Liberal, or Radical, educationalists, have been constrained, happily, to change their position with regard to Bible reading in Board schools. It was left to "the Conservative party," as the *Guardian* remarks with regret, "to fight the battle of Holy Scripture:—

> Is it to go forth to the people of this country that Liberalism chooses to identify itself not only with opposition to the Church, but also with repudiation, except under pressure, of the idea of religious education? The leaders of the Liberal party must look to this. If they persist in purchasing, at any cost, the support of the extreme Left—made up of the political Nonconformists and the Secularist party, who use them as tools—they can hardly be surprised if those who care above all other things for the causes which these men assail, are tempted half-unwillingly to rally round the banner of Conservatism; and they will find too late that they have raised against themselves an overwhelming power."

At the Norwich Diocesan Conference the Bishop called attention to a really practical question—viz., the union of small parishes:—

> Small cures with small incomes are evils in more ways than one. It is an evil to have an impoverished clergy, and it is an evil for a clergyman not to have enough to occupy his time. Further, there is great waste of strength which could be utilised elsewhere, particularly in London, where with four times the population there is only half the number of benefices which exist in the diocese of Norwich.

The meetings called by Archdeacon Denison in support of "The Prayer Book as it is," were, at least, enthusiastic. The Earl of Devon, Mr. Reginald Wilberforce, Canon Woodard, and other speakers, protested against any legislation upon advice of Convocation as now constituted.

The Lower House of Canterbury, it is clear, has few friends, and the Ornaments Rubric compromise is dead and buried. The draft Bill, too, has met with a cold welcome. At the Chichester Diocesan Conference the speaking was all on one side; the Archdeacons alone had a good word to say for it. At Norwich, Archdeacon Groome, proposing to refer it to a committee, doubted the necessity for alteration in the rubrics, and thought the Bill proceeded from a desire on the part of Convocation to usurp the rights of Parliament. Canon Ryle proposed an amendment condemnatory of the Bill; but after an animated discussion, during which several speakers, both lay and clerical, expressed a decided want of confidence in Convocation, which they considered must be greatly reformed before its decisions would be accepted by the Church, the amendment was lost by 100 votes to 56. In Lichfield, and other dioceses, the Bill has been, practically, condemned.

The condition of things in South Africa and in Ceylon, ecclesiastically speaking, is deplorable. The Bishop of Colombo has refused licences to the Missionaries recently sent out to Ceylon by the Church Missionary Society. He declared that if any one attended "schismatic" services he or she would be cut off from all the rites of the Church—that is to say, that their children and families would be denied the sacraments, marriage, burial, and every other Christian rite.

The Report on Patronage will satisfy, probably, a large portion of even enthusiastic advocates of Church Reform.

Mr. Mackonochie has neglected the orders of the Court of Arches for years, and, possibly, he will now neither submit to the Law nor secede from the Church. His case, at all events, has proceeded a step further. The intervention of the Queen's Bench, evidently irregular, proved a failure, and Lord Penzance, as the Dean of Arches, has issued the order which for seventeen months lay dormant. The Incumbent of St. Albans is suspended *ab officio et a beneficio* for three years. It is stated (Nov. 20) that at a meeting of the Council of the English Church Union, Mr. Mackonochie himself being present, a "policy of resistance" was agreed on.

The Archbishop of Canterbury has received at Lambeth Palace a deputation of fifty delegates from Trades Unions. In reply to their complaint concerning attacks upon Unions in certain Church School Books, his Grace stated that the "offensive" writings would be withdrawn from circulation.