---

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

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

THE

# CHURCHMAN

MARCH, 1880.

## ART. I.—CONVOCATIONS, SYNODS, AND DIOCESAN CONFERENCES.

ALTHOUGH the Diocesan Conference occupies the last place in the title, as being the Consultative Assembly which has been latest called into existence, it is the one which must first engage our attention as that which elicits most popular interest, and which promises the most practical results. The age has for ever passed away in which the laity of the Church of England would patiently endure, that important questions touching their own temporal and spiritual interests should be decided in purely clerical gatherings, in which they themselves had no place, and in whose election they themselves had no part. How the remedy was to be applied and where to be found have been for some years past the most weighty of ecclesiastical problems which pressed for solution.

On the one hand, our Church laymen, as a body, heartily applauded the fairness of the appeal made by the late Archdeacon Sinclair, when, in 1852, addressing the clergy of the Archdeaconry of Middlesex, he said, "There is scarcely one of us who, could he take the place of a layman, would not feel misgivings rise within him when he found a purely clerical body called together to determine the doctrine he was to believe, the discipline he was to undergo, and the mode in which he was to worship God."[1] With equal depth of feeling they refused any such compromise as that which might be educed from certain mediæval precedents, which would allow them at stated times to enter the Synod for the purpose of making complaints, but which would give them no true position in the formation of its decisions.

[1] "Collected charges of Archdeacon Sinclair," p. 212.

Happily for their interests other precedents survived. It was remembered that in the councils of Constance and Basle the spiritual rights of the laity were asserted and recovered, though but for a little while. It was not forgotten that in the debates of the latter council the speeches in favour of the long-suspended rights of the laity are its most precious monuments, and that in the treatise of Andreas, Bishop of Megara, which chronicles its doings, the arguments are ably sustained, which prove that as the Creed defines the Church to be "the Communion of Saints," the right of all Catholics, lay as well as cleric, to take part in a general council which represents the whole Church, *verè, vel interpretativè aut representativè* is involved—and that on the ground of the universal brotherhood of Christians, and the equal transfusion of the Holy Spirit through their earliest assemblies, the equality of the votes of the laity in Synod with those of the clergy may be maintained.[1]

On the other hand, the lay members of our Church may well have thought that he had need to be a bold man who would seek to engraft a lay element on the old stock of our conciliar assemblies, whether convocational or diocesan. It must surely be with the fear of canonical wrath that some among them at the present time seek to promote a compromise on the lines of having a body of laymen associated with the convocations of the clergy as lay assessors. It is a question to be gravely considered whether such propositions do not render their exponents liable to the penalties which Canons 139, 140, 141 denounce against those who deprave our sacred synods, and affirm that they are not the true Church of England by representation! Let all such be hereby duly warned, for, if their language can constructively be interpreted to cover such depravation, they may be excommunicated, and not restored until they repent and revoke their wicked error! Apart, however, from all questions of terror, it is an opinion entertained by many of the laity, that the Archbishops and Bishops should have the power of calling into Provincial and Diocesan deliberative assembly their respective clergy where, in such questions as affect the clergy alone, the Bishops could ascertain their wishes and also make known their own views, provided that in no case decisions be arrived at affecting the body of the Church at large.

It has been amid such conflicting opinions and sentiments that a new kind of diocesan assembly has sprung into existence, which the Bishop of Bangor claims that his diocese in modern times has had the honour of inaugurating; and it is the distinction of this conference that whilst newer than mediævalism it is also older, inasmuch as its lines are based on those of the

[1] Vide "Historical Introduction to Sinclair's Charges," by Canon Jenkins, p. 44.

earliest Church assemblies. This new council, known as the Diocesan Conference, has been thus defined, "It consists of elected representatives of the clergy and elected representatives of the lay churchmen of the diocese with some ex-officio members of both orders; and meets annually under the presidency of the Bishop, to deliberate on such matters as, with his sanction, are laid before it."[1]

The definition speaks of elected representatives, but the character of the representation varies greatly. In the diocese of Bangor where the clergy only number about 200, every one holding the Bishop's licence is summoned, whilst the laity are elected by a system of universal suffrage of all those in full communion in the Church of England—parishes under 1000 being entitled to one lay representative—over that number an additional representative for each additional 1000, but in no case to exceed six, and by this arrangement the lay members a little out-number the clergy. In the diocese of Chester the principle prevailed for some years of electing a third of the clergy and a third of the lay members by their respective orders, of the several ruri-decanal chapters and conferences. A change was introduced however in 1874, and has since prevailed, whereby, without any distinction between clergy and laity, all the members of the ruri-decanal chapters and conferences have the right to attend the central Diocesan Conference. The attendance has not, it may be observed, been greatly increased by this change of arrangement, but the sense of perfect fairness and of mutual confidence which everywhere exists in reference to its proceedings has been regarded as a sufficient justification of the change. In the Diocese of Norwich, where a Diocesan Conference was attempted some years ago on the collective principle of including all the clergy, the churchwardens and the lay representatives, the gathering was found to be too unwieldy to be worked, and latterly, when the conference has been revived, it has been on the elective principle.

The definition further makes no reference to anything beyond "deliberation." It may be well to add that in the Diocese of Chester, after a self-denying ordinance of seven years, whereby the proceedings were limited to bare discussion, a change was resolved upon whereby the results of such discussions are embodied in resolutions, upon which a vote is taken. By this change the tone of mutual forbearance and mutual respect has in no way been lowered, and the moral weight attached to the discussion on such a question as that of "Sunday Closing" is very greatly increased when, as in the Diocesan Conference at Chester, in October last, an amendment in favour of such entire

[1] *Church Quarterly Review*, Oct., 1879, p. 169.

Sunday Closing is proposed and all but unanimously carried. The Diocese of Chester does not stand alone in following up its deliberations by the practical test of the vote.

Where an experiment was so new and purely tentative as that of the first Diocesan Conference, it could not be otherwise than that experience must test and correct many of the original features. After an existence of seven years the Diocese of Chester framed for itself a working constitution based on information procured from twelve other Dioceses in which Conferences were held. The resolutions which follow are its code, and will be studied with profit by those who wish to know more of the internal organisation of a successful Diocesan Conference :—

1. That the Diocesan Conference meet annually at Chester, under the presidency of the Bishop, and that the time of meeting be determined, with the approval of the Bishop, from year to year, by a committee of management.

2. That all the beneficed and licensed clergy, and all the lay-members of the ruri-decanal Conferences be members of the Diocesan Conference —and that a number of laymen not exceeding 24 be nominated by the committee of management and approved by the Bishop, such laymen to be communicants.

3. That the arrangements of the Conference be entrusted to the committee of management appointed year by year, consisting of the Dean, Chancellor, Archdeacons, one clergyman, and one layman, elected from each rural-deanery.

4. That the subjects for discussion be decided by the committee of management, subject to the approval of the Bishop. Subjects may be suggested either by deaneries or by individual members of the Ruri-decanal or Diocesan Conferences. Notices of motion are to be sent to the secretary of committee at least 30 days before the meeting of Conference. The business proposed to be transacted at any meeting of the Conference is to be stated in a list of agenda, which shall be issued at least 20 days before such meeting, and no business except such as is of a merely routine character shall be transacted, and no discussion be permitted thereon, unless the same shall be duly notified in the list of agenda, or shall arise in the form of an amendment strictly relevant to a motion so notified and sanctioned by the Bishop. Any special business, the introduction of which shall receive the consent of the meeting, may, with the consent of the Bishop, be brought before the Conference if time permits. Provided always that nothing herein contained shall be taken to prohibit the Bishop himself from making, *proprio motu*, and at any time, any statement or motion, although no previous notice shall have been given thereof.

5. That the conduct of the business of the Conference and the selection of the speakers be vested in the chairman; that voting be by show of hands; and where not less than ten may claim it by orders; in which case tellers shall be appointed and the motion shall not be deemed to be carried unless approved by a majority of each order.

6. That one open session be held at each Conference if the com-

mittee of management so advise, and that special notice of motions to be brought forward at such session be sent to the secretary of committee 30 days before the meeting of the Conference, and be approved by the committee.

7. That it shall be competent to the Conference to appoint committees to consider and report upon any subject of special interest and importance.

8. That the treasurer shall receive 3*s.* from each church or congregation sending representatives to the Conference, and that such payment be a condition of being so represented.

Against Diocesan Conferences the objections have been frequently urged that they are shunned by the laity, and that they begin, continue, and end in desultory talk. Neither of these charges I proceed to show can be substantiated. The accusation that such Conferences are the creation of the sacerdotal party, undertaken to promote a government of priests, will not bear a moment's investigation, and is at once contradicted by those who remember the circumstances which called them forth, and the character of their constitution.

(*a.*) The accusation that *the laity have never really been consulted, and that they have never taken any interest in the movement*, can be best refuted by an appeal to facts. Turning to the Diocese of Chester first, we find that its Conference in 1871, when elected, consisted of a total of 465—viz., 258 lay and 207 clerical members. The actual attendance on the first day of that Conference comprised 209 out of the 258 laymen, and 154 out of the 207 clerics. On the second day the numbers were 177 of the 258 laymen, and 151 of the 207 clerics. In the year 1875, when the Conference was thrown open to all members of the ruri-decanal chapters and conferences, and the clergy were thus reinforced by the addition of all licensed curates, the attendance on the first day still showed 180 laymen to 257 clergymen. Turning to the Diocese of Carlisle, we find similar results. "After ten years' trial," says the Bishop, "I see no reason to believe that the interest in our annual Conference diminishes, or that there is any doubt as to its utility. I find that in the present year the numbers attending were 60 clergy and 55 laity. In the previous year the lay element slightly predominated, and the same in the year before. Upon the whole the equilibrium is fairly maintained between the clerical and the lay sides of the house."[1] The Ripon Diocese has been one of the last to adopt the Diocesan Conference, but the feature which seems mainly to have impressed itself upon the minds of impartial onlookers during the Conference which was held in

[1] "A Pastoral Letter by Harvey Goodwin, Lord Bishop of Carlisle," p. 4, Christmas, 1879.

Leeds in October last, and whose proceedings were reported in full by the local papers, was the great attendance and keen interest of the laity. "Such a gathering of laymen of mark and of position in the area embraced by the Diocese could not (says the editor of the *Leeds Intelligencer* in a leading article) have been drawn together by any other cause than that of the Church, in whose welfare they feel an interest, apart from and above any political associations. To talk of the Church of England as the decrepit creature of the State in the face of a gathering so earnest, so truly representative, and combining such a variety of opinions, firmly held and freely recognised, is the very infatuation of self-deception."[1] The Conference called last into existence is that of the Isle of Man, so recently as January of the present year. The excellent Bishop, Dr. Rowley Hill, thus explains the circumstances under which it was originated:—

> Experience has taught us, in the great religious movement of the present day, that there never can be any healthy development of Church life without the hearty co-operation of the clergy and laity. The wise counsel, the help, the experience, the sympathy of our religious laymen are now considered essential to the proper working of the system. It is the realization of this principle which has led to the institution of Diocesan Conferences. For many a long day the whole work of the Church was thrown upon the clergy. We have seen the error of our ways. We feel the importance of acting cordially together. The clergy seek the counsel, they ask for the opinion, they look for the help of the religious laity. They shrink from occupying an isolated position. Hence our Diocesan Conferences.[2]

If our readers will bear in mind such facts as these we have adduced, and which might be easily multiplied, they may ask with astonishment what justification there can be for such statements and counsels as those recently given in one of our religious papers, when, throwing ridicule and discredit on the attempt to organise a Diocesan Conference in London, it remarks: "In this way we get the materials of our Conference, over which the Bishop will preside in person, and which we doubt not will as obsequiously represent the episcopal views as did the Papal Counsels—*alias* the image of the Beast—the predominant theology of the Vatican. As for the laymen who are not 'churchy,' they, if wise in their generation, will have nothing to do with all this complicated machinery for the promotion of priestcraft. Only let them steadfastly refuse to countenance these gatherings, and they will soon collapse; for in reality they do not possess an atom of authority or a particle of stability. They are but the scaffolding without which sacerdotalism cannot

[1] *Leeds Intelligencer*, October 20, 1879.
[2] *London Guardian*, January 28, 1880.

rear its habitation, and they will fall into desuetude the moment the hateful building is complete." It may be hoped that no Evangelical Churchman will rashly accept statements so utterly baseless and so entirely mischievous. It may be confidently claimed that the movement has done more than all other movements combined to make the laity a living and directing force in the government of the Church, and to roll away the reproach brought against it by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, when some years ago, at a Church Congress, amid sympathetic plaudits, he affirmed, "I look with dissatisfaction upon the imperfect share which is assigned to the laity in the administration of matters of common concern in the Church. The readiest means of preventing collisions between the two powers is to provide for such a representation of the lay members of the Church as may enable the whole Church body to act harmoniously together in effecting improvements in discipline and in the mode of the Church's action—for in order to accomplish her task she must make a far greater call than at present upon that great but imperfectly developed element of her strength, the Christian laity."[1]

(*b.*) The objection that *Diocesan Conferences begin, continue, and end in talk*, can also be refuted by the very simplest statement of facts. If such a charge were literally true, it would not therefore follow that good had not been accomplished. Discussion contributes its share towards forming and moulding that public opinion which in our own day exercises so great an influence on legislation. Canon Ryle, in his little pamphlet on "Our Diocesan Conference,"[2] enumerates a list of thirty-five subjects on which he thinks there is a great deal to be said and a great deal to be learned, and concerning which he would be exceedingly glad to know what his clerical and lay brethren in Norfolk and Suffolk are thinking and doing. He admits, with his masculine common sense, that during a ministry of thirty-seven years he must have made some foolish experiments and had some humbling failures from want of knowledge of the right way to go to work. In such a Conference only those would command attention who were seen to know what they were talking about. In addition to the information elicited by discussion, he argues that much would be gained by the occasional appointment of small committees, who would undertake between the annual meetings to investigate special subjects, to collect and arrange information, and present the result of their inquiries in short reports, which, printed and circulated among the members, would be productive of good, as the experience of certain dioceses has already proved. Those

[1] "Bath Church Congress Official Report," p. 172, 173.
[2] "Our Diocesan Conference," 1879, p. 10.

who are persistently incredulous as to the practical character of Conferences might profitably be put on such a course of reading as would be involved in the study of the fifteen annual reports of the Ely Diocesan Conference!

As, however, no proof seems so valid as one that can be measured by the pounds, shillings, and pence standard, I may state that taking the Diocese of Chester as an instance of others, such practical tests can be successfully applied. One of the first fruits of the Chester Diocesan Conference was the formation of a fund for the augmentation of poor benefices. That fund has already received from the diocese a sum of 57,884*l.*, which amount has been doubled by grants from Queen Anne's Bounty and from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. The work still progresses, and how urgently it was required, and how much has been accomplished will be seen when it is announced that there still remain in that diocese 107 benefices under 200*l.* a year. Again, as a direct result of the Diocesan Conference discussions, an association has been established entitled the Chester Diocesan Finance Association, which receives funds for the four so-called Diocesan Institutions. It is entirely due to this organisation that, notwithstanding the long spell of commercial depression, the funds devoted to the furtherance of Church Building, the maintenance of Training Colleges and Diocesan School Inspectors, the provision for Clergy Widows and Orphans, and the sustentation of Schools for the Children of the Clergy, manifest a steady increase producing during the past year an income of nearly 10,000*l.* This committee in closing their Report feel warranted in saying, "With the return of better times we may anticipate a large development of liberality and zeal not only sufficient to place our Institutions on a more satisfactory basis than in times past, but ample enough to meet any fresh want arising from the growth of population or the increasing action of the Church." The Chester Association is the first of the kind in the kingdom, but other dioceses are quickly following its example. How quickly and successfully a Diocesan Conference may contribute to mould public opinion, a most cheering instance has recently proved. After an interesting discussion in the Chester Conference on Sunday Closing, an amendment, as already stated, was all but unanimously carried in favour of entire closing of the public-houses on the Lord's Day. Three months later, a Parliamentary election is held in Liverpool, and for the first time, in the largest constituency ever polled, numbering over 60,000 voters, the two candidates went to the poll pledged for entire Sunday closing. A few days later, and on Monday, February 1st, the Town Council of the same place, by a majority of 29 votes to 1, decide that a petition in the name of the municipal council shall be forwarded

to the Houses of Parliament in favour of entire Sunday closing. When it is remembered that such conferences now exist in all but four of our English dioceses, and that such are the fruits they can be made to yield, no language can adequately convey the strength of the writer's conviction as to the immense importance of Evangelical Churchmen loyally supporting and intelligently working these institutions which have so rapidly taken root in the soil of our English Church.

If, however, additional evidence be required to strengthen faith in the utility of the Diocesan Conference, it may be well to look outside our own land, and to remember how in the American Church, for wellnigh a century, the convention has been the very foundation on which our sister Church has rested all her organisation—or rather the very root from which her branching system has grown. On the creation of a new diocese a Diocesan Council of clergy and laymen is fully formed, even before the appointment of a Bishop. Besides the annual Diocesan Convention, there is the General Convention every third year, which if the parishes be reckoned as the articulation, and the Diocesan Convention as the larger limbs, may be accounted to hold the place of the backbone in the American system of ecclesiastical framework. How marvellously this system has adapted itself to the growth of the great Republic has been told by the present Dean of Chester. He was privileged to be present at the General Convention, held at Baltimore in 1871, and whereas the last General Convention held at Baltimore in 1808, was attended only by two bishops, there met in 1871 fifty Bishops, together with theoretically 400, but practically 300, lay and clerical delegates elected four and four from each corresponding diocese. The same differences prevail in the sister Church as among ourselves; but the excellent spirit of moderation which was diffused throughout the assembly the Dean ascribes to the presence of the laymen, who with equal knowledge and experience spoke in the Convention on equal terms with the clergy.[1]

Again, it would be well to study the constitution of our own colonial churches. The Diocesan Conference has had no more distinguished, no more hearty exponent, than the late Bishop of Melbourne, Dr. Perry, now Canon of Llandaff. A glowing testimony to the success of the experiment wrought out by Bishop Perry has been given by Sir W. Stawell, Chief Justice of Victoria:—

> We met together in Conference under legislative enactment. The representatives elected were members of the Church of England and communicants; clergy and laity met together, and were presided over by the Bishop. They voted by orders, they passed their own enact-

[1] "Leeds Church Congress Official Report," p. 277.

ments, they framed their own resolutions, and the result has been that in a country in which there were only two clergymen, there are now about 170 incumbents, with churches fully in proportion to the number of clergymen. The most conservative persons in that assembly are the laity. Generally speaking, those who wish to support the power of the Bishop are the laity; those who think the Prayer-book, as it is constituted, cannot be improved upon, are the laity; and those who desire to cling to the old Church, without any alteration whatever, are the laity.[1]

Again, it would be well to study the history of our sister Irish Church since her disestablishment. The fragments have been rendered compact and seaworthy, which otherwise as wreck had been strewed on every shore. To the General Convention, consisting of the Archbishop and Bishops, together with representative clergy and laymen, under God this success is due. On this point our readers may be referred to an interesting article by Archdeacon Whately, in THE CHURCHMAN of November last. The opinion set forth in that article, that the laity as a body are more Protestant in doctrine, more practical in business, and capable of stronger attachments by having responsibility imposed upon them, is one which will command general assent, and it is his belief that since the introduction of the laity into the Irish Convention, Plymouth Brethrenism has decreased, whilst in the power expeditiously to put down practices which savour of Romanism, and in the appointment of a committee for the distribution of patronage, the Irish Church has largely gained.

The system which works so well in the American Church—in the Colonial Churches, in the Irish Church, and which has been found so efficacious in the Established Church of Scotland, as well as in the dioceses of our own Church wherever it has been fairly tried, is no longer an experiment. No party in the Church has the credit of its inception, and no Bishop, whatever his school of thought, who has held his Diocesan Conference would be willing to be without one. If the present Bishop of Winchester and the present Dean of Lichfield be classed as High Churchmen they may be claimed as enthusiasts in favour of the Conference. The former has said:—

> A diocesan synod was the very embodiment of episcopal autocracy. . . . . For these reasons I prefer Conferences of the character of this assembly—Conferences of free thinkers, of free speakers, and of free voters. The clergy require the assistance of the laity; and if the laity are asked to give their work, the clergy must expect that they will desire to give their opinions as well, for it cannot be expected that they will act merely as the followers or bond-slaves of the clergy. Many of the laity, too, are as zealous for the faith as any clergyman

[1] "Bath Church Congress Official Report," p. 278.

can be; so that probably the best form of a council now is one which consists of Bishop, clergy, and laity.

The opinion of the Dean will be found on page 158 of THE CHURCHMAN.

The Bishop of Ripon and the Dean of Carlisle will be ranked as evangelical churchmen. Both of them have looked with some suspicion on the diocesan movement, but though among the latest adherents none, as it will be seen, can be more ardent in their support of the Diocesan Conference. The Bishop of Ripon, at his recent Conference in October last, having explained the reluctance with which he was prevailed upon to move by the pressure exerted upon him by the body of the Church itself, gave in his hearty adhesion to the principle as one which must henceforward be recognised as an indispensable condition of healthy Church life, and then added, "the experience of two years has swept to the winds any lingering doubts that might have existed in my own mind." With the opinion expressed by the venerable Dean of Carlisle at the last Conference in that city, I will bring this article to a close:—

This Conference is just the thing we want—that is, a fair representation of clergy and laity in the council of the Church. Bishops are not the Church, the clergy are not the Church, the laity are not the Church; but the Bishops, priests, and deacons acting in wise accordance with the people, constitute the Church of England. The times in which we live are just adapted for such a Church, and we ought to be thankful if to this ancient structure and machinery, many parts of which have become rusty and useless, we can apply new springs of power and wisdom, which may make it a grand source of reformation, if it be needed, to the Church of England.[1]

JOHN W. BARDSLEY.

## ART. II.—CHAUCER AND WYCLIFFE.

1. H. SIMON, of Schmalkalden. *Chaucer a Wycliffite.* Chaucer Society's Essays, Pt. III.
2. REINHOLD PAULI. *Bilder aus Alt-England.* Gotha. 2te Aufl. 1876.
3. G. V. LECHLER. *Johann von Wiclif und die Vorgeschichte der Reformation.* Leipzig. 1873.

RELIGIOUS reformations have invariably been preceded and attended by times of intellectual excitement and activity, prolific in men who, by voice or pen, have loudly inveighed

[1] *The Guardian*, Oct. 8, 1879.

against the corruption of manners and the vices of the clergy. It would be idle to deny the services which such men have rendered in preparing the way for the triumph of the truth, even though they have not themselves been preachers of righteousness in any sense. By undermining the authority of an arrogant hierarchy, by tearing the veil of hypocrisy from the face of an ignorant and debased priesthood, and by breaking the spell under which the people had been held enthralled, they have at least served to enlist the sympathy of the masses with the coming change, and greatly contributed to the success of the Reformation; but it is equally certain that to protest against open and shameless demoralisation, to expose vices and abuses which shock the common sense and decency of society, does not require the possession of real religion, nor even the mere intellectual apprehension of doctrinal truth. Some of the most unsparing denunciations of the corruptions of the Romish Church have been uttered by men who never severed themselves from her communion, who held firmly by all her errors, and who even founded new monastic orders in the vain hope of remodelling her constitution on the old lines, or by others whose attacks were really aimed at Christianity itself, not at the deformed image in which it was presented to their readers.

In our own country, while the godly vicar of Lutterworth, John of Wicliffe, protected by the generous but dissolute prince John of Gaunt, was preaching against some of the errors of the Church of which he was a priest, and was engaged along with Hereford and Purvey in translating the Word of God into the language of the people, three poets, Gower, Langland, and Chaucer, each from a different standpoint, joined in exposing the corruption of society in general, and the vices of the monks and friars in particular.

Gower, in his "Vox Clamantis," which being written in Latin was evidently addressed rather to the more learned clergy than to the people, and the title of which was suggested by the character of John the Baptist, mercilessly handles peasant and noble, prelate and monk, soldier and lawyer in turn, but shows by the sermon in the second book, that he had no sympathy with the doctrines of Wicliffe, however convinced of the necessity of a moral reformation. He deservedly earned the title of the Moral Gower, but was to the last a sincere Romanist in his creed.

Langland was a man of a very different stamp; born of poor parents, he was schooled in adversity; a clerk in minor orders, too proud to seek preferment by sacrificing his principles, he earned a miserable subsistence by singing dirges at the funerals of the rich. His existence, embittered by penury and blighted hopes, was in melancholy harmony with the crisis of the nation's

life. To him the times were out of joint, and little hope had he of better days. In the vision of Long Will, concerning Piers the plowman, the hero of this "pilgrim's progress," or politico-theological allegory, a long and varied train of characters passes in grim procession before his eyes, but with the single exception of poor Piers the plowman, presenting every form of moral deformity, without one redeeming feature. The powers of darkness seem all abroad, prelates and monks fattening on the revenues of the Church lands, mendicant friars practising every kind of imposture on their dupes, a poor and ignorant secular clergy, peasants and artisans profiting by the dearth of labour consequent on the recent plagues to live in bold idleness or gluttonous indulgence, brutal barons taking advantage of the extinction of villeinage to evict their labourers, driving them to insolent beggary or lawless life, while Parliament seeks to repress the impending revolution by the most rigorous and oppressive measures, rich and poor fearing and feared, hateful and hating one another.

Still diverse from Gower and Langland was the character of Geoffrey Chaucer; his career was indeed chequered, but his trials served only to chasten the native joyousness of his gentle mind. The greater part of his life was passed in comparative ease; he had moved and made friends in every rank of society except the highest and the lowest, and with wondrous dramatic power, exquisite art, and a happy mixture of kindly sympathy and harmless raillery, he depicts the manners of the motley group of pilgrims to the shrine of St. Thomas of Canterbury. True, his satire becomes sharp enough as he relentlessly holds up to scorn the pardoner and the friar, but even here we miss the stern invective, the scathing indignation, of the ascetic Langland. Yet we must remember that the popularity which the Canterbury Tales rapidly obtained among all classes rendered Chaucer's milder irony far more obnoxious to the clergy than the bitter censure, the unconcealed hatred, expressed in the "Vision," addressed, too, as it was, to a public very few of whom were able to read.

We know how it was sedulously reported that Chaucer before his death had made his peace with the Church, how a retractation, the spuriousness of which is universally admitted, was appended to his works, and we need not therefore be surprised to find that there is good reason to believe that that part of the poem which touches most closely on the points at issue between Wicliffe and the Church of Rome has been grossely tampered with by clerical copyists. The labours of a little band of learned and devoted students had already condemned as spurious several entire poems commonly attributed to Chaucer, when Mr. H. Simon, of Schmalkalden, struck like many others with the inconsistencies

and self-contradictions of the Parson's Tale, has with the critical acumen of a true German scholar after a laborious and exhaustive analysis of the Tale succeeded in separating the interpolations from the genuine work, and shown that the poet was not the elegant sceptic he is usually considered to have been, but a sincere partisan of the doctrines, no less than an admirer of the character, of the Reformers.

Passing over the lay personages in the prologue we have a monk, ironically said to be certain of preferment, richly dressed and mounted, fond of good living and passionately addicted to the chase. A wanton friar, who "knew the tavernes wel in every toun," "an esy man to geve penaunce" and "the beste beggere in his hous," and a Pardoner, even more contemptible with wallet "bret ful of pardoun come from Rome al hot," and relics of the most incredible value, including a glass of "pigges bones" with which—

> Upon a day he gat him more moneye
> Than that the persoun gat in monthes tweye,
> And thus with feyned flaterie and japes,
> He made the persoun and the people his apes.

In striking contrast to these repulsive characters stands the "Poure persoun" . . . . "riche of holy thought and werk," . . . . "also a lerned man, a clerk"—

> That Cristes gospel trewely wolde preche,
> Benigne he was and wonder diligent,
> And in adversité ful pacient.
> Wyde was his parische,
> But he ne lafte not for reyne ne thonder,
> In sicknesse nor in mischief to visite
> The ferreste in his parissche, moche and lite,
> A noble ensample to his scheep he gaf.

He did not seek preferment, like too many of the clergy of that day—

> But dwelt at hoom and kepte wel his folde,
> So that the wolf ne made it not myscarye.
> He was a schepherde and no mercenarie,
> And though he holy were and vertuous,
> He was to sinful man nought despitous,
> To drawe folk to heven by fairnesse,
> By good ensample, this was his busynesse.

He would sharply reprove the obstinate without respect of persons, and lastly—

> But Cristes lore and his apostles twelve
> He taughte, but first he folwede it himselve.

Such is the description of the Parson which, as Mr. Simon says, "has hundreds of times been quoted as the ideal of Christian charity and humility, evangelical piety and unselfish resignation to the high calling of a pastor," yet we cannot deny that such characters have been found among the parish priests even in the bosom of the Church of Rome. But let us examine it more closely; the first feature on which the poet dwells is that he taught the gospel in its purity—

That Cristes gospel trewely wolde he preche
Out of the gospel he the wordes caught, &c.

This was the essential character of the preaching of Wicliffe and his party, by which they were distinguished from the rest of the clergy, who would not allow the sole authority of the Scriptures. Scarcely less characteristic were their irreproachable holiness of life, which their worst enemies dared not gainsay, and their earnest appreciation of learning in the service of the truth. Ignorance no less than laxity of morals was the rule in the regular orders; learning was confined to the secular clergy, from among whom Wicliffe recruited his associates.

Lastly, in his pastoral visits, our parson goes "uppon his feet and in his hand a staf," just as Wicliffe's itinerant preachers are said to have gone about by Henry Knighton, Canon of Leicester, Thomas Walsingham, a Benedictine of St. Albans, and other historians of that period. At the same time it cannot be Wicliffe himself who is portrayed, for he did not travel, nor was he ever a *poor* parson.

Leaving the picture of the man himself as given by Chaucer, let us turn for a moment to the language and behaviour of his companions. When the parson firmly but gently remonstrates with the rollicking innkeeper for taking God's name in vain, Harry Baily derisively remarks—

I smell a loller in the wind.

But receiving no answer, as he had expected, points directly at the parson, and with another profane oath exclaims—

We schal have a predicacioun
This loller here wol prechen us somewhat.
Nay, by my fader soule! that schal he not.
Sayde the schipman, Here shall he not preche:
He schal no gospel glosen here, ne teche.

No greater insult could have been offered to an "orthodox" priest than this of calling him a Lollard. If our parson did not admit the impeachment, he must in self-respect and for the sake of the company have indignantly repudiated it. But he does nothing of the kind; he did not indeed feel bound to proclaim

himself a heretic, and thus to provoke opposition, but silently waits the opportunity of giving them, when he shall be called on to speak, a few simple words in season. Again, however unwelcome might be the expectation of a sermon of any sort, how could such harangues as they were accustomed to hear from the preaching friars, made up of stories from the lives of the saints, legends sacred and profane, the "Gesta Romanorum," and even Ovid's "Metamorphoses," the whole spiced with coarse jokes and with jingling rhymes, be described as "gospel glosing?" Such preaching Wicliffe denounced with all his soul. Everywhere in his sermons we find condemnations of the "Gesta vel cronicas mundiales," "Gesta, poemata vel fabulas," "Colores rithmicos," and "formam metricam." "Debet evangelisator predicare," says he, "plane evangelicam veritatem." The parson was a Wicliffite, and all the pilgrims knew it. At length the bully of an innkeeper, rudely as he had treated the monk and the "nonnes priest," is disarmed by the gentle behaviour and dignified meekness with which the parson had borne the jeers and thrusts of the rougher members of the party. He respectfully invites him to favour them with a fable, only stipulating that it be a short one, as the day is nearly spent. He even attempts a little flattery, an unmistakable testimony on the poet's part to the conduct, the peaceful disposition, and influence of the Lollard or Wicliffite preachers. To this invitation the parson accedes on certain conditions—

Thou getest fable noon i told from me
For Poul that writeth unto Timothé,
Repreveth hem that weyveth sothfastnesse,[1]
And tellen fables, and such wrecchednesse.
Why schuld I sowen draf[2] out of my fest,
Whan I may sowë whete, if that me list?
For which I say, if that you lust to hiere
Moralité and vertuous matiere,
And thanne that ye wil geve me audience,
I wol ful fayn at Cristes reverence
Do you plesauncé leful,[3] as I can.
But trusteth wel, I am a suthern man,
I can not gestë,[4] rum, ram, ruf,[5] by letter,
Ne, God wot, rym hold I but litel better.
And therefor, if you lust, I wol not glose,
I wol you tel a merry tale in prose,
To knyte up al this fest, and make an ende;
And Jhesu, for his gracë," wit me sende[6]
To schewë you the way, in this viage

[1] Them that waive (or pass by) truth.
[2] Draf—rubbish.
[3] Lawful pleasure.
[4] Gestë—to tell romances.
[5] Use alliteration.
[6] Send me wisdom.

Of thilke parfyt, glorious pilgrimage
That hath Jerusalem celestial.

His appeal to the authority of St. Paul in the Epistles to Timothy when declining to favour the company with a fable, is eminently characteristic. Nowhere does the Apostle expatiate so fully on the right discharge of the office of a pastor, or warn his readers so earnestly against false doctrine and enforced celibacy and abstinence. They were special favourites of Wicliffe, and the caution against *fables*, which occurs no less than four times in these and that to Titus, is echoed again and again in the writings of the Reformer. He who put such words into the mouth of the parson must have been acquainted with the sermons of Wicliffe.[1]

Nor need we be surprised at finding a Wicliffite preacher taking part in a pilgrimage, or as he advisedly calls it a "*viage*" to Canterbury. The shrine of à Becket was indeed the destination of the others, but there also were the tombs of Augustine, the first missionary to the Saxons, and of Ethelbert, his royal convert, there was the first English church, there too were the tombs of Langton, the champion of our national liberties, and of the Black Prince, the idol of the people; but above all, in the concourse of superstitious pilgrims from all parts of the kingdom, he would find a rich field for his evangelic labours. That he attached himself to one of these parties was a mere precaution against the perils of the road. The Tale itself, being purely a religious discourse without any reference to mediæval romances, has not received at the hands of critics the attention that has been bestowed on the others for the sources of the materials of which the literature of East and West has been ransacked.

But no one who has read it with the least care can fail to have remarked its inconsistency not only with the character of the speaker, but with its own self. Side by side with the language of Scripture, and the simple evangelical doctrine of repentance and forgiveness of sins by faith in Christ alone, are long disquisitions concerning the degrees of guilt depending on circumstances of time and place which might have been culled from Peter Dens, and an exposition of enormous length on the seven deadly sins. Passages which irresistibly recall the language of our reformed communion office jostle others insist-

[1] Objection has not unnaturally been taken to the coarseness of much of Chaucer's writings. It must be remembered, however, that in the age in which he lived, and indeed for nearly two hundred years after, the common language of society was marked by an utter absence of refinement or even of modesty. Besides, it may be mentioned that the prologue to the Wife of Bath's Tale is composed almost wholly of free translations from Jerome *adversus Jovinianum* and Theophrastus *de Nuptiis* and Tertullian *de monogamiâ* as quoted by Jerome in his work.

ing on the necessity of auricular confession and priestly absolution, and are followed by a minute description of the various forms of private and public penance.

But when we come to a critical examination of the Tale as a literary production, the clumsiness of the forgery becomes patent. Every rule of composition and of grammar is violated, theses and definitions are contradicted by their illustrations, the order of the several points is repeated or inverted, and the tedious digressions are marked by decided differences in language and idiom. Once the interpolator got confused between the personalities of the parson and the poet, and makes the former "a lerned man, a clerk," . . . . "leve to divines so heigh a doctrine" as the exposition of "the Ten Commandments!"

The perfect symmetry of every other work of Chaucer's, his mastery of the arts of composition, the transparency and logical accuracy of his sentences, are well known to every student of his writings. It is remarkable how the Tale, judged from a purely literary standpoint, gains by the elimination of the foreign matter. It now forms a concise, yet clear and complete statement of the views of Wicliffe's party on the doctrine of repentance; it is perfect as a work of art, and excellent in every part; it is in entire harmony with the character of the Parson; and, lastly, it is, what the corrupt version most certainly is not, in compliance with the express wish of the host, short.

The plan of the Tale may be thus stated. The preacher, wishing to "improve the occasion" of the pilgrimage by proving that true penitence does not consist in any such works of satisfaction or self-imposed penance, but in turning from sin, in repentance and faith in Christ, takes for his text a passage from the Prophet Jeremiah (vi. 16), evidently chosen with a view to turn the thoughts of his hearers from the innovations of the Romish Church to the primitive doctrine of Christianity. He then gives a definition of penitence according to St. Ambrose, and "some doctor," adding a third of his own. The explanation of the word itself, which he had promised, is omitted; probably it has been excised by the copyist. Next, he discusses the things which should move a man to repentance, enumerating (1) the remembrance of his sins; (2) the consciousness of slavery implied in sin; (3) dread of future punishment; (4) the sorrowful remembrance of good left undone and of happiness lost; (5) the remembrance of the sufferings of Christ for our sins; (6) the hope of forgiveness, the gift of grace to do well, and the glory of heaven; secondly, the "manner of contrition," and, lastly, the fruits of repentance. Such is the pure gold of this gospel sermon, separated from the dross in which it has been smothered by monkish scribes.

The subject of the Parson's Tale, or "Meditacioun" as he

calls it, is that of Wicliffe's "Wicket," the manner of treating it is the same; nay, more, the very words are, in numberless instances, borrowed from the works of the great reformer. The palpably spurious portions are those treating of the three "accioun̄s and the three spices (*i.e., kinds*) of penitence"; "the laste thing . . . . (*viz.*) whereof availeth contricioun" which follows the sixth of the six things which should move a man to repentance; the whole of the "secounde partye of penitence" of which no first part has been indicated in the introduction; and the dissertation on the seven deadly sins, much of which is too obscene for general reading; in fact, the remaining three-fourths or more of the Tale, except the closing section on the "fruyts of penitence," which is genuine. These additions have necessitated numerous minor interpolations or alterations in the text of the introductory part, which Mr. Simon has pointed out, besides which there are many passages in the sections on the things which should move a man to penitence found in the Lansdowne or other MSS., but wanting in the Harleian, which look very suspicious.

It is scarcely necessary to add that the "Preces de Chauceres" which is made in some copies a part of the Parson's Tale, and in others added as a sort of death-bed recantation of the poet's, is utterly unworthy of notice.

To persons not familiar with the domestic history of those times it might seem incredible that such wholesale falsification could be perpetrated on a work of so popular a poet. There is, however, good reason to believe that Chaucer did not publish the Parson's Tale in his lifetime. Since no contemporary MS. of the Canterbury Tales exists, this must remain a matter of conjecture; but Lydgate, some years after Chaucer's death, speaks of the Tale of Melibeus as the only piece of prose among them, whereas that of the Parson, had he known of it, would have possessed special interest to him as an ecclesiastic. The author, too, had good reasons for suppressing his sermon on penitence.

After Wat Tyler's insurrection had been put down, Wicliffe was falsely accused by his enemies of having contributed by his preaching to the popular rising. His doctrines were condemned by the Synod of 1382, and he was deprived of his professorship, though he was protected from further persecution by the influence of the Queen, and of John of Gaunt until his death, which occurred in 1384. In 1386 a change of government took place: the Duke of Gloucester superseded John of Gaunt, who was driven from power, and with the fall of his patron Chaucer was deprived of his lucrative office. From 1388 to the end of the century, *i.e.*, to the time of Chaucer's death, the persecution of the Lollards waxed hotter, until Archbishop Arundel, who had

succeeded Courtnay in the see of Canterbury, induced the usurper Henry IV. to pay for his assistance by the bloody statute De Comburendo Heretico.

Chaucer was now old and infirm; a poor layman, dependent for his subsistence on the charity of the court, he could not feel himself called on to provoke persecution, and to forfeit his means of living by making public a work which would inevitably have brought on him the indignation of the ruling powers; but kept it to himself until the storm of persecution should have passed, or he should have been removed by death. Chaucer died in the little house in the gardens of St. Mary's, Westminster, which he held on lease from the Abbey, surrounded doubtless in his last hours by the monks who constituted themselves his literary executors. The Parson's Tale, of which, as we have seen, Lydgate was ignorant, did not probably appear till between 1410-20, the date of our earliest MS., when Lewis Chaucer, the poet's only son, had long been dead, if indeed he survived his father, and there was no one who cared to identify the poet's handwriting, or possibly had ever seen the original Tale.

That the monks, when the persecution of the Lollards was at its height, when the writings of Wicliffe were being hunted up and committed to the flames, and his followers brought to the stake, should have themselves published so heretical a work is inconceivable: they might have destroyed it, but felt that the production of an orthodox essay on penitence, inculcating the necessity of auricular confession, of penance and priestly absolution, proving that whatever doubts he might have entertained in his lifetime, the poet of the people at least died a "Catholic" at peace with the Church, would be a triumph, the moral effect of which would be incalculable. They had plenty of leisure for a complete falsification of the work, though the forgers, who were obviously clerics, seemed to have found the transformation of the Tale no easy task.

Mr. Simon has done the cause of learning and truth good service, but there is still ample scope for a further revision of the Parson's Tale by collation with the writings of Wicliffe, though it would be well to postpone the attempt until the completion of the sixth text edition of the Tales, which the Chaucer Society has in hand.

EDWARD F. WILLOUGHBY.

## ART. III.—ON CHURCH AND STATE IN FRANCE.

1. *L'Église et la Révolution Française.* Par EDMOND DE PRESSENSÉ. Paris, Meyrueis: 1864.
2. *L'Église Gallicane dans son Rapport avec le Souverain Pontife.* Par le Comte JOSEPH DE MAISTRE. Lyon, Pelagaud: 1874.
3. *Histoire du Gouvernement Parlementaire en France.* Par M. DUVERGIER DE HAURANNE. Paris, Lévy Frerès: 1871.
4. *Le Correspondant:* 1879.
5. *Manuel du Droit Public Ecclésiastique Français.* M. DUPIN. Cinquième édition. Paris, Plon: 1860.

I.

ON the 21st January, 1535, "all Paris was astir; the streets were hung with drapery; reposoirs were erected;" a solemn procession defiled through it;—"many bodies of the saints"—were carried through it. The Virgin's milk; our Lord's purple robe; one of His many crowns of thorns; one of the numerous true crosses on which He was hung; the relics of Sainte Genéviève were brought out of their shrines. Cardinals, archbishops, and bishops preceded the Host under a magnificent canopy, borne by princes of the blood; then followed Francis I., bareheaded, and on foot, the Queen, the courtiers, the university, the corporations, all walking two and two, with lighted torches, "exhibiting marks of extraordinary piety." The object was a reparation because the sacrifice of the Mass had been openly impugned by the Huguenots. The reparation was completed by the plunging up and down into flames of three "heretics." The wretches "were made to feel that they were dying." The people were filled with cruel joy; savage thirst for blood was aroused in them.

On the 21st of January, 1793, there was another gala day in Paris. There was again a procession through the streets of the great city. On this occasion there were no reposoirs, no relics, no priests, no nobles; but there was a king borne along in a tumbril to the scaffold. Once more the people were filled with cruel joy, once more the savage thirst for blood was aroused. "Une multitude sans Dieu vaut une multitude idolâtre."

During the intervening period of four hundred and fifty-eight years, the Church of Rome had reigned supreme in France. One third of the country belonged to ecclesiastics. At the

expiration of it the throne, the nobility, the priesthood were swept away, and France was reeling to and fro drunk with blood and crime, having made the miserable exchange of atheism for superstition. For the time the desolation was complete. Society had to be built up afresh out of ruins. Nearly a hundred years have elapsed and the work is yet incomplete. The struggle is still severe between those who would restore the past and those who would reconstitute France on the principles contended for at the Revolution. It will be our task to note the chief incidents of this protracted conflict and to comment upon them.

II.

It is a mistake to consider Frenchmen irreligious. In the seething times which preceded the Revolution, it is perfectly true that there was a dissolute crew of nobles and philosophers, of infidel priests and debauched abbés, whose only creed might be summed up in "let us eat and drink for to-morrow we die." But poor Jacques Bonhomme had little share in all this ghastly revelry and these wild speculations.[1] During the revolutionary period there were the most frantic excesses of mocking infidelity, and up to the present time there are multitudes of Frenchmen absolutely "without God in the world." But the whole history of the Huguenots shows that there is in Frenchmen a capacity for worshipping "God who is a spirit, in spirit and in truth," without fetichism and without cumbrous ceremonial. The marvellous and rapid manner in which religion was restored in France after the delirium of the Reign of Terror, points in the same direction. In the Constituent Assembly Mirabeau declared, "Dieu est aussi nécessaire que la liberté au peuple Français." In the Convention, even Robespierre maintained that the idea of the Supreme Being and of the immortality of the soul is "un rappel continuel à la justice; elle est donc sociale et républicaine." Again he affirmed, "Si Dieu n'existait pas, il faudrait l'inventer." In the same spirit M. Portalis le Père, when introducing the Concordat and the Organic laws to the Legislative Assembly, propounded the question, "La religion, est elle nécessaire aux hommes?" In answering it he first inquired whether a new religion could be established.[2] To this he re-

[1] For the full account of this wonderful contrast, see Merle d'Aubigné's "History of the Reformation in Europe," vol. iii.

[2] The reference was to "Théophilanthropie," a new system set on foot by the Directory. It was a sort of Deism, of the kind suggested by Rousseau in his "Contrat Social;" La Reveillère Lepaux was the hierophant of it. The ritual was as absurd as that of Modern Positivists. The officiating ministers were clad in white robes with rose-coloured sashes, and preached on tolerance, filial piety, commercial honesty, and similar topics. This, however, was soon found to be very wearisome, and the

plied in the negative. What religion was possible? Christianity. Nor was this policy confined to isolated expressions of a few republican leaders. In 1792, the Fête of Sainte Genéviève was celebrated with enthusiasm in Paris by multitudes. More than a thousand persons could not gain admittance into the Church. The Commune endeavoured to put a stop to the "Fête des Rois," but only succeeded in creating great scandal.

As there were, in the time of the Dragonnades, French Huguenots, who were "tortured, not accepting deliverance that they might obtain a better resurrection," so in the revolutionary era there were French bishops and clergy equally prepared for similar martyrdom. In the massacre at the Carmes there were scenes of heroism displayed worthy of the times of Irenæus; conspicuous among all was the venerable Archbishop of Arles, thanking God that he had his blood to offer to Him. Of course there was another side of this picture. While these holy men were willingly offering themselves up to a cruel death, apostate priests in the Church of St. Eustache were dancing the carmagnole round a bonfire in which missals, copes, and relics were burning. Still the sentiment of religion was not extinct, but revived rapidly in France; it exists now even among those who, seduced by what is termed philosophy, or ensnared by evil passions, are, in darkness and confusion, feeling about after God if haply they may find Him. Too often the upshot of their baseless speculations is that they

> Find no end in wandering mazes lost.

But yet there are depths of religious feeling which can be stirred in Frenchmen; there are multitudes among them ready at any moment to cry out, "who will show us any good?" When any great preacher, like Lacordaire, or Ravignan, or Hyacinthe, mounts the pulpit at the conferences at Notre Dame, and brings, or is supposed to bring, a message from God, the vast church is filled, not only with the drilled supporters of clericalism, but with souls athirst for the water of life, wherewithal to quench their consuming thirst. Why, then, certainly ever since the Revolutionary era, and indeed long before it, have the French laity appeared to be in antagonism with Christianity? Why, under all the successive phases of Government, has there been a perpetual struggle against religion, presented to them under the form of Romanism, whenever that struggle has been

---

listeners had to be paid for attending. It was a remarkable instance of the complete failure of a "croyance sans mystères et sans dogmes" to become a religion, even under circumstances apparently most favourable. This is the perpetual difficulty of Unitarianism.

possible ?[1] Why has, since the Reformation, the conflict been unceasing between the intelligence of France and Ultramontanism ?

The answer to this must be found in the words of Mirabeau, which we have already quoted. France wants God, but France wants liberty also. During the days of the Second Empire, we were much touched with the words which fell from the lips of a most distinguished Frenchman in Paris, as he was speaking of England. Glancing at the police present at a meeting, he exclaimed, "Et nous autres Français, nous aimons aussi *un peu* la liberté." In order to develop this position it will be necessary to review, in a brief historical sketch, the relations which have existed between the Church of France and the State since 1789. The date might be removed further back with much advantage, but it will suffice in an article like the present, to show how what may be summed up in "Dieu," has been unceasingly presented to Frenchmen in an attitude irreconcilable with "la Liberté."

III.

In his most interesting volume on "l'Église et la Révolution," M. de Pressensé, in a very able manner, proves that throughout the whole of that stormy period, ecclesiastical questions, not merely relating to the property of the French Church, but also to its tenets and maxims, constantly occupied the attention of those who successively rose to power. He asserts that the aim and object of the Revolution was "Liberty." Equality was a subsidiary matter. The question of religion badly understood and hastily resolved, was, he maintains, the proximate cause of the Reign of Terror. In order to understand this we must review the attitude of the clergy. In 1787, La Fayette, in the Assembly of Notables, had been instrumental in procuring the Edict of Toleration of that year. By this edict non-Catholics (*par pudeur* no other name was given to them!) were allowed to live in France and to practice their professions or trades; they were permitted to marry, and to register the birth of their children before civil officers; regulations were also made for their burial, although no permission was hereby accorded for

[1] Le caractère le plus distinctif et le plus invariable du parlement de Paris se tire de son opposition constante au Saint Siége. Sur ce point jamais les grandes magistratures de France n'ont varié. Déjà le XVII^me^. siècle comptait parmi les principaux membres de véritables Protestants tels que les Présidents de Thou, de Ferriere, &c; on peut lire la correspondance de ce dernier avec Sarpi, dans les œuvres de ce bon religieux; on y sentira les profondes racines que le Protestantisme avait jetées dans le parlement de Paris. . . . . Ce même esprit s'était perpetué jusqu'à nos jours dans le parlement, au moyen du Jansénisme qui n'est au fond qu'une phase du Calvinisme.—De Maistre, sur l'Église Gallicane.

Protestant worship, which was expressly confined to the French Church. Until the Revolution the clergy never ceased protesting against this edict. "Lord save us! the kingdom is in peril, for Protestants, contrary to the laws, are admitted to employment," was the cry of the Archbishop of Arles.[1] The last act of the assembly of the clergy in 1788, was a formal demand to the King to revoke the edict of toleration. It might with some truth be said that the first occupation of the Constituent Assembly was the question of religious liberty. The step taken was tentative, a species of compromise. "No one, it decreed, was to be molested on the score of his opinions, even his religious belief, provided the manifestation of it did not disturb public order established by law." This decree (5th November, 1789,) is worth noticing, for hitherto France can hardly be said to have got much further, if indeed quite so far, after a conflict of a hundred years.

With much more ease and completeness the relations between the Church and the State were transformed in other respects. The nation took possession of the whole property of the clergy, who from independent proprietors, became salaried agents, as they have ever since been. It was useless to make any attempt to uphold conventual establishments, then a hopeless scandal to public morality. M. de Pressensé (p. 122) shows that the system of a salaried clergy was no novelty of the French Revolution. It had been a monarchical tradition, handed down from the days of Louis XIV. In reality it was "Gallicanisme à outrance." We recommend the admirers of the "Gallican" Church seriously to consider this question. Le Vayer de Boutigny, who was consulted by Louis XIV., compared the Church to a ship; this is no novelty; but he added, the helm is in the hands of the spiritual power, while the captain, who regulates its whole course, is the State. It was in vain that in the Assembly Dom Gerle strove to obtain a decree that all religions could not be admitted into France, but that the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman religion is, and ever shall be, the religion of the nation, and its worship alone authorised. The Huguenots were permitted to return; they were to be eligible for all employment. Rabaut L'Etienne, the son of an old Huguenot minister, "an apostle of the desert," for whose head a price had often been offered, wrote in 1790 to his father, "The President of the National Assembly is at your feet." In the Constituent Assembly, Jansenism, so long trodden under foot, triumphed over its ancient adversaries. The civil constitution of the clergy was adopted. Bishops and clergy were to be elected by the people. The spirit of the Constituent Assembly may be summed

[1] Cædimus inque vicem præbemus crura flagellis.

up in the apopthegm of the Jansenist Camus, uttered June 1st, 1790. "The Church is in the State, the State is not in the Church. We are a National Assembly; we have the power of changing the religion of the country." This is in precise accordance with the maxims of "Gallicanisme à outrance," if we substitute Louis XIV. for the National Assembly.

In these recent conflicts there had been some doubtful and imperfect gain for religious liberty. The germ of future troubles was contained in the oath imposed on the future clergy, by Article 21 of the "Civil Constitution of the Clergy," that they would be faithful to the nation, to the law, and to the king, and would maintain with all their power the constitution voted by the National Assembly. This would not seem a very formidable difficulty to an English clergyman, but it must have been a very bitter test for a French bishop or priest. Although it attacked no article of Catholic or Apostolic religion it was directly antagonistic to Romanism. Those who had so long and so cruelly persecuted, were rapidly finding themselves exposed to persecution. It is impossible not to feel sympathy with them in the terrible dilemma to which they were reduced. If the French clergy had been content to struggle for their own independence and for more just relations with the State, which was oppressing their consciences, that sympathy would be extreme. But with this they combined undisguised hatred to political liberty; then and ever since they have been in open antagonism with all who love liberty in France. In this war the Pope took the lead. Early in 1790 the National Assembly was condemned in a brief, unreservedly, for having decreed liberty of conscience and eligibility[1] of non-Catholics to military and civil employments. "The Papacy had only anathemas for France," Louis XVI. wrote earnestly to the Pope, pleading with him to accept the civil constitution of the clergy. "Even a provisional sanction could not be obtained." The two powers, the Papacy and the Revolution, Ultramontanism and Religious Liberty, were in open conflict. This is no justification for the subsequent horrors in France; but, when neither party would yield, one or the other had to succumb. The weakest, the French Monarchy and the French Church, was trampled under foot. Louis XVI. had before him the alternative of excommunication or dethronement. Fatally for himself he attempted a middle course: he fled to Varennes. Meanwhile resistance was organised at Rome. Religious liberty was condemned as monstrous and chimerical. All possibility of accommodation was cut off. The new constitution of the clergy was condemned as heretical. A schism

[1] Habiles facti sunt acatholici ad omnia gerenda municipalia, civilia, militaria munera.

was set up. Most of the Bishops emigrated at an early period (John xii. 11-13); a few remained at their posts, faithful to death. The flight to Varennes sealed the fate of the French monarchy. Then the wine-press was trodden throughout France; blood came out of the wine-press. To use the striking expression of Mirabeau, a thick veil was thrown over Liberty in France.

After the frightful events of the Thermidor religious questions came up again. On the motion of Cambon, in 1794, it was decreed that the "French Republic pays no expenses, no salary of any form of worship," but the liberty of public worship which had been interdicted was restored, and citizens were permitted to use the churches for different forms of worship at hours to be fixed by the civil authorities, on condition that the ministers acknowledged submission to the laws of the Republic. Under the Directory, Camille Jourdain vindicated liberty of conscience and liberty of worship. Religious feeling repressed during the last horrible crisis exhibited itself afresh. Both in the Constitutional and in the Ultramontane Church signs of new life were apparent. M. Pressensé does not hesitate to compare this feeling to that of the Jews on their return from exile at Babylon. Grégoire, the Constitutional Bishop of Blois, preached fifty times and confirmed 45,000 persons in his diocese. Thirty thousand persons attended the Te Deum at Notre Dame after the battle of Marengo. In the first council of the Constitutional Church, held in 1797, Bishop Grégoire reported that 40,000 parishes had restored the worship of their fathers. It is not easy to express a favourable opinion of the Constitutional Church, composed as it was of incongruous elements, lacking in fervour and spirituality. Still, if it had had fair play, which it never had, it might have gone far to reconcile for Frenchmen two ideas so long painfully in antagonism—God and liberty.

But Bonaparte, now First Consul, was meditating that transformation of his authority into Imperial power, which, at the cost of all liberty to France, he accomplished. For the metaphysicians of 1789, as he termed them, he had the most supreme contempt. He meant to be the founder of a new dynasty of emperors in emulation of Charlemagne. In an evil hour for France and for himself it occurred to him that the Pope could be a serviceable tool; a bargain might be struck mutually advantageous to both parties; religious sanction conferred by the Pope might consecrate his power, placing him on a level with the ancient kings to whose throne he was succeeding. Lafayette said to him, when negotiations for the Concordat were opened at Rome—"Vous avez envie de vous faire casser la petite fiole sur la tête." The answer of Napoleon was—"Nous verrons, nous verrons." Bourrienne, who relates the story, tells us this was the true origin of the

Concordat.[1] It is not easy to distinguish in Bonaparte what his real sentiments on religious subjects were, but he has left on record this statement:—"No society can exist without morality; there can be no true morality without religion. It is religion alone upon which a State can rest with stability and continuance. A society without religion is a ship without a compass." With him, however, the restoration of the papal power in France was a pure measure of policy. It may be summed up in his statement, "J'ai besoin du Pape; il fera ce que je voudrai." He was woefully mistaken. M. de Pressensé tells us that the Concordat was only a revised edition of the civil constitution of the clergy with the democratic element omitted. This, in many respects, was, as we have shown, the old system of the lawyers in the times of the monarchy. The delusion which mainly influenced Bonaparte was one which is not unknown to our own statesmen—"Je nourrirai les prêtres." By this contrivance he imagined that he would rule them instead of the Pope. In his contempt for the power of the Papacy—perhaps in his ignorance—he yielded to the Pope more than Ultramontanism ever could have anticipated.

But what he gave in the Concordat he withdrew virtually in the Organic laws which were presented with it and ratified by a decree of the Corps Législatif (8th April, 1802). These Organic laws were, in their main points, restoration of the old Gallican liberties. Whether through desire of precipitating negotiations, misplaced confidence in the might of the civil power, or, still more probably, reassertion on the part of her statesmen of the religious independence of France, the assent and consent of the Pope to these Organic laws was never applied for or obtained. Certainly it would have been diminution of liberty to ask for it; still, it is maintained that the Concordat was granted upon condition of its being regulated by these laws. The State thus asserted its independence; just in proportion as it maintains its supremacy even to the present day, it enforces these laws. On the other hand, the Papacy has never recognised them; it has only submitted to them. It will be readily seen what a fertile source of discord was thus created. The subsequent troubles of France result from this unhappy complication. It will give some idea of the short-sightedness of even able politicians in religious questions, that M. Portalis, when recommending the Concordat and Organic laws, urged, as a reason, that "we have nothing to fear from Ultramontane systems and the excesses consequent upon them"! He declared that monastic institutions were a thing of the past, and would not be revived! He was alive to the danger of falling

[1] De Pressensé, "L'Etat et L'Église," p. 384.

under the yoke of Rome, but conceived it sufficiently protected by "the deposit of our ancient liberties" reproduced in the Organic laws! Under these illusions the Concordat (*ensemble*), with its Organic laws, was passed. At first Napoleon congratulated himself on having restored everything in its ancient order. One of his generals replied, "Yes, except two millions of Frenchmen who died for liberty, and cannot be recalled to life." Subsequently he admitted that the Concordat was the greatest fault of his reign. "I reap what I have sown," he said to M. de Pradt in 1811; "the Concordat is the greatest mistake I have made in my life." From that time forward he was himself entangled in religious quarrels. For France the Concordat was more fatal than the subsequent defeat on the plains of Waterloo.

IV.

In 1789 Liberty was the aim of France; at the period of the Restoration it had to all appearance perished under the iron despotism of Napoleon. But the intervening struggles had not been altogether in vain. Much that had unshackled the nation had perished and could not be restored. In this political had fared better than religious liberty; still it too had made some progress. Protestants could live in France without civil disabilities and with some freedom of worship. This was not much, but it was enormous progress. Against this the Church of the old *régime* had contended till it was destroyed itself. At the period of the Restoration, even in the Charter of 1814, there were symptoms of a reversion to the former condition of things. In the Concordat of 1802, which the Pope had accepted, it was declared that the Romish faith was that of "the great majority of French citizens;" also that it might be freely exercised, and its worship public, subject to police regulations necessary for public peace and order. It the Charter of 1814, while equal liberty and protection was accorded to all sects, the Romish faith was recognised as "the religion of the State," and its ministers alone were to be subsidised from the Treasury. This was in the condition of France a retrograde step.

From 1814 till the expulsion of Charles X. the ceaseless object of the restored clergy was to abolish religious liberty and to undo the past. No sooner was the Monarchy established than propositions were brought forward to abolish the University and to place all colleges and schools under the Bishops; all educational establishments in the country were treated as haunts of immorality, atheism, and sedition, which must be destroyed (*anéantis*). Roux Laborie, well-known as the representative of the clergy, declared in the Chamber that all their old power and riches must be restored to the clergy. In contravention of the organic

laws all persons were compelled to dress their houses (*tapisser les maisons*) during religious processions. For refusing to do this Protestants were condemned to fine and imprisonment. Lamennais insisted that if they did not the police should do it for them. In opposition to Odillon Barrot, who maintained that in religious matters law was neutral, he declared that then "la loi est athée." The retort was prompt, that if neutral= atheistical, the law ought to be *athée*. In the opinion of Lamennais, to hold that the temporal power of kings was independent of the spiritual was atheism. In his earlier career he was one of the ablest exponents of the views of the clerical party. He stated them thus: "No government, no police, no order are possible if men are not united by one common belief, conceived under the sense of duty; therefore, in order that human societies may not be abandoned to the anarchy of opinions or to the wills of individuals, there must be an infallible power. This infallible power must be by Divine appointment, the Pope in temporal as in spiritual things; kings as well as people must be obedient, "L'Eglise ordonne; les princes exécutent; des deux puissances l'une décide, l'autre agit; voila l'ordre!"[1]

In 1824 a grand sensation was caused by a pastoral of M. de Croi, Archbishop of Rouen, ordering the clergy to denounce their parishioners who did not attend mass; to post on the parish or cathedral doors those who did not go to Communion at Easter,[2] placing in a separate list "Concubinaires," all those who had contracted a civil marriage. In 1824 a law of sacrilege was passed, by which those who profaned sacred vessels were to be punished with death; those who profaned the sacred wafers were to be treated as parricides, that is, were to be punished by death preceded by mutilation. This law was carried in the Senate by the Bishops, who declared that if it was passed they would be the first to go into the condemned cells, to exhort the guilty to suffer death with resignation; to accompany them in the tumbrils, to mount the scaffold with them and embrace them there as brethren under the eyes of the common Father of mankind! Had such a law been now in existence in England, as a consequence of the fearful outrage recently committed in Hatton Garden, the wretched criminal, not for shooting at the priests but for scattering the consecrated wafers about, would have been first mutilated, then hung, while some Romish Bishop attended the condemned man on the scaffold! This was the law procured by the vote of French

[1] La Mennais, "Progrés de la Révolution et de la guerre contre l'Église."

[2] It has been computed by the Romish clergy that scarcely one Frenchman in twenty-five is an Easter communicant. When the extreme importance of this participation is borne in mind, it is a fair test of the relation of the French laity to the Church. "Ils ne font pas leur Pâques."

Bishops. So marked was the opposition of the clergy to all liberty, that Chateaubriand, who was ambassador at Rome, declared to the Pope that, "instead of supporting the new institutions or at least maintaining silence, the clergy had blamed them in terms which impiety made a weapon of. It cried out that Catholicism was incompatible with public liberty," and that "there was internecine strife between the Charter and the priests." It would be difficult to say that it was not so.

Meanwhile the Jesuits had returned and, although prohibited by law, were attempting to assert themselves. At Amiens and Nancy they tried to force the Cours Royales to follow in their processions. The difficulty about teaching created then almost as much excitement as it does now. In spite of all efforts their success was not great, so bitter was the hostility to them. Then as now, they endeavoured to raise the cry of religious liberty. Then, as is the case now with the Belgian Bishops, the Pope was more alive to the situation than they were, accepting the ordinances passed by the Portalis Ministry in 1828. Exactly as we have recently seen, the Bishops maintained that Cardinal Benetti's letter, condemning their opposition, did not express the Pope's sentiments, and that it was a deadly blow to the Catholic religion. So fast and furious was this more than Ultramontanism, that it provoked the most deadly hostility. We cannot stay to dwell upon the manifestations of it. It may suffice to say that all the rising intellect of France was against the Church. Too often, as it could not have both God and liberty, it chose the latter, rejecting the former, at any rate so far as the profession of religion was concerned. In the pages of the *Globe*, Saint Simon, Comte, Thiers, Ampère, de Rémusat, Saint Beuve, encouraged by Broglie, Guizot, Cousin, Villemain, indulged in the most audacious speculations. M. de Montalembert, an unimpeachable witness, declares that during the fifteen years of the Restoration the Church, so far from having gained ground, had fallen into the most deplorable discredit. Not one in twenty, even from the best colleges, of young Frenchmen turned out a Christian; the visit of an ordinary man to a church was, he said, as great a marvel as that of "a Christian traveller to a mosque in the East."

Once more the deluge came. The ancient Monarchy was swept away. The Church of France, according to Montalembert, narrowly escaped perishing with it. But if it survived under the Monarchy of July, it was with maimed powers and authority. In the Charter of 1830, the Roman religion is no longer "the religion of the State." Ministers of other religious denominations are salaried equally with priests. It was expressly declared by M. Dupin in his Rapport on the new Charter, that the terms of the former Charter had awakened imprudent pretentions to exclusive

dominion which had resulted in the disgrace of the family then reigning, and had brought the State to the verge of ruin. Once again the French Bishops and clergy had striven to arrogate spiritual and temporal despotism. Once again had France revolted against them. "Le Christianisme est mort" was a general sentiment. The clergy on their own admission were smitten with a sort of "civil death." M. de Salvandy declared, "some months ago the priest was everywhere; now God is nowhere." Six years afterwards Nôtre Dame was filled with overflowing congregations, chiefly consisting of young men, presided over by the Archbishop of Paris, whose life had been given to him for a prey, while all were hanging on the accents of Lacordaire. What had happened in the interval? For a brief interval there was liberty: and there was God. The motto chosen by Montalembert, La Mennais, and Lacordaire, for their celebrated journal *L'Avenir* was, "Le Dieu et la Liberté." To this France, not as we have said in reality irreligious, heartily responded. The priesthood had withdrawn into its proper functions, and had, too, ceased to domineer over and to wound susceptibilities.

This apparent reconciliation, however, between what was held to be God and liberty was not of long duration. We have not space to follow in detail the tracasseries of Louis Philippe's reign. We can only point generally to the enterprise of M. de Montalembert with his two friends De La Mennais and Lacordaire. Of these three De La Mennais was the eldest. He had established himself as a power in royalist and clerical circles. But he had seen how fatal to religion in France had been its alliance with the fallen monarchy. He had become a republican. In his anxiety to preserve religion, he had cast away his old political convictions. A grand hope of a theocracy, free, pure, enlightened, disinterested, floated before his vision. It was his mistake to imagine that this could possibly be the Church of Rome. When bitter opposition sprang up against the *Avenir* and the doctrines it taught, De La Mennais, in the fiftieth year of his age, was willing, in the spirit of a little child going to a father, to set out upon an expedition to the Pope to claim his sanction for the noble but Quixotic enterprise on which they had embarked of reconciling in concert with Rome "God and liberty"! They sallied forth on this wild errand, wilder than the quest of the Sangreal. The story of their failure is one of the mournful episodes of history.[1] They saw the Pope. In due season they were informed by an Encyclical Letter (15th August, 1832) that "from the infected fountain of indifferentism, the absurd and erroneous maxim—or rather the delusion—that liberty of conscience must be assured and guaranteed, has flowed."

---

Et quæ tanta fuit Romam (illis) causa videndi? Libertas!!!

Again they were assured that the liberty of the press is "a fatal liberty, which cannot be too much hated or cursed." Then, as we are informed in the pages of the Correspondant, "Une âme perit dans cette catastrophe, l'âme de Lamennais." The fervent defender of religion found that, as a Roman ecclesiastic, it was impossible to reconcile God and liberty. He chose the latter. But it may be permitted to ask how many more souls have perished and are even now perishing in this, to a Roman Catholic, hopeless entanglement whenever a thought of true liberty is entertained?

The shock to Montalembert and Lacordaire was fearful. But the habit of submission prevailed over the temptation to revolt. Their glorious ideal had been demolished, but there was still a certain kind of liberty to contend for. The laws of France had proscribed the religious orders which had been an incubus upon the country; they had also restricted teaching, and placed it under the control of the University. Now with Rome it is one thing, and a damnable thing, to uphold liberty of conscience, liberty of opinion, and liberty of the press, either in the abstract or when they are indulged in to her prejudice. It is another thing to urge the claims of liberty when her usurpations can be forwarded. In this subordinate quest after a certain sort of liberty, Lacordaire and his friend thenceforward employed themselves. Religious orders were forbidden by law; Lacordaire employed himself in resuscitating them. Clothed in the garb of a Dominican friar, he stood up in Nôtre Dame, and shaking his robe, exclaimed, "Je suis une liberté." Strictly speaking he was a lawlessness. Montalembert exerted his brilliant abilities to compass what he termed "la liberté de l'enseignement."

No impartial person will deny that there was cause for complaint in French education. It would be very easy to establish that there was mismanagement in the Lycées, and teaching by professors hostile to Christianity. For this a remedy was needed. The difficulty was to find one which would be suitable. Godless education is a terrible calamity. M. de Gasparin has borne his testimony, and it is that of a distinguished Protestant—"I bethink myself with terror what I was when I issued forth from this national education. I recalled what all my companions were. Were we very good citizens? I know not, but certainly we were not Christians; nor did we possess even the weakest beginnings of evangelical faith." Père Gratry has in like manner left on record a dismal account of the experiences of his early career in what we would term public schools. But what was the remedy? Towards the end of the reign of Louis Philippe "clericalism," as the French term it, was once more gaining the ascendant. But in 1848 there was once more a Revolution. There was again a

National Assembly in power. In the fundamental law which it adopted there was not even mention made of the Catholic religion. The Charter of 1830 had declared it to be the "religion of the majority of Frenchmen." Since 1848 it is "legally" neither the "religion of the State" nor the "religion of the majority." On the occasion of each revolution jealousy of "clericalism" was a main predisposing cause of it. At the issue of each, as the Sibyl came to Tarquin with fewer books, France has offered the Church of Rome fewer prerogatives. Still the partisans of Romanism did not lose heart. Montalembert and his friends, urging the plea of liberty, battled for the "liberty of teaching." When Louis Napoleon was President they obtained, in 1850, the passing of the Loi Falloux. By this law, which might much more appropriately have been termed the Loi Montalembert, licences given for opening schools were abolished; so were certificates from some authorised school for the B.A. examination. Religious seminaries were thrown open, and the religious orders were permitted to teach. An academy was created in each department, in which delegates from the local clergy held a position. There was thus freedom for Catholic teaching. Had there been prudence, enlightenment, moderation in the clergy, there would have been once more a prospect of "God and liberty." Unfortunately for France it was not so to be. Instead of what we in England understand by religious teaching, or anything like it, what Montalembert in his hour of triumph expressed his dread of in words painfully prophetical, came to pass—"Catholics were wanting to freedom."[1] There was a fresh and determined effort made to subjugate consciences rather than to teach Christian truth, also to re-assert the ancient dominion of the Papal Church. Religious congregations, notably the Jesuits, proscribed by law, established themselves during the period of the Empire with the connivance of the temporal and with the undisguised support of the spiritual authority both in Rome and in France. In a celebrated letter to the clergy of his diocese, written in 1869, M. Dupanloup numbers up with pride these congregations, and speaks of them as "cette incomparable armée pacifique, qui est comme nôtre armée guerrière la première du monde." But what was the feeling of France at the fresh invasion of this expelled army whose head-quarters were at Rome? It is possible that many French parents were

[1] As freedom can never be effectually established by the adversaries of that Gospel which has first made it a reality for all orders and degrees of men, so the Gospel can never be effectually defended by a policy which declines to acknowledge the high place assigned to Liberty in the councils of Providence, and which, upon the pretext of the abuse that like every other good she suffers, expels her from its system.—"Gladstone on Vaticanism."

discontented with "Liberty," as taught in the Lycées, but were they satisfied with "Dieu," as expounded to them by M. Dupanloup's army? In the mean time, under Pius IX., the Pope declared himself to be the Church. In 1859, in the presence of the assembled Bishops, he proclaimed the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. They simply listened to him and accepted it. In his Encyclical of 1869, he declared that it is madness to desire liberty of conscience; that the clergy ought to pay no taxes; that they should have their own tribunals in criminal or civil matters; that public education must be in the hands of the priests. In that and in the Syllabus which epitomised all the doctrines of previous Encyclicals, there was, it is true, talk of liberty. But as has been well observed, "It was the liberty of the Head of the Church to claim in the name of Heaven, and to exercise by all earthly means over souls, bodies, peoples, and princes the most absolute despotism. It was the abrogation of all rights, the absorption of the individual into that ideal being, the Church, which alone is free, but at the price of the liberty of all."[1] But was this the liberty which Frenchmen wanted? A desperate and partially successful effort was made by flattering French vanity to connect the Catholic destiny of France with the military destiny. The upshot was the German war; the disappearance of the Bonapartist dynasty; the singing of Luther's Hymn in the halls of Versailles; and the establishment once more of a Republic on the wrecks of all previous kingdoms or empires of France.

Again the Church of Rome has lost ground. Each successive revolution since 1819 has stripped her of privileges. Even the last seem now in peril. It is an anxious question whether there will be still money voted for the maintenance of bishops and priests, and for the conservation of religious edifices. The bills of M. Jules Ferry threaten the destruction of the law of M. Falloux. The "Liberté d'enseignement," which has been so abused, is apparently on the point of being restrained. The Jesuits will shortly disappear, except as private Frenchmen, from France, once more free. Liberty has been reclaimed, but what of God? There is an ugly look, that at the present moment the two ideas are once more in opposition in France. On the one hand, are the serried and well-disciplined battalions of Rome receiving their *mot d'ordre* from Rome. At their disposal, as camp followers, are the remains of the ancient noblesse, political Bonapartists, whose fortunes are wrecked, and a considerable mass of the women of France. These just now are clamour-

[1] "Rome and the Council in the Nineteenth Century," by F. Bungener, p. 159.

ing for liberty as the Pope understands liberty. They also proclaim "God;" but inextricably mixed up with this are Papal Infallibility, sacerdotalism, Lourdes, La Salette, puerile and disgusting fables and practices of all sorts, together with all the revolting teaching sanctioned by Jesuitism. Lying wonders, jugglery, and absurdities form the strength and the weakness of this teaching. In opposition to them is the mass of Frenchmen prizing above all things, madly and often ignorantly, liberty. Vain in the last degree have been the efforts to show that they have any sympathy with all that is bound up with Ultramontanism, which is what is presented to them as "God." When we bear in mind that "Go to Lourdes" is the modern French synonym for imbecility, we may form some conception of how far Frenchmen are prepared to sacrifice their hardly-won liberty for this conception of religion or "God."

We have indicated, we fear only too briefly and too imperfectly, what may be fairly termed the disease from which France is still and has been so long suffering. In describing it we have endeavoured to exhibit it from the French rather than from our own point of view. It is possible, also, that the terms used may seem startling to English apprehension not accustomed to identify liberty with licence, or God with grovelling superstition. But it would not be easy otherwise to explain the dilemma which France is now in, or how the alternative presents itself to Frenchmen as a people. The question is, Can there be no remedy found whereby what seems irreconcilable can be reconciled? Must France necessarily be Voltairian, Hegelian, Positivist, or else Ultramontane and fetichist? Is there no *juste milieu?* Is there no balm in Gilead which can heal wounds, bruises, and putrefying sores? Must a Frenchman believe in Marie Alacocque in order to be a Christian? Must he surrender himself to the Pope, body, soul, and spirit, if he would acknowledge and worship God? Are liberty of conscience, liberty of opinion, liberty of speech, inconsistent with religion? The answer to this requires separate and independent treatment hereafter.

GEORGE KNOX.

## ART. IV.—PRINCE METTERNICH'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY.

*Memorials of Prince Metternich.* Edited by HIS SON. Translated by MRS. NAPIER. 2 vols. Bentley.

THE appearance of these Memorials has been long eagerly anticipated by a curious public. It was known that the famous diplomatist had during his long career, both as Ambassador to Paris and Minister of Foreign Affairs at Vienna,

been busy in describing the conduct of events and the characters of his contemporaries in a journal which was one day to be published, and the reading world looked forward to a literary pleasure which had not been gratified since the perusal of the Memoirs of St. Simon. It was the wish of the illustrious chronicler that an interval of twenty-five years should elapse before his criticisms were made public. This period having now expired, the literary labours of the Prince are presented to the world, in German, French, and English. The Memoirs are well written, full of incident, and depict history in a most graphic style. Only two volumes have as yet appeared—from 1793 to 1815—but the work, which will be in six volumes, will rapidly be completed.

Prince Metternich was born at Coblentz, May 15, 1773. His father was the associate of the famous Minister Kaunitz, whose name is so much associated with the Low Countries, and who stood as the godfather of the subject of this biography. At the age of fifteen young Metternich entered the University of Strasbourg, and on the completion of his studies was attached to the Austrian Embassy at The Hague. His rise was rapid. In 1801 he was appointed Minister at Dresden; in 1803 as Ambassador to Berlin, where he took a prominent part in negotiating the treaty between Austria and Prussia and Russia; in 1806 he was sent to Paris, and there signed, the following year, the Treaty of Fontainebleau. As soon as the war had broken out between France and Austria in 1809, Metternich was summoned to Vienna to hold the seals as Minister of Foreign Affairs. At the Conference of Dresden and Prague, as will be seen by these volumes, he warmly espoused the cause of his country; and the beginning of the downfall of Napoleon may be dated from this time. In the year 1813 war was formally declared by Austria against France, and in September the Grand Alliance was signed at Töplitz, when Metternich was rewarded for his past labours by being raised to the dignity of a Prince of the Empire. With his elevation to this high position the present contributions to his biography, now under review, cease. The remainder of his history is soon told. In the subsequent conferences and treaties he took a very prominent part, and signed the Treaty of Paris on behalf of Austria. Upon the opening of the Congress of Vienna, Metternich was chosen president. On the formation of the "Holy Alliance" he was the controlling genius. In 1848, on the breaking out of the Revolution, he was compelled to fly from Vienna. He returned in 1851, and, though he never again assumed office, his counsels are said to have swayed the Emperor down to the moment of his death, June 5, 1859.

The chief interest of these Memoirs lies in the knowledge we

obtain of Napoleon; we are admitted, as it were, behind the scenes, and watch the great General maturing his plans, treating all who cross his path with the hauteur of a vulgar and successful conqueror, carrying out in every detail the schemes of his ambitious policy—resolute, aggressive, avaricious, scorning advice or repulse—till the Nemesis that was on the trail of his war-path overtook him and made him bite the dust of humiliation, surrender, and exile. From his position first as Austrian Ambassador at Paris, and afterwards as Minister of Foreign Affairs, Metternich was thrown much in official intercourse with Napoleon, and the information he gives us as to the life and character of the proud Corsican is as novel as it is interesting; indeed, these Memoirs are more comments upon the proceedings of the first Emperor of the French than of reflections upon the other historical and political events of the period. The character given by the Prince of Napoleon is most carefully limned; the faults and virtues of the man are laid bare as if dissected by the pen of a Boileau or a Balzac.

Among individuals by their position independent of this extraordinary man (writes Metternich) there are few who have had so many points of contact and such direct relations with him as I have had. In the different phases of these relations, my opinion of Napoleon has never varied. I have seen and studied him in the moments of his greatest success; I have seen and followed him in those of his decline; and though he may have attempted to induce me to form wrong conclusions about him—as it was often his interest to do—he has never succeeded. I may then flatter myself with having seized the essential traits of his character, and with having formed an impartial judgment with respect to it, while the great majority of his contemporaries have seen, as it were through a prism, only the brilliant sides and the defective or evil sides of a man whom the force of circumstances and great personal qualities raised to a height of power unexampled in modern history.

From this "impartial judgment" let us proceed to draw for the colouring of our portrait.

On presenting his credentials as Austrian Ambassador at the French Court, Metternich does not appear to have been favourably impressed with the appearance of Napoleon. He found him standing in the middle of one of the rooms at St. Cloud, wearing the Guard's uniform, and with his hat on his head. "This latter circumstance, improper in any case," comments the Prince, "for the audience was not a public one, struck me as misplaced pretension, showing the *parvenu;* I even hesitated for a moment whether I, too, should not cover." This hauteur was, however, only the arrogance which seeks to mask its shyness and to appear at ease. In spite of his brilliant victories and the halo of glory which surrounded his past actions, Napoleon

seems to have been guilty of the pettiness which is ashamed of its humble birth. He was a conqueror, and a maker of kings, yet he felt that the Sovereigns of Europe ridiculed his pretensions, sneered at his newly-created aristocracy, and regarded him as an adventurer. Sensitive and uneasy, he was soon galled at any slight upon his social position, and was ever asserting claims that Heralds might have had difficulty in substantiating. He laid great stress on his aristocratic origin and the antiquity of his family. He frequently assured Metternich that envy and calumny alone could throw any doubt on the nobility of his birth.

I am placed (he said, alluding to the flatteries of his toadies and the sneers of his foes) in a singular position. There are genealogists who would date my family from the Deluge, and there are people who pretend that I am of plebeian birth. The truth lies between these two. The Bonapartists are a good Corsican family, little known, for we have hardly ever left our island, but much better than many of the coxcombs who take upon themselves to vilify us.

Conscious of his social inferiority, now that he had risen to equal the proudest, Napoleon was most anxious to appear before the world as the thorough gentleman. He so essayed to act the part that he necessarily became stiff and artificial. By a man like Metternich, sprung from one of the noblest families in Austria, who had every advantage as to face or figure that Nature could endow him with, who had formed his manners in the most exclusive *salons* in Europe, and who was a keen observer of life, the snobbish aims and arts of Napoleon were easily seen through. "His attitude seemed to me," remarks the discriminating critic, "to show constraint and even embarrassment. His short, broad figure, negligent dress, and marked endeavour to make an imposing effect, combined to weaken in me the feeling of grandeur naturally attached to the idea of a man before whom the world trembled." As we are generally most deficient in the very gifts that we the most admire, so Napoleon, who envied the ease of the true gentleman, was almost destitute of *savoir vivre*. We are told that it is difficult to imagine anything more awkward than the Emperor's manner in a drawing-room; whilst the pains he took to correct the faults of his nature and education only served to make his shortcomings more evident.

I am satisfied (says Metternich) he would have made great sacrifices to add to his height and give dignity to his appearance, which became more common in proportion as his *embonpoint* increased. He walked by preference on tip-toe. His costumes were studied to form a contrast by comparison with the circle which surrounded him, either by heir extreme simplicity or by their extreme magnificence. He

endeavoured to imitate the well-graced attitudes of the actor Talma. In the society of ladies he was dull and vulgar; though his efforts were frequent he never succeeded in framing a graceful or well-turned speech to a woman. He spoke to them of their dress, or of their children, and sometimes indulged in an offensiveness of illustration which exposed him to repartees he was unable to return. "What red hair you have!" he said to one of the maids of honour of the Empress Josephine. "Yes, Sire, I have," was the reply, "but you are the first gentleman who told me so."

But if we turn from the petty vanity of the man to the genius of the statesman and the commander, how different is the portrait! By the force of his character, the activity and lucidity of his mind, and by his talent for the combinations of military science, he was one of those men who are not so much aided by opportunity as who make their opportunities. Influenced by one passion, that of power, he never lost either his time or his means on those subjects which might have diverted him from his aim. Master of himself, he soon became master of men and events. In whatever time he had appeared he would have played a prominent part. He regarded himself as one isolated from the rest of the world, made to govern it and to direct every one according to his will. Existence—without his controlling genius to direct affairs—was in his eyes impossible. "I shall perish perhaps," he said to Metternich in the eventful year of 1813, "but in my fall I shall drag down thrones, and with them the whole of society." Many men, astonished at his successes, said he was a "privileged being" born under a "lucky star," and the "favourite of fortune," but Napoleon, conscious of his intellectual superiority and the labour with which he had thought out his combinations, replied, "They call me lucky because I am able; it is weak men who accuse the strong of good fortune."

Like Sir Robert Walpole and those who are intent upon one object and indifferent to the means provided the end be attained, the Emperor judged human nature alone by its baser parts. As Walpole said "every man has his price," so Napoleon attributed all human action to unworthy motives. Guicciardini and Macchiavelli were his two favourite authors, and he acted upon the hard, selfish principles they inculcated. His selfishness, indeed, was brutal; the fearful sufferings which it inflicted upon myriads never caused him a pang. To quote his own words, he made no account of a million men's lives.

He was eminently gifted with that worldly tact of recognising those who would be useful to him. He discovered their weak side, their greed, vanity, or spite; then he laid siege to it and took care to join their fortunes to his own, involving them in such a way as to cut off the possibility of retreat to other engagements. A mere adventurer, he studied the national character of the people he

governed, and the history of his life proves that he had studied it rightly. He knew exactly how to play upon the levity, the fickleness, and the intense vanity of the Frenchman. He looked upon the Parisians as children, and often compared Paris to the opera. When remonstrated with by Metternich for the palpable falsehoods which then formed the chief part of his bulletins, he replied, with a smile, "Oh, they are not written for you; the Parisians believe everything, and I might tell them a great deal more which they would not refuse to accept."

Aware of the manner in which he had taken possession of the throne, he never lost an opportunity of anxiously protesting against those who accused him of being a usurper.

> The throne of France (he said to Metternich) was vacant. Louis XVI. had not been able to maintain himself. If I had been in his place, the Revolution—notwithstanding the immense progress it had made in men's minds in the preceding reign—would never have been consummated. The King overthrown, the Republic was master of the soil of France. It is that which I have replaced. The old throne of France is buried under its rubbish: I had to found a new one. The Bourbons could not reign over this creation. My strength lies in my fortune: I am new like the Empire: there is, therefore, a perfect homogeneity between the Empire and myself.

In these days of an aggressive Socialism it would be well if our demagogues took to heart this remark of the Emperor—"the child of the Revolution," as Canning called him. "When I was young," he said, "I was revolutionary from ignorance and ambition. At the age of reason I have followed its counsels and my own instinct, and I crushed the Revolution." In other words, having nothing to lose—like most Communists—he agitated as the mischievous leveller, but when it fell to his lot to become a possessor both of property and power, he changed into a staunch Conservative. Nothing more proves the purely predatory designs of the Socialist than this remark of the Emperor upon his past conduct. How true is the saying of Job, "Doth the wild ass bray when it hath grass?"

Intellectually, Napoleon stands before us in these pages as biography has hitherto regarded him—as a man more dependent upon genius than upon education. In conversation he was singularly clear and precise—"seizing the essential point of subjects, stripping them of useless accessories, developing his thought, and never ceasing to elaborate it till he had made it perfectly clear and conclusive; always finding the fitting word for the thing, or inventing one where the usage of the language had not created it, his conversation was ever full of interest. He did not converse, he talked." One of his habitual expressions was, "I see what you want; you wish to come to such or

such a point; well, let us go straight to it." He had little mathematical knowledge. "His knowledge of mathematical science," says Metternich, "would not have raised him above the level of any officers destined, as he was himself, for the Artillery; but his natural abilities supplied the want of knowledge. He became a legislator and an administrator as he became a great soldier, by following his own instinct." The turn of his mind always led him towards the Positive. He valued only those sciences which can be controlled and verified by the senses, or which rest on observation and experience. His heroes were Alexander, Julius Cæsar, and Charlemagne. The great aim of his military policy was to make France supreme over the States of Europe—the centre and force of all Governments. The vast edifice which he had constructed was entirely the work of his hands, and he was himself the keystone of the arch. Yet this gigantic construction was wanting in its foundation, and composed of materials which were nothing but the ruins of other buildings. When the keystone of the arch was removed, the whole edifice fell in.

Within the limits of a magazine review it is impossible to take notice of the mass of new historical matter presented to the reader in these Memoirs. The book must be consulted by all who wish to obtain a clear view of the events which so gravely agitated Europe at the commencement of this century. One incident we must, however, allude to, for it is the most interesting as well as the most dramatic of all in the pages before us. Coming events were beginning to cast their shadows. The great Emperor had recovered from the losses he suffered on the frozen plains of Russia, and had once more faced the Allies in Saxony. At Lützen and Bautzen the troops of the Coalition had been defeated; yet difficulties were gathering around Napoleon, and he was uncertain of the course Austria intended to pursue, who, with her usual shifting policy, had not yet joined the Allies. An armistice was proposed, which was accepted by the Coalition, anxious of obtaining aid from Vienna. The scene opens at Dresden, in the famous summer of 1813. No sooner arrived at the Saxon capital than Napoleon summoned Metternich to his presence, for upon the decision of Austria depended the fate of Europe. "I felt myself," says the Prince, "at this crisis the representative of all European society. If I may say so, Napoleon seemed to me small!"

"So you *too* want war," he cried; "well, you shall have it. I have annihilated the Prussian army at Lützen; I have beaten the Russians at Bautzen: now you wish your turn to come. Be it so; the rendezvous shall be at Vienna." "Peace and war," replied Metternich, "lie in your Majesty's hands. Between Europe and the aims you have hitherto pursued there is absolute contradiction. The world requires

peace. In order to secure this peace you must reduce your powers within bounds compatible with the general tranquillity, or you will fall in the contest. To-day you can yet conclude peace; to-morrow it may be too late." "Well, now, what do they want me to do?" asked Napoleon, sharply; "do they want me to degrade myself? Never! I shall know how to die: but I shall not yield one handbreadth of soil. Your sovereigns, born to the throne, may be beaten twenty times and still go back to their palaces: that cannot I—the child of fortune; my reign will not outlast the day when I have ceased to be strong, and therefore to be feared. I have made up for the losses of the past year: only look at the army, after the battle I have just won! I will hold a review before you!"

Metternich hinted that the army desired peace. "Not the army," cried Napoleon, hastily. "No! my generals wish for peace. I have no more generals. The cold of Moscow has demoralised them. I have seen the boldest cry like children. A fortnight ago I might have concluded peace; to-day I can do so no longer." A discussion then ensued. The Prince endeavoured to prove that, in a conflict between Napoleon and Europe, the latter must be victorious. The Emperor defied the Coalition, but he was anxious that Austria should remain neutral. "The Emperor of Austria," said Metternich, "has offered the Powers his mediation, not his neutrality. Russia and Prussia have accepted the mediation; it is for you to declare yourself to-day." Here Napoleon entered upon a long digression on the strength of his army, and the force he could assemble in the field. "Is not your present army anticipated by a generation?" asked the Prince. "I have seen your soldiers: they are mere children. And if this juvenile army that you levied but yesterday should be swept away, what then?" At these words—

Napoleon allowed himself to be overcome by rage; he turned deadly pale, and his features worked convulsively. "You are no soldier," he exclaimed fiercely; "and you do not understand what goes on in a soldier's soul. I have been reared on battle-fields: and such a man as I am makes no account of a million men's lives." He used a much stronger expression than this; and, as he spoke, or rather screamed these words, he flung his hat, which he had hitherto kept in hand, into a corner of the room. I did not stir, but leant upon a console between the two windows, and said, with deep emotion, "Why do you apply to me? Why do you make such a declaration to me between four walls? Let us open the doors; and may your words resound from one end of France to the other! It is not the cause which I represent that will lose thereby!" Mastering his passion, he replied, in a more moderate tone of voice, "The French cannot complain of me. In order to spare them I have sacrificed my Germans and my Poles. During the Russian campaign I lost three hundred thousand men, but only thirty thousand of them were Frenchmen."

The interview lasted till dusk. As Napoleon dismissed the Prince, he said, as he held the door, "We shall see one another again." "At your pleasure, Sire," replied Metternich, "but I have no hope of attaining the object of my mission." "Well, now," said Napoleon, touching the Prince on the shoulder, "do you know what will happen? You will not make war upon me?" "You are lost, Sire," said the Austrian; "I had the presentiment of it when I came; now, in going, I have the certainty." He *was* lost. It was the will of God. The victories of Lützen and Bautzen were followed by the defeats on the Katzbach and at Leipsic, and by that terrible campaign of 1814, which led to the lonely isle of Elba.

Here we take our leave of these interesting volumes; they are certain to appeal to a large circle of readers, for few subjects are more fascinating than history written by those who have created it.

## Art. V.—CLERGY SUPPLY AND THE PLURALITIES ACTS.

IN No. III., p. 239, we quoted the following expression of opinion by the Bishop of Norwich, at his Diocesan Conference, on what we ventured to call "a really practical question:"—

> 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.

It will be observed that the Bishop here speaks only of small parishes with small incomes. But he would have included, no doubt, parishes with small populations and large incomes. For if it be an evil for a clergyman with a small income "not to have enough to occupy his time," it is hardly less an evil in the case of a clergyman with a large income. The "waste of strength," which his lordship complains of, is the same in both cases; and in the case of the disproportionately well-endowed benefice, the waste of strength is intensified, and its supposed mischievousness is increased, by waste of endowment.

The subject to which the Bishop of Norwich has drawn attention is one of interest and importance in many ways. For certainly under the present strain to keep abreast of the ever-growing demands upon her strength, the Church of England can

but ill-afford to let any of it run to waste. It is admitted on all hands that there never has been so much difficulty experienced by incumbents in getting curates as at the present time, and this, notwithstanding an increase of some 40 or 50 per cent. in the average of stipends. Instead of the ordinations increasing annually at the rate of 20 per cent., which would probably be no more than is necessary to keep pace with the erection of new churches, and with the growing desire of incumbents, wherever possible, to keep a curate, we believe that they are nearly stationary. This state of things has been variously accounted for. It is alleged to be due to our unhappy differences; to the stringency of the rubrics as to the Athanasian Creed; to the so-called Erastianism of our ecclesiastical system; to the widespread doubt which prevails among educated young men. Mr. Gladstone, in his recent Address to the University of Glasgow, referred to the subject in the following terms:—

> I am glad to infer, with confidence from the figures before me, that there is no lack of youths in Scotland who like the business of the Church ministry for their vocation in life. That is not so in all lands at the present time. In two great countries, Germany and France, there is a great decline in the number of candidates for ordination both in Protestant and Roman communions. In Holland, it is said that one-seventh of the cures are vacant. There were, some time back, similar apprehensions on this score in England—at least, in the Established Church of England, amid the desolating convulsions it has undergone; but I think they have diminished or passed away. There are, however, traces of a latent feeling here and elsewhere, that Divine interests are secondary or unreal in comparison with those of the physical or experimental world, or that the difficulties belonging to subjects of religion are such that to handle them effectually and with a sound conscience is hopeless.

For ourselves, we believe that the influence on the supply of clergy, of the causes to which we have referred has been, and is, much exaggerated. Even were it not so, and the state of the case to be as alleged, we should be sorry to see the ranks of the clergy extended by any sacrifice at the shrine, either of Liberalism or Mediævalism, of the Protestant and Scriptural truth which characterises the doctrinal and liturgical standards of our Reformed Church, or by covering over and concealing the differences and divisions of antagonistic schools of thought with a veil of so-called charity. We do not say that here and there some of these causes do not operate, but we are satisfied their effect is very limited, and that the chief cause for the stationary figures of the annual ordinations is to be sought in other directions. Two kinds of influence have been at work. One is the deepened sense of responsibility as to the ministerial office which has happily grown up of late years, and *pari passu* with this, there has been the

withdrawal of many inducements—worldly inducements may we call them?—to take holy orders which formerly existed. During the last twenty years or so, partly as the result of changes introduced by the Endowed Schools' Commissioners, by which holy orders are no longer in most cases a requisite condition for masterships, there has been a considerable decrease in the ordination of graduates engaged in tuition. The great majority of college fellowships are now held free of the obligations to take orders. The termination of the Concordat between the Education Department and the Archbishops, as to the inspectorships of Church schools, and the action of the department in confining the office of H. M. Inspector to laymen, have also not been without some influence. We believe also it would be found, on investigation, that fewer family cadets are now destined from early years for the occupation of family livings. The *tone* of public opinion has been raised, and parents are more shy of putting pressure on their sons in the direction of the ministerial office.

All this affects materially, no doubt, the number of ordinations. But it is really the reverse of discouraging. For it proves that, even with the ordination-figures stationary, there must be a positive increase in the number of men ordained for parochial work. Moreover, it is as true of the Church as of the army, that twenty hearty volunteers are worth more than any number of pressed or bribed men. The mischief has been incalculable which has been done to Christianity and to the Church of England in days gone by, and is done now, through the ordination to the ministry of men without spirituality or a converted heart—of men to whom all truth is unreal, and the discharge of ministerial and pastoral functions a mere perfunctory thing, empty of life, and unction, and peace. Such men may go through the round of ceremonialism with decent propriety, and perhaps even deceive themselves by imagining that religion is equivalent to godliness, the regulation-posture at a so-called altar an act of faith, and busy-ness about ecclesiastical decoration or Church work the realisation of the ministerial ideal. But let the ideal embrace, as it must, the honest preaching of God's truth, the skilled and faithful dealing in tenderness with souls in all the varied phases of spiritual experience, and who does not see how entirely uncongenial hearty work of this kind must be to the man who is of the world worldly, who has no conscious sympathy with God, no living experience of the power of the Holy Ghost in his own heart, who knows nothing, and can tell nothing of what God has done for his own soul. We can well believe that the consideration of this has had something to do with the deficiency in clergy supply. Men are not so ready, as formerly they were, to answer offhand the plain and searching

questions of the ordination service, and every true Churchman may thank God for it.

It is in view of these circumstances that once and again during the past few years the question has been boldly pressed forward whether the time has not arrived for reconsidering the provisions of the Pluralities Acts, with a view to the more economical employment of the strength which the Church of England possesses in the aggregate number of the clergy. It is impossible, in the limited space at our disposal, to present the case so strongly as it might be presented, but a few facts as to the relative numbers of the town and rural clergy, and the work which devolves upon them, will suffice to indicate the grounds on which the advocates of a change rest their case. Some few years ago the *Quarterly Review* had some remarks on the unequal distribution of the clergy, though not with any reference to the repeal of the Pluralities Acts and the union of small parishes. So far as we know, the figures then published have never been controverted. It was there stated that for some 15,000,000 of town population there were employed less than 6000 clergy, incumbents and curates included, with endowments of only 750,000*l.*, while for 7,500,000 of rural population there were upwards of 13,000 clergy, with endowments of about 2,750,000*l.*! Further inquiry has elicited the fact that of 10,700 benefices in the Southern Province, about two-fifths have a population of less than 400 all told, while of these two-fifths, nearly one-half or 2100 have a population of 200 or less—that is, on an outside estimate, about forty or fifty families. What makes the anomaly more conspicuous is the fact, that very often the smaller parishes are the better endowed, so as to justify the sarcastic criticism sometimes heard, that Church endowments are distributed in an inverse ratio to the population and the amount of work to be done. It is now forty years or more since the author of "Essays on the Church" specified the unequal distribution of endowments as one of the glaring illustrations of the need of Church reform.

But the immediate question which the Bishop of Norwich seems anxious to ventilate is not the readjustment of disproportional endowments, but the union under one incumbent of small and scantily-endowed parishes, so as thereby to set free clerical power, which is now running to waste for want of sufficient material on which to employ itself, and at the same time, to give to the clergyman a sufficient, or, at least, a better income. *Primâ facie*, any proposal to repeal or modify the stringent enactments of the Pluralities Acts would probably be met with a decided negative. More than forty years have passed by, carrying with them an entire generation of clergy, since the Act 1 and 2 Vict. c. 106, received the Royal assent

with the unanimous approbation of all parties. The crying abuses of nepotism and plurality which disfigured the Church of England for the half century preceding the Queen's Accession, and made it a by-word and a reproach to the enemy, have become so entirely a thing of the past as to linger only in the memories of the elder clergy. It was a time when the Sparkes, the Norths, the Pretymans, and others of equal notoriety revelled in the enjoyment of piled-up preferments; when a hack curate, holding also perhaps the mastership of a grammar school, would take three or four services in parishes miles apart, before sunset; when three brothers in the diocese of Norwich held between them fifteen livings; and when of some 500 curates, four-fifths were employed by non-resident incumbents. "A burnt child dreads the fire." It is therefore not unnatural for those who recall the experiences of those days to feel somewhat suspicious and even alarmed at the proposal to undo even partially what was so wisely done when Parliament passed the first Pluralities Act.

On the other hand, it will be replied that though the law was wisely brought to bear at that time in a trenchant and sweeping way, as the only effectual method of eradicating very gross abuses, yet now that the abuses are got rid of, and a healthier moral tone has been developed alike among clergy and laity, the Church may fairly be allowed to reconstruct her ecclesiastical system and reorganise her forces. Even should this involve the union of contiguous small parishes, the Church authorities, it is argued, may be trusted to provide ample safeguards against the possible recurrence, under cover of the proposed arrangements, of these now extinct abuses. For ourselves we are by no means prepared to say that such safeguards are impossible of construction. But the danger is a palpable one, and would demand the most careful and stringent precautions to protect the Church against it. There is, unquestionably, a good deal of truth and justice in the contention of the Bishop of Norwich as to the waste of strength under existing circumstances. But in the absence of other and equally important changes, we are by no means sure that the suggestion for uniting under one pastorate adjacent small parishes is capable of very extensive realisation; in cities, it may be feasible, because the people are clustered together, though even there, the union generally involves the removal of one of the churches, a result which is not contemplated in the case of the rural parishes. But in the country, where the churches are two and perhaps even three miles apart, it is not clear how the people can be provided with two services at each church, unless the incumbent be compelled to employ a curate. In that case there seems no sufficient reason, speaking generally, why each parish should not have its own resident pastor, as at present. We should view with something stronger than regret any attempt

to re-establish the custom of restricting the services in a parish to one on a Sunday, unless in the case of a very small parish, or where the neighbouring parish church is within easy walking distance. It strikes us, indeed, that any such proposal as that hinted at by the Bishop of Norwich, even if desirable on the grounds indicated by his lordship, would be of small practical use for setting the clergy free for town curacies, unless steps were taken for the establishment of a permanent diaconate. This element of the question is, however, too large an one to be fairly considered at the close of our Article.

## ART. VI.—THE MAGNIFICAT.

### ITS LITURGICAL USE.

THE Song of the Virgin Mary has become a Song of the Church. Therefore the reflections (presented in a former Paper[1]) on its first intention and personal bearing may properly be followed by a few words on its liturgical use.

The Christian instinct has rightly felt that the first utterances of faith and joy at the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ should not be left as silent records in a book, but should sound as living voices for ever, and that the breath of the Holy Ghost, which is in them, should be felt in the congregation to the end of time. These Songs thus become both a means of unity and a refreshment of faith: for thus the devotions of the ages become one with each other, through the element which they all successively inherit from their common source; and, in using the words, every generation feels closer to the time when they were spoken first, and renews its sense of the historic truth of the events which attended the incarnation of the Son of God.

But, besides these benefits from the liturgical use of the Canticles, there is a fitness in the words themselves to become the perpetual voice of the Church. Has not this been always felt? Is it not felt now? How many worshippers still breathe out their own emotions in "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour!" knowing now the full meaning of that word, as she who first uttered it could not at the time have known it. How many, with a larger intelligence than was then possible for her, marvel and rejoice at the "great things," which "He that is mighty has done" for servants in such "low estate!" How many repeat the assurance that

[1] THE CHURCHMAN, p. 301.

"His mercy is on them that fear Him from generation to generation," with a thankful consciousness that this mercy has now descended to their own generation, and lightened on their own souls!

Indeed, this first strophe may be said to be our best instruction in the true principles of praise. It shows us that "if praise express itself in words, it is yet in its essence an internal act," an act in "my soul," and (going yet deeper into my nature) an act in "my spirit;" as also appears in the great Psalm of Thanksgiving, "Praise the Lord, O my *soul*, and *all that is within me* bless His holy name." So also when "magnifying" deepens into "rejoicing," we learn that true praise is not only duteous homage, but also spontaneous joy; and when the great name, "the Lord," is followed by the sweeter title of "God my Saviour," we are taught in what kind of faith and experience the reasons for that joy will be found. Again, in the following verses we see how naturally the highest apprehension of blessedness will ally itself with the deepest sense of holiness, and how the view of "great things done to" us will solemnise as well as elevate the mind, disposing to such reverent adoration as is condensed in the ascription, "and holy is His name."

In the second division of the Song the truths proclaimed are also proper to be recorded through the whole course of human history. So long as there is vanity in the imaginations of men's hearts, and arrogancy comes out of their mouths; so long as there is unbelief in the seats of teaching and oppression on the thrones of government; so long as there is in the common mind a worship of wealth and confidence in the arm of flesh; so long, in short, as the world continues what it always has been and still is, so long should the prophetic strain be heard in the houses of God:

> He hath shewed strength with His arm.
> He hath scattered the proud in the imaginations of their hearts.
> He hath put down the mighty from their seats: and hath exalted the humble and meek.
> He hath filled the hungry with good things: and the rich He hath sent empty away.

It is fit that, like the Psalmist,[1] we should feel how great a change passes on the outward scene when we "go into the sanctuary of God;" and how the high things of this world shrink and wither under the breath of the world to come. They pass before us here in their chief forms: the pride of intellect and of the imaginations of the heart; the pride of rank and power and sway over others; the pride of possession and self-sufficiency,

[1] Ps. lxxiii. 17.

which says, "I am rich and increased with goods, and have need of nothing." The Song presents these forms of pride as scattered, cast down, or sent empty away, because at last the truth of things is come. In so doing it celebrates no secondary accident of the Kingdom of Heaven, but its essential principle, that "God resisteth the proud and giveth grace to the lowly."[1] The same strain is heard from all the voices of the prophets, who have told of the day when "the lofty looks of man should be humbled, and the haughtiness of men should be bowed down," and when also "the meek should increase their joy in the Lord, and the poor among men rejoice in the Holy One of Israel." With this exalting of the humble, and this filling of the hungry, the Son of Man began His whole course of teaching.

He opened His mouth and taught them, saying,
Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.
Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth . . . .
Blessed are they that do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled.

The exaltation thus assigned to one moral state implies a corresponding downfall in its opposite; which indeed, in other places, the Lord spares not to announce, and the express declaration of which is added to these very beatitudes in St. Luke's report (Luke vi. 24-6). But the first place is occupied in the Lord's discourse by the exaltation of the humble, and in the Virgin's Song by the downfall of the proud, because He is "lifting up His eyes on His disciples," and she is lifting up her eyes on the world as it was; He speaking in the midst of a Church which was forming, she at a time when no Church was gathered. But with us the two elements are ever present; the spirit of the world and the spirit of the gospel, working according to their several natures: and to the one is administered a needful warning, to the other a strong consolation, by ever-repeated words which tell in effect that "he that exalteth himself shall be abased, and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted."

If the principle of divine government which the Song proclaims is one to be rehearsed for ever, so also is the testimony with which it concludes.

He remembering his mercy, hath holpen his servant Israel: as he promised to our forefathers, Abraham and his seed for ever.

We see how great stress is laid in the Holy Word on the continuity of the plan of God. A thousand links, some obvious, some intricate, bind the New Testament to the Old. As many as are the references in the pages of the Old Testament to the

[1] Prov. iii. 34, quoted, James iv. 6, and 1 Pet. v. 5, *αντιτασσεται τοις υπηφανοις*. Sets himself against them, as in battle array.

things which shall come after, so many are the references in the pages of the New to the promises which had been made before. It is of great moment to the due appreciation of the gospel that we regard it as the scheme of God from the beginning, in which the law itself was but parenthetic, and that we recognise the salvation which was once presented to anticipation, that which we now enjoy at present, and that which is "ready to be revealed in the last time," as successive stages of one everlasting covenant.

For us the words "to Abraham and to his seed for ever," are associated with a voice which echoed them, and a teaching which explained them; that in which the Apostle of the Gentiles contracts the seed of Abraham into the single person of Christ, and in so doing expands it to all that are in Him, in all nations and through all ages.

> Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, "And to seeds," as of many; but as of one. And to thy seed, which is Christ.
>
> As many of you as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ.
>
> And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.—Gal. iii. 16, 27, 29.

Thus to its last word the Song is all our own, and claims of right the Doxology to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, with which we end it, and by which the Church adopts as its own the proleptic psalms and hymns, and *naturalises* them, so to speak, in the perfected revelation of truth.

One concluding observation remains to be made concerning the Liturgic use of the Canticles, and in particular of this, the first voice of New Testament praise. Thus incorporated into the devotions of the Church, they become examples of the *tone* of Christian song, and give the key-note to the general praise.

The tones of Christian song must be various, as are the emotions which it expresses, and the themes which it celebrates. But this variety makes it all the more necessary to maintain the influence of the examples divinely provided, as permanent standards of the best type of devotion. This benefit is more than ever to be appreciated in the day in which we live. A certain facility of composition is widely diffused, utterance is become voluble, the standard is generally taken from the popular taste, and there is an ever-increasing confusion of religious voices in the air. For the hymns of such a time there will be various kinds of danger, but especially that of a free indulgence in bold and heated expression, and of an easy, familiar tone on sacred topics, which must in its ultimate effect impair and depreciate the general character of religion. Over this tendency

the Canticles sung in our Churches exercise a kind of oblique restraint, attuning devout minds to reverence and lowliness, and to that grave and tender reserve which suggests more than it utters, and chastens holy joy in order to exalt it. Thus, through all the variations of feeling incidental to place, to time, and to individual temper, the strain of Christian song is kept in tune with the voices which lead it, among which was heard first, and is heard still, "The Magnificat, or Song of the Blessed Virgin Mary."

T. D. BERNARD.

NOTE.—To these observations on the Magnificat, I will venture to append the expression of a wish that we had an authorised selection and collection of the scriptural and chief ecclesiastical Canticles, with some greater liberty for variation and interchange in their liturgical use. Such a collection is found in the famous Utrecht Psalter. A beautiful MS. volume of a late date (1514), in the Cathedral Library at Wells, contains, I think, the same selection and in the same order, only that the Psalms, instead of being illustrated, as in the Utrecht Psalter, by curious pictures, are accompanied throughout by explanatory glosses and many admirable Collects.

The contents are as follows:—

1. The whole Psalter, with the additions mentioned.
2. Canticum Esaie, Is. xii.
3. Scriptura Ezekie Regis, Is. xxxviii. 9-21.
4. Canticum Anne, 1 Sam. ii. 1-11.
Oratio Abacce pro ignorationibus, Hab. iii.
6. Canticum Moysi, Exod. xv. 1-19.
7. Canticum Moysi, Deut. xxxii. 1-44.
8. Ambrosii et Augustini. Te Deum.
9. Canticum trium puerorum. Benedicite.
10. Canticum Zacharie. Benedictus.
11. Canticum dive Marie Virginis. Magnificat.
12. Canticum Symeonis. Nunc dimittis.
13. Symbolum Athanasii. Quicunque vult.

It is interesting to see how entirely the "Athanasian Creed" was reckoned, not as a Creed properly so-called, but as a hymn or Canticle in expansion of the Creed, or a song of defence against assaults of heresy.

## ART. VII.—THE DOCTRINE OF THE FATHERS ON THE LORD'S SUPPER.

THE Eucharistic controversy, as waged between the different sections of the Church of England, has long been in a state eminently unsatisfactory. The question at issue turns in this, as probably it does in all other cases, on matters of fact. The ultimate authority is admitted by all parties to lie in the intention of Christ, and in the words by which the Sacrament was

first instituted. Protestants do not admit that there is the least ambiguity in these words, or, taking the whole teaching of our Lord together, any difficulty whatever in definitely fixing their meaning. They are quite prepared to abide by the literal form of our Lord's words. It has been acutely pointed out by that eminent dialectician, the late Dr. Vogan, in his work on the Eucharist, that the literal meaning of the words of institution is fatal to the modern doctrine that the natural Body and Blood of Christ are to be found in, with, or under the elements by virtue of their consecration. The natural element cannot contain that with which it is itself identical. But however this may be, Protestants do not admit that the words of institution are doubtful in such a sense, that they themselves have any doubt of their meaning; but in the sense that different people put different interpretations upon them, they are bound to admit it. Appeal to the words themselves fails therefore to furnish an end to controversy, so long as they are thus variously interpreted. The Roman Catholic, the Lutheran, the Zwinglian, and the Calvinist, the Ritualist and the Evangelical, all appeal to the same words, but are separated *toto cælo* in the sense which they put upon them.

In this state of things the interpretation put upon the words of institution by the Christians of the early centuries, and the views they consequently entertained of the nature and effects of the Lord's Supper, become a very important element in the controversy. Those who decline to accept the Fathers as authorities may yet value them highly as witnesses to the belief of their day. If those who conversed with the Apostles, and the generations immediately subsequent to them, are found to have understood the words of institution in one uniform and unvarying sense, the fact can scarcely be regarded otherwise than as raising a strong presumption that this particular sense is the true one. But is it a fact, that the Real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the consecrated elements did form part of the faith of Christians from the first? The Anglo-Catholic section of the Church of England confidently affirms the assertion to be true and reiterates it with the utmost emphasis and confidence. For instance, we have recently been told that "it is as clear as day that S. Ignatius understood S. John vi. 51—of the bread of the holy Eucharist;" that "not only in the age of S. Ignatius and afterwards, but in the very earliest times, in the days of S. Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Eucharistic table was a Θυσιαστήριον. And of course, if so, that which was offered upon it, and eaten off it, was θυσία, a sacrifice, and he who celebrated it was λειτουργός, a priest;"—that Ignatius considered the consecrated elements to be "the medicine of immortality, the union of his flesh to that of Christ," and that this mode of speaking

was not peculiar to him: that it was the teaching of the early Church that "the Eucharist (that is, the consecrated elements) is the flesh and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ," which suffered for our sins, which the Father in His mercy raised again; "that the doctrine of S. Irænеus is perfectly clear and conclusive for the Real Presence."[1] Such assertions may carry little weight with those who are accustomed to examine the authorities for themselves, but at all events they bear witness to the strong and confident convictions of the party represented by the writer. Yet Protestants speak with equal decision on the other side, and unhesitatingly affirm that such statements, as have been quoted, do not justly represent the teaching of the early Fathers, and are only made plausible either by mistaking rhetorical language for dogmatic statement, or by misapprehension of the real issue which has been raised in the course of discussion, or by careless and defective quotation. They have shown their confidence in this view by reiterated attempts to bring the question to the test of public examination. Thus the matter has stood pretty much since the Reformation. For the present no more is necessary than to refer, in proof, to the language of Bishop Jewell, in his celebrated sermon at St. Paul's Cross, repeatedly renewed as the challenge has subsequently been; as, for instance, by Archbishop Usher, in his "answer to a challenge made by a Jesuit."

And yet the disputed fact is one which, in its own nature, should admit of ready determination. The passages from the early Fathers, at all events, are very few in number. It is true that their language in many instances is exceedingly loose and inaccurate, and almost entirely devoid of that precision which the controversies of succeeding ages have compelled more modern writers to adopt, as theology has been reduced more and more to an exact and scientific form. Nevertheless, inaccurate and rhetorical as is the language of the early Fathers, the difficulty of clearly determining their views on the subject of the Lord's Supper cannot be insuperable. Why, then, have things remained in this unsatisfactory state? It is because High Church writers on this subject have up to the month of October last steadily refused to face the question, or to enter on any thorough vindication of their statements.

That the state of the case may be clearly seen, it is desirable that the facts should be more precisely recapitulated. In no religious controversy can all the members of a school be expected to examine for themselves the authorities on which their case rests; this must be the duty of the few, who have time and inclination for so laborious an inquiry. It is no disrespect, there-

[1] "Doctrine of the Fathers on the Real Presence." *Church Quarterly Review*, October, 1879.

fore, to the High Sacramentalists, with whom we are in conflict on this subject, to express the belief that their views have been mainly founded on the writings of Archdeacon Wilberforce and Archdeacon Denison, on the array of authors contained in the elaborate judgment of Sir Robert Phillimore in Sheppard *v.* Bennett, and above all in the catena furnished by Dr. Pusey. Not only has the high reputation of this last-named divine served to justify the confidence placed in his authority, but his own strong assertions have naturally increased the feeling. Thus, he writes :—

> The following evidence that the belief in the Real Presence was part of the faith of Christians from the first, is more than enough to convince one who is willing to be convinced. If this convinces not, neither would any other. There is no flaw, no doubt, I might almost say no loophole, except that man always finds one to escape what he is unwilling to accept.
>
> I have now . . . . gone through every writer who in his extant works speaks of the Holy Eucharist, from the time when St. John the Evangelist was translated to his Lord to the date of the Fourth General Council, A.D. 451, a period of three centuries and a half. I have suppressed nothing; I have not knowingly omitted anything; I have given every passage, as far as in me lay, with so much of the context as was necessary for the clear exhibition of the meaning.—" Doctrine of the Real Presence," pp. 316, 317, 715.

The immense influence which Dr. Pusey's works have exercised is proved by the testimony of his own friends. Rev. W. E. Bennett addresses Dr. Pusey thus—" I have gradually learned from yourself, and from other doctors of the Church, to whom in your writings you have referred, the essential necessity of these great truths." The devout John Keble speaks yet more positively, in the preface to his work on Eucharistical adoration —" This I do not profess to demonstrate, but accept it as demonstrated by Dr. Pusey."

His own competence for the task he asserts, gently indeed, but very firmly, affirming that he had lived with the Fathers for the last twenty years, as " in his home." How, in the face of such assertions, it can be possible for any writer to use such language as the following, we are at a loss to conceive :—" Dr. Pusey is not responsible for the penning of the patristic passages; he is not responsible, except to a limited extent, for their selection. They are the common-places of the subject, found in a long extent of theological treatises and manuals." The last clause may perhaps explain a good deal of what appears otherwise to be utterly inexplicable.

It must be remembered that not one writer, but many, have emphatically denied the truth of Dr. Pusey's conclusions, and questioned the accuracy of his quotations. The learned work of

the late Dean Goode on the Eucharist is one long bill of indictment against them. This work was, indeed, already passing through the press when the volume on "The Doctrine of the Real Presence," &c., was published, but Dr. Pusey's views had already been made known. In regard to him Dean Goode uses the following language:—"How, as respects a large proportion of these passages, Dr. Pusey himself could suppose that they convey any proof that their authors held this doctrine, it is difficult to imagine. The whole evidence in the case of almost all of them seems to lie in the fact that in speaking of the consecrated elements they apply to them the terms 'the Holy Blood of Christ.' But, as I shall show presently, this fact proves nothing." In his subsequent volume on "The Real Presence," &c., Dr. Pusey has referred more than once to Dean Goode's arguments, and expressed his hope of replying to them, if health should permit. But the intention has never been carried into effect. The Dean of Ripon has not stood alone. He was promptly supported by no less a person than the acute and learned Bishop Thirlwall, who in his charge, delivered October, 1857, discussed the doctrine of the Eucharist, and expressed himself thus:—

I believe, however, that the so-called Catholic teaching, understood as I have said, is no less repugnant both to Scripture and to the whole stream of genuine primitive tradition, though, by means of compilations, which are bringing the name of a catena into suspicion and disrepute, as equivalent to an engine of polemical delusion, it may be made to appear to have a great mass of patristic evidence in its favour. —"Remains of Bishop Thirlwall," vol. i. p. 266.

A foot-note to the same page adds:—

A very large part of the passages collected by Dr. Pusey in his notes on his sermon, "The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist," would be deprived of all even seeming relevancy and argumentative value by the simple insertion of the words sacramental and sacramentally.

In 1869 the learned Dr. H. Burgess, formerly editor of the *Clerical Journal*, published his work on "The Reformed Church of England, in its Principles and their Legitimate Development." The fourth chapter is devoted to the subject of the Lord's Supper. Among the page headings occurs the following:—"Use of Justin, by Dr. Pusey." He closes his discussion on the evidence of antiquity in the following words:—

We think we have proved that, unless we are to extend that tradition (primitive tradition) far into mediæval times, it is utterly unable to lend its countenance to any of the mysterious doctrines and ceremonies made to cluster round the Lord's Supper by the Church of Rome, and its imitators, the Anglican-Catholic party.—P. 196.

The charge was subsequently renewed by Dr. Vogan in his

great work on the "True Doctrine of the Eucharist," originally issued in 1849, but republished in an enlarged form in 1871. He too appeals to the Fathers, and after quoting a passage from Hilary, says: "This part of Dr. Pusey's work is largely made up, I think, of passages as little pertinent to the purpose. In fact, I find that fully one half in number, and much more in bulk, of the passages he has cited to prove 'that the belief in the Real Presence was part of the faith of Christians from the first' are quite inapplicable, and consequently that the number of the Fathers he has called in evidence must be considerably reduced:" (page 148). He subsequently points out, as, for instance, in Chapters xii. and xiii., causes which have led to the misunderstanding of the Fathers who are quoted, and concludes the discussion thus:—

> Let the reader . . . place this brief statement of the doctrine of the Real Presence side by side with the extracts which have been or may be produced from the Fathers; he will see that these venerable authorities give no sanction to this doctrine; and that, for well nigh a thousand years, they proclaim with one voice their belief in our Lord's words, when He said of the bread, "This—is—my body which is given for you! This—is—my blood which is shed for you;" a belief which Dr. Pusey again and again states and acknowledges, but strangely converts into the belief of his own very different and self-contradictory doctrine.—P. 161.

Then followed the works of Dr. Harrison. "Whose are the Fathers?" was published in 1867, and the author states his thesis thus: "Our serious charge against these Anglo-Catholics is that the extracts given from the Fathers are often garbled, and many passages, though not garbled, have been quoted apart from the context, which, if it had been given with the extracts, would have made them useless for the purpose for which they were adduced." This charge was reiterated with further evidences and illustrations in the "Answer to Dr. Pusey's Challenge respecting the Doctrine of the Real Presence," published in 1871, in which he formally renews his accusation of "garbled extracts, unfair translations, and unaccountable omissions."

It thus appears that it is not Dr. Harrison alone who has impugned the quotations adduced by Dr. Pusey to prove that the Real Presence was part of the faith of Christians from the first. He is but the last of a considerable succession of writers, some of whom have been men of the highest reputation and position in the Church, to say nothing of many minor publications of the same general kind which have reiterated the same complaint. Yet of these charges no serious notice whatever has ever been taken.

The *Church Quarterly* states the fact with evident self-

congratulation. It quietly ignores all the other writers named, and mentions Dr. Harrison alone.

It had been anticipated that this bold attempt to claim the Fathers for the Protestant side, and to refute Dr. Pusey, would raise a perfect storm in the Ritualistic and High Church camp. Instead of that there was perfect silence even of the good-natured kind. Not even the majestic challenge of the *Christian Observer* could elicit a single word.

There must be some one among them, writes that editor, although there may probably not be many, who has sufficient acquaintance with patristic learning to rebut the crushing exposure, if indeed the assertions of Dr. Harrison can be met. As it is, Dr. Pusey is arraigned before the world on charges which amount to mendacity—no less!—of the most shameful and disingenuous character. The system of Rome, it is true, is a system of forgery and lies; but he never has professed that he is a Romanist. We shall wait with much anxiety to see what answer can be made by him or for him.

And he has waited ever since January, 1864.

The complacent satisfaction breathed throughout this extract is singularly misplaced. Men are so naturally identified with the principles they profess, that the character of the one cannot be called into question without injuring the influence of the other. Public writers have no right to sit down contentedly under the grave accusation of misleading the Church of Christ. Either the accusation is false, or true; if false, it is a duty to repel it; if true, it is a yet higher duty to submit to it. Every conceivable motive might have been supposed to suggest an indignant, immediate, and complete refutation of charges so discreditable to those that made them, if they are false; so discreditable to those against whom they were alleged, if they are true. Yet a serious attempt at vindication has never been made. The silence of assumed contempt has been maintained, not only from 1874, but from the publication of Dean Goode's work in 1856, down to October, 1879. For three-and-twenty years the party has been content to lie under the gravest suspicions which can possibly be alleged against public writers, and above all against theologians.

But at last the silence has been broken. Dr. Harrison condensed his previous works into one small readable volume, under the title of the "Fathers against Dr. Pusey." He subsequently issued a yet smaller publication, of which he has circulated 20,000 copies throughout the country. It can be readily understood that this measure was too formidable to be overlooked. Hence the Article in the *Church Quarterly* of last October. Its appearance should be a matter of most sincere congratulation, for it admits the gravity of the accusations made against the catenas of Dr. Pusey, and of others of his school. It moves the controversy one step forward, and opens a prospect, at

last, of bringing the opposing facts alleged on either side to a final and conclusive settlement. It does more. The writer, in order to vindicate in certain selected crucial instances the sense put upon the language of the Fathers, is compelled in his own defence to explain the canons by which it has been interpreted. The wonder of the fact, as well as the fact itself, is thus shifted onward. No one can be surprised that with such canons of interpretation as are now maintained, the teaching of the Fathers should be supposed to support the doctrine of the Real Presence, for the whole question is really begged beforehand. The only subject of surprise is, that such canons should ever have been adopted. If they can be sustained, the allegations of Dr. Pusey will be justified. But if no one of them will bear examination, the entire argument founded upon them falls at once to the ground.

Here, therefore, the personal questions with which the main issue has been encumbered may all be dropped. No further allusion will be made, for instance, to Dr. Pusey. Had it not been necessary for a full statement of the case, his name would not have been used at all. Christian courtesy may be allowed to distinguish between the theologian and the man. Not but that, even as a theologian, Dr. Pusey has rendered noble service to the Church of Christ. His work on Daniel and his commentary on the minor Prophets, for instance, will ever remain a κτῆμα εἰς ἀεί. Would that it were possible, in the recollection of services like these, to forget the incalculable evils that have resulted to the Church of England, and to the interests of God's truth at large, from the system which first sprang into activity under the shelter of his name. It is no little misfortune that the respect due to the undisputed learning and unquestioned personal piety of one who has filled so large a place in the recent history of the Church of England as to have been called "The Great Anglican Doctor," should be clouded by such a recollection, or that indignant protest should be mingled with the sympathy with which all parties in the Church will regard the domestic afflictions of an aged Christian. May it be with him as it was with Bellarmine in his last hours, that he may find during the closing years of life the strength and consolation of his soul in Christ, and Christ alone. It is no unfaithfulness to truth to express the hope that the hard tones of controversy may be gently tempered to the ears on which are beginning to break the everlasting harmonies of the better world.

Here also may be dropped for the most part the personal discussion between the *Church Quarterly* and Dr. Harrison. It has been shown that he is not the only antagonist with whom the maintainers of the Real Presence, as part of the faith of Christians from the first, have to do. He is but the latest of

a series of writers who have maintained the same accusations against ultra Church catenas as himself, and whose reputation stands as far above the reach of any supercilious indifference, as their arguments stand above the reach of loose reasoning and unproved assumptions. Dr. Harrison is well able to defend himself, and may be assured that contemptuous references to "Edinburgh Theology" and hard words of reproof will alike be brushed aside by any independent reader, as equally irrelevant and unbecoming. The personal discussion is altogether overshadowed by the grave issue at stake. We do not care so much to know in what points any particular writer is right and in which points he is wrong, as we care to know whether the early Church did, or did not, believe in the Real Presence of the true Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated elements at the Lord's Supper. On this question attention must now be concentrated by the critical examination of the four canons laid down by the *Church Quarterly* as rules for interpreting the language of the Fathers. For on these canons the whole question will be found to turn. There are, however, some points on which it is desirable to dwell for a short time, before the personal side of the controversy is entirely dismissed.

Great fault is found with the assertion that "the doctrine of the Real Presence was unknown to the Christian Church till it was invented by Paschasius Radbert in the ninth century." The words do not, be it observed, refer to transubstantiation. On the mode in which the Body and Blood of Christ are present in the elements they say nothing. It is on the fact of their alleged presence that stress is justly laid. "If Dr. Harrison errs in his estimate of the doctrine of Paschasius, he errs, it must be admitted, in good company. "About A.D. 831, Paschasius Radbert, a monk, and afterwards Abbot of Corbie, maintained the corporal presence. Whether even he taught the full-grown doctrine of transubstantiation, or only consubstantiation, our divines have questioned." So has written no less competent a witness than Dr. Harold Browne, the present Bishop of Winchester ("Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles," p. 696). Hagenbach, whose authority is admitted to be "considerable," makes the same assertion. "Gerbert, whose reputation was great in those days, endeavoured to illustrate the doctrine propounded by Paschasius of a real change of the bread into the Body of Christ" ("History of Doctrines," pp. 11, 84). Gieseler, in a passage containing several points well worthy of attention, says:—

The ecclesiastical mode of speaking, that bread and wine in the Lord's Supper became by consecration the Body and Blood of Christ, may have been frequently understood of a transformation of substance by the uneducated; but among the theologians of the West, this

misconception could not so readily find acceptance, in consequence of the clear explanations given by the celebrated Augustine. When, therefore, Paschasius Radbert, a monk, and Abbot of Corbie from 844-851, expressly taught such a transformation, he met with considerable opposition.—"Ecclesiastical History," vol. ii. p. 284.

This passage is the more noticeable because an attempt has been made to create confusion as to the teaching of Paschasius, by quoting certain phrases which, taken by themselves, apart from their context, appear to bear an Evangelical meaning. The attempt is more ingenious than it is ingenuous. It is scarcely accurate to state that the sentiment of Paschasius is expressed in the words "Christum vorari fas dentibus non est." In his letter to Trudegard he ascribes the sentiment to Augustine. "If I could believe," he says, "that it was the body our Lord took from the Virgin Mary, his mother, yet, on the other side, even the illustrious doctor Augustine declares this to be a great sin; which wise saying seems to excite too much horror in the recipients, unless they believe that to be present in the sacrament which the truth testifies to exist in reality (in aperto). And if they shall have believed that this is so, as some believe, nevertheless they incur that sin, inasmuch as they believe falsely, because it is thus spoken, that it may be lawful that Christ should be eaten with the teeth (quia sic dictum est, ut fas sit eum dentibus vorari)." But he proceeds to allege that Augustine had contradicted himself in this matter, and draws a distinction between two concurrent acts, implying that Augustine was partly right and partly wrong. "Thus partly (ex parte) all do not eat with the mouth, but with the heart, and by faith we believe that it is the Body and Blood of Christ." He is writing, it must be remembered, to one whose mind had been disturbed by the language of Augustine ("cujus te commoveri sententia dixisti"). (Migne Patrologia, vol. cxx. pp. 1551, 2). He allows a considerable place to faith in his argument, but the province he gives to faith is very different to what Augustine gives to it; it is faith in the fact that the bread and wine become after consecration the actual Body and Blood of Christ, "the flesh in which He was born in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and which hung upon the cross, and the blood which was shed upon the cross, and which was then in His own body" (Ibid.). In his great treatise, "De Corpore et Sanguine Domini," he explains his own meaning thus: "Sub eorum specie visibili quæ videtur, secretius virtute divina caro consecratur, ut hæc sint interius veritate, quod exterius creduntur virtute fidei:" under the visible form of Sacraments by the inward power of God, is consecrated flesh, so that they are inwardly and in truth what they are outwardly believed to be by faith. Here we see the meaning attached by Paschasius to such words as "potentialiter, efficaciter," and so forth, when used

by Paschasius. The object of faith is the actuality of the flesh and blood present in the Sacrament. It is not easy to define the precise doctrine of this writer, and hence the wise caution with which Bishop Harold Browne speaks in the passage already quoted. That has happened to Paschasius Radbert which has happened to well nigh every teacher of a new doctrine, that its logical results have been carried out by his followers to extremes which he himself never contemplated.

There is nothing in all this to throw a shadow of suspicion on the trustworthiness and consistency of Dr. Harrison. Nor is the attempt to damage his authority more successful which is founded on his quotations from Augustine. He has been accused of picking out particular passages, without either considering their context or inquiring as to their consistency with other passages from the same writer. No doubt Dr. Harrison would reply, that this is the very thing which he himself has done, and which he charges his opponents with not doing. Indeed, here again he is in most excellent company:—

> We must now proceed to Augustine, whom all agree to honour. He has so much to the purpose, that how to choose is difficult. "Prepare not thy teeth, but thy heart." "Why make ready thy teeth and thy belly? Believe and thou hast eaten. Our Lord hesitated not to say, *This is my Body*, when He gave the sign of His Body." "Spiritually understand what I have spoken to you. You are not to eat that Body which you see, and drink that Blood which they will shed who will crucify Me. I have commended to you a Sacrament. Spiritually understood, it will quicken you. Though it must be visibly celebrated, it must be invisibly understood." "What you see is bread and the cup. But as your faith requires, the bread is Christ's Body, the cup is His Blood. How is the bread His Body, and the wine His Blood? These things, brethren, are therefore called Sacraments, because in them one thing is seen, another understood. What appears is a bodily form: What is understood has a spiritual point." "The Body and Blood of Christ will then be life to each, if what is visibly received in the Sacrament be in actual verity spiritually eaten, spiritually drunk."—"Bishop of Winchester Exp.," pp. 693-4.

One more subject must be noticed before the way is clear. There is no part of this controversy which has been pushed into such subtleties, or made the occasion of such contradictions, as that which surrounds the phrase "spiritual body." The Church of England asserts, in language as precise as it seems possible to use, that "the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one"—(Post Communion Rubric). Yes, it is replied, that is undoubtedly true. But it is not the "natural body" of which we speak, but the spiritual body. This spiritual body is that in which the Lord

now sits in heaven, and it possesses capacities and attributes altogether unknown to the natural body. This spiritual, glorified body we believe, in some mode or other, which we do not presume to scrutinise, and which is the proper object of faith, to be really and actually present in the consecrated bread and the consecrated wine in the Lord's Supper; and this, at one and the same time, in the countless thousands of spots in which the Sacrament may be administered. What the Rubric says, it says only of the natural body of Christ, and not of the spiritual, glorified body, in which we believe. Such an argument implies either that Christ's risen body ceased to be a corporal body when it became spiritual; or else that Christ has two bodies, one a natural body, subject to the ordinary conditions of time and place to which the natural body is liable, and also a spiritual body gifted with omnipresence, and containing in itself the eternal life of the Lord Jesus Christ. Would it be at all rash to say that this doctrine of two bodies is a rank heresy? It is certain that the Apostles' Creed, the creed of the undivided Church, attests the unity of the Lord's body throughout, from the conception in the womb of the Virgin onward, till the judgment day. "I believe in Jesus Christ," who was "conceived," "born," "suffered," "was crucified," "descended," "rose again," "ascended," "sitteth," "will come to judge"—one and the same Jesus Christ all through. The language of the Athanasian Creed is not less precise: "One Christ; one not by the conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by the taking of manhood into God." Just as positive is the Third Article, "Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again *His* body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature; *wherewith* He ascended into heaven, and there sitteth, until He return to judge all men at the last day." In this matter, Paschasius may be allowed to speak, who says, "No sane man believes that Jesus had any other flesh or any other blood than that which was born of the Virgin Mary and suffered on the cross."

Not only do Anglo-Catholic writers accept this fiction of a spiritual body of Christ as well as a natural one, but they appear to argue that the same thing is true of us all. What other meaning can be put upon the words, "Had they (the Apostles) no idea of a pneumatic or spiritual body? Had they no idea of a body, underlying the visible, tangible body, which at death casts off its mortal garment, and wends its way to regions invisible?" Are we to believe in two coexisting bodies that make up each man's one personality? or is there merely a play upon words, and do they refer that to the body, which is true only of the soul? No doubt the soul, exactly speaking, may be termed a body; that is, the soul is finite; for else it would be divine, not human; for the divine essence alone can be infinite. But if it is finite it must occupy

a definite space, and be capable of being circumscribed. In that sense the soul may be a body; but if it be so, it proves nothing whatever towards the object of the ultra-Church writer. If the soul be an immaterial body because it occupies space and can conceivably be circumscribed by lines, this does not prove that our Lord's glorified body has ceased to occupy a definite space, and to be amenable to the laws of bodies. This is what it is sought to establish; the object is to show that it is possible for the Lord's body to be in ten thousand places at the same time, wherever the bread and wine are consecrated in the Lord's Supper. But if our Lord's body has become immaterial and spiritual, like the soul of man, it would not also become ubiquitous, for the soul of man is not ubiquitous. The analogy may prove that our Lord's body would be invisible if it were present; but it would not in the slightest degree prove the possibility of its being present in more than one place in one time. It would disprove it, if there be any worth in the analogy at all. But such specious subtleties only darken counsel. There is not the slightest ground for supposing that our Lord's glorified body is an immaterial body. All the evidence points the other way. If it were immaterial, it would not be the body which our risen Lord bade His Apostles touch and handle. It would not have flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection and completeness of man's nature, as the Articles assert. It would not be the body that rose into heaven, and of which it was announced that "that same Jesus shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven."

All this special pleading has been made possible by the unfortunate use of the word "natural" in the Post Communion Rubric—unfortunate, because it is evidently used for material. But it is used in 1 Cor. xv. as the opposite to "spiritual;" and if "natural" means material, spiritual would seem to mean "immaterial." That it does not mean "immaterial" has been decided by the Church, for she declares our Lord's risen body to be material —that is, to have flesh and bones; and indisputably she is right. To become spiritual is not to be converted into spirit, or else the adjective itself would be absurd. As the regenerated man of 1 Cor. ii. is spiritual, πνευματικὸς, just as we speak of a spiritual mind, as opposed to natural, ψυχικὸς, so the σῶμα ψυχικὸν of 1 Cor. xv. is the body under the condition of sin and controlled by its influence, in which sense Scripture frequently uses the phrase of "flesh and blood" as equivalent to the sin-stained nature with which we are born into the world; and the σῶμα πνευματικὸν is the same body, freed from its mortal weaknesses and brought under the control of the Spirit of God. Does any one dream that the human body after the resurrection will become ubiquitous? Yet we are

taught that such as the body of Christ is now in heaven, such our bodies will be hereafter. If, therefore, Christ's glorified body is omnipresent, the risen bodies of the saints will be omnipresent likewise—that is, they will be Divine, not human. If all this only means that the Godhead of the Lord Jesus Christ is everywhere even in the bread and wine, why should it not be clearly stated? But this is not what is meant.

It is much to be regretted that a controversy so important as that concerning the nature of the Lord's Supper should be obscured by subtleties which can only deceive ordinary readers, and which, it must be believed, deceive the writers themselves. Why should they use plain fallacies, unless they are themselves deluded by them? Because it is inconceivable that the natural body of the Lord Jesus Christ should be in, with, or under the consecrated elements, does it therefore really follow that we must give up our belief in the resurrection and the future life? ("Doctrine of the Fathers," p. 60). Because the writers of "The Unseen Universe" have proved that "if we possess nothing else than that which is visible and tangible, in that case our mortality, our utter extinction at death, is a demonstrable thing," does it follow that every living man must have two bodies, one visible and tangible, the other invisible and intangible? (Ibid.) Because Jesus could not give His actual organic human body to eat, and His blood, as yet flowing in His veins, His genuine human blood, to drink, does it follow that we have no need to concern ourselves "about such matters as right and wrong, truth and justice, virtue, heroism, nobility of soul, self-denial, or indeed about anything else except what will minister comfort and satisfaction to each man's own selfish self?" (Ibid, p. 207). Because our blessed Lord did really come out of the unseen world to take flesh, and after His death went back to the right hand of the Father, does it follow that His glorified Body descends from heaven at every administration of the Lord's Supper, and is held in the hand, and pressed by the teeth, even of the unworthy recipient? What possible dependence propositions so utterly unlike can have upon each other is beyond all the realm of reason and the comprehension of ordinary men.

One lucid thinker, to whose definitions the Church of England will ever be deeply indebted, has been removed from amongst us, almost while these lines are being written. A few words of grateful remembrance may be permitted. Dr. A. J. Stephens, the greatest ecclesiastical lawyer of his day, has been taken to his rest; but will never be forgotten by any one who had the privilege of knowing him. The tall, powerful frame, with the massive face, the eagle eye, the firm lip, and the all-pervading intelligence, were but the outward signs of his strong individuality. The masculine intellect and the firm grasp of truth,

the broad comprehension, the lofty impatience of all that is little, the disdain for the petty trivialities of verbal criticism, the insight that went at once to the very heart of his subject, the directness of his character, and the steadiness of his convictions, all fitted him to walk with unfaltering step amid, to the minds of other men, the complexities of the Eucharistic controversy, and to unfold with singular lucidity of order and a most happy command of words, what was as clear as daylight to his own convictions. What his genial frankness and kindness of heart made him to his personal friends, belongs to another sphere than that in which this article moves. He is gone, and his like will not soon be seen again.

EDWARD GARBETT.

## Review.

*Sunshine and Storm in the East: Cruises to Cyprus and Constantinople.* By Mrs. BRASSEY, Author of "A Voyage in the *Sunbeam*." With upwards of 100 Illustrations, chiefly from Drawings by the Hon. A. Y. BINGHAM. Pp. 450. Longmans, Green & Co. 1880.

A JOURNAL kept while cruising in the Mediterranean, though less novel than the story of a family yachting-voyage round the world, may yet be almost as attractive. Certainly, by the readers of that charming book "A Voyage in the *Sunbeam*, our Home on the Ocean for Eleven Months," Mrs. Brassey's letters from the shores of the Mediterranean will be eagerly welcomed. The letters, indeed, have many points of interest. In some respects, perhaps, the journal of the cruises to Cyprus and Constantinople possesses, at the present time, an interest even greater than that of the voyage round the world. Mrs. Brassey's style, graceful and unaffected, is well known. In a literary point of view, her letters, chatty, graphic, agreeable, and full of information, deserve unstinted praise.

The first cruise was undertaken in 1874, and it included a visit to the Ionian Islands. Four years later came the second cruise, and this included a visit to Cyprus, and a second visit to Constantinople. "Melancholy, indeed, seemed the change in the Turkish capital during the four years since our last visit—a change from all that was bright and glittering to all that was dark, and miserable, and wretched."

Two or three extracts from Mrs. Brassey's journal, without comment, will show the character of the book. First, of a narrow escape, while the *Sunbeam* was lying moored to a Government buoy in Portsmouth Harbour. Mrs. Brassey, recovering from a severe illness, was lying in bed: it was 8.30 in the morning, and the children were at breakfast:—

I heard some of the men shout, or rather scream, "She is into us! We shall be sunk! Fetch the children! Lower the boats! Get the missus on

deck!" Then I heard the rattle of the falls through the davits, and the splash of the boats in the water. Then two stewards rushed through the engine-room passage, each carrying a child, and followed by the affrighted maids, all saying, "She will cut us through by the fore-companion." Then two men came flying down to carry me up, and the nurse appeared with a quilt to wrap me in. There was a scare, a scurry, a terrible fright, a crash, but not so bad a one as we had anticipated, and then a cry of relief. She has not cut us below the water-line; we shall not sink after all. The *Assistance*, a troop-ship bringing soldiers from Ireland, in trying to avoid a sailing-barge, had been caught by the tide, and come stem on into us, but fortunately very far forward, where our over-hanging bow protected us. She had reversed her engines before she touched us; for had she not tried to alter her course, and been going astern at the time she ran into us, we should have been crushed like a walnut-shell, and sunk in a few seconds. It was a *mauvais quart d'heure* such as I hope never to experience again, especially when unable to move, or to do anything to help myself or any body else.

Shortly afterwards, while on the Barbary coast, they had another escape from collision. We read—

Tom and I had retired to rest, and were both fast asleep, when Mr. Bingham knocked at the door to tell us that Kindred wanted to see Tom on deck. This was by way of not alarming us, the fact being that we were in imminent risk of a collision, and that Kindred did not see his way of avoiding it. As there was no wind, I never thought of anything being amiss, and did not rouse myself till I heard Kindred say to Tom in an agonised voice, "She *won't* come round, and we must be into her." After our recent experience in Portsmouth Harbour, I lost no time in rushing up on deck, when I saw the huge black hull of a barque bearing slowly down upon us, with her red light showing, and her bowsprit pointed right amidships. As there was no breeze, we were both quite helpless, and, in spite of all we could do in the way of shifting sails, nothing seemed to succeed. Whether we tried to get ahead or astern of her, there appeared to be some force of attraction between the two ships that drove them slowly but surely towards each other, as they rose and sank on the heavy swell. After about half-an-hour's suspense, a breath of wind came, and we managed to draw slowly ahead, so as to allow her to pass astern of us. I never thought I should have been so glad to see any green light as I was to catch sight of hers. By the time midnight had arrived we were at a really safe distance, and retired to rest again. At breakfast this morning we not unnaturally discussed the events of the night, and I asked Tom what would have happened had we really come into contact with the barque. "Oh! we should have been bumped against, or have scrunched up and down against one another, till we went to the bottom."

The account of the run through Cyprus is bright and full of interest. Sir Garnet Wolseley and the higher officials of the island, Turkish, Greek, and English, showed Mr. and Mrs. Brassey all that was best worth seeing. Here is a specimen of the many pretty pictures. At Nikosia—

After breakfast we strolled through the camp to the Greek monastery from which it takes its name, a large ancient building, containing a church and many cells, some of which are now used by Sir Garnet for office purposes during the day-time, when the tents are unbearably hot. The pretty little garden attached is full of jasmine, verbena, and oleander, and we were invited to take a stroll

in it till the Archimandrite, or Archbishop of Cyprus, was ready to receive us himself, with all his attendant priests, and to show us the church. He is a fine-looking old man, about seventy years of age, with piercing black eyes, a long grey beard, and a polite but dignified manner—altogether quite one's *beau idéal* of a Greek patriarch. In the church, to which he conducted us, there is a fine-gilt, carved wood screen, containing three pictures in the Byzantine style, of considerable merit, and surmounted by some life-size figures of the Apostles. The pulpit is most curiously arranged. A little carved and gilt lantern is fixed against the wall, close to an arch, on the opposite side of which is suspended a ladder by means of ropes, which, when lowered, forms the only means of communication between the pulpit and the floor of the church; so that when once the priest has ascended, and the ladder has been removed, he cannot get down again without assistance. After our visit to the church, the Archimandrite invited us to his own apartments, where we were entertained with sweetmeats, cold water, and Turkish coffee.

The following is a description of a terrible gale when the yacht was off Milo, in the Greek Archipelago. With the glass at 29·80, on December 17th, they made a start for Old England under sail:—

Dec. 18th was indeed an eventful day, and if our friends in England could only have seen us, they would have felt much anxiety on our account and have given us much pity. It was terribly rough when I first awoke and groped my way on deck in the dark, and by 8 A.M. we hove-to in a fearful gale under a trysail and reefed canvas. Three times did we try to get the yacht round under her mizen, but she utterly refused. The stays and rigging that support her masts will have to be seen to as soon as we get into port, or they will be getting us into trouble.

The wind blew harder even than on last Friday, I think, or else we were more fully exposed to its fury. It howled and roared, and really seemed to scream in the rigging, as the sudden blasts rushed wildly by. A tremendous sea was running, and there appeared to be every prospect of the weather getting worse. I therefore tried hard to persuade Tom to run back to Milo, but he was loth to lose twenty miles of the distance we had gained with so much trouble yesterday. The glass kept falling, falling, till at last, about 12.30 P.M., he consented to put the yacht round, and then we had a dusting. Although we shipped only one really big sea just as we were going about, it was quite enough to make everything very wet and uncomfortable. Once round, she rode the waves like a cork, though the water poured over her lee rail—which must be at least ten feet above the level of the sea—like a cascade, and the boats, three or four feet above that again, were frequently full of water, and in imminent danger of being torn, or rather lifted, from their davits. It was indeed an anxious time, before a gale like this, almost under bare poles, close to a lee shore. I cannot recollect ever in my life seeing Tom more anxious. It was a grand sight, though, to see the huge waves tearing alongside of us, threatening every moment to engulph us altogether; rushing along the channels, dashing up the rigging, pouring over the lee rail like a fountain, while still we went rushing along faster and faster before it and with it. Sometimes we seemed to fly before the gale, and sometimes the gale seemed to tear past us. It was a great relief to everybody on board when at last the order was given to jib. No sooner was it carried out than we were in comparative shelter from the fury of the sea round the point of Milo.

But the strength of the gale still seemed to increase; the wind blew harder

than ever. All the morning it had been impossible to light the fires, either for steaming or cooking; but as soon as we had begun to run, and it was possible to do so, fires had been lighted in case steam might be wanted. Very fortunate it was that this had been done, for just as we thought we were safe inside the long harbour of Milo, we found the yacht would not fetch it. Oh! the disappointment of that moment, when we thought our miseries and dangers were over! We had to wait three long quarters of an hour hove-to at the mouth of the harbour till steam was up.

And here we must take leave of this fascinating volume. Open it where we will—and we confess we have only "dipped into it," from sheer lack of time, a treat is in store for us,—we read its pages with pleasure. Mr. Bingham's illustrations must not be forgotten; they are really charming. The book is beautifully printed, and "got up" in admirable taste.

---

# Short Notices.

*Is the Papacy predicted by St. Paul?* (2 Thess. ii. 1–13.) An Inquiry. By CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D., Bishop of Lincoln. With a few words in reply to Dr. Farrar. Pp. 34. Rivington.

This timely and vigorous pamphlet deserves to become widely known. All earnest and reverent students of prophecy, whether or no they agree with the learned Bishop on every point, will read the pamphlet, we believe, with deep interest. As a reply to the rash remarks of Dr. Farrar, it has a peculiar value at the present moment. In support of the statement that idolatrous worship is now claimed by the Papacy, according to the prediction of St. Paul, Bishop Wordsworth quotes from modern Roman Catholics. Montalembert, for instance, in 1870, wrote that these favoured votaries of the Papacy, the Ultramontanes, "trample under foot all our liberties to sacrifice truth, justice, reason, and history, to the *idol they have set up in the Vatican*"—"pour venir ensuite immoler la verité et la justice, la raison et l'histoire, a *l'idole* qu'ils se sont erigée au Vatican." Bishop Wordsworth concludes his able inquiry in these words:—

In this solemn question we have now appealed, not to uninspired men, but to St. Paul; we have inquired of the Holy Ghost; we have heard the verdict of God. Thence we may conclude as follows:—If the *Mystery of iniquity* is the same thing as the *Mystery of godliness;* if the Man of Sin is a man of God; if the Son of Perdition is an heir of Salvation; if *deceivableness of unrighteousness* is the same thing as godly sincerity; if *strong delusion* is the same thing as sound persuasion; if to *believe the Lie* is the same thing as to hold the Truth; if to be in peril of condemnation is the same thing as to be saved; if to be consumed with the *spirit of Christ's mouth* is the same thing as to hear from Christ's lips the joyful words, *Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you;* then Romanism is a safe religion; then it is not sinful to encourage it; then it is a matter of little moment whether you belong to the Church of England or fall away to the Church of Rome—but not otherwise.

*The Two Paths; or, Canon Farrar's "Eternal Hope" briefly examined.* By the Rev. J. BENNETT, M.A., Incumbent of Park Chapel, Chelsea. Pp. 128. New Edition. J. F. Shaw & Co.

We have read several pages in this book, here and there, with satisfaction; the argument appears to be not only sound, but clear and vigorous. The last chapter, however, headed "Evangelical Truth," especially

attracted our attention, and we found it to contain a sort of complaint against "the Evangelical body as a whole," and, further, an attack upon those Evangelicals who attend Church Congresses. Surely in a book which professes to be an examination of Dr. Farrar's mischievous work, such remarks are out of place.

*The Antiquary.* A Magazine devoted to the Study of the Past. Edited by EDWARD WALFORD, M.A. No. 2. Elliot Stock.

With this new Magazine we are much pleased. The articles are ably written, and well varied, and a good deal of antiquarian news is given in short compass. The notes on Thomas à Kempis, and "The Mythical Gersen" are exceedingly good. As to printing, paper, and general "get-up," *The Antiquary* deserves warm praise.

*Comforting Words for the Weary, and Words of Counsel and Warning.* With Original Hymns. With an Introduction by the Rev. HUGH MACMILLAN, D.D. Pp. 102. Houghton & Co., 10, Paternoster Row.

An admirable little book, and well suited for the sick, sorrowful, and weary in body or mind. It is written with charming simplicity and freshness, and is replete with Scriptural truth. The hymns which conclude each one of its brief meditations are good, both as to their sentiment and diction. Dr. Macmillan gives the work great praise, and remarks that its authoress has inherited much of the genius and piety of her ancestress, the well-known Lady Colquhoun of Luss.

*The Church under Queen Elizabeth.* An Historical Sketch. By the Rev. F. G. LEE, D.D., Vicar of All Saints', Lambeth. 2 vols. W. H. Allen & Co.

The author of these volumes is a beneficed clergyman of the Church of England; but his position in regard to the Church of Rome we will not attempt to define. For the "Ritualists" he has nothing but hard words. Thus, in the Introduction he quotes from the *Church Times* (Sept. 26, 1879) and thus comments: "The person who could deliberately write of the Elizabethan Reformers' Supper as a 'Mass' must be either a profound ignoramus or as daring as he is impudent and dishonest." Again: "The more recent exhibitions of 'Ritualism,' as it is called, display all the narrowness, virulence, and pettiness of the most perverse sects." And, once more, the author blames the Ritualists for discouraging "Corporate Reunion," and disparaging "*the English Roman Catholics who, through so long a night of moral darkness, have kept the Lamp of Divine Truth burning.*" The *italics* are our own; and we refrain from comment. In regard to "Corporate Reunion," however, we may mention that at the end of Dr. Lee's second volume appears a very singular "statement." The "Rulers of the Order of Corporate Reunion, founded Sept. 8, 1877," we read, are—

The Bishop of DORCHESTER.
The Bishop of SELBY.
The Bishop of CAERLEON.

What Bishops are these? In another statement we observe a petition to the Pope, and a "prayer for the restoration of England, Scotland, and Wales, and of the non-Catholics of Ireland, to Catholic Unity," sanctioned by Cardinal Manning! After this, we are by no means surprised to read a letter from Lady Gertrude Douglas to the author of these volumes, concerning cures wrought by "Our Lady of Lourdes." As to the volumes—we have only quoted from the Preface and Appendix—it is needless to say much. Their chief characteristic is hatred of the Reformation. The

author candidly confesses that for his "facts" he is considerably indebted to "Brother H. Foley, S.J." Members of that "great Society" may, possibly, both read and praise these dreary volumes.

*The Responsibility of the Heathen, and the Responsibility of the Church.* A Missionary Address founded upon 1 Timothy ii. 1–7. By the Rev. C. F. CHILDE, M.A. Pp. 62. Nisbet and Co.

A little book which should be read and given away.

*Observations on Sunday-School Instruction.* By the late John GREGG, D.D. Edited by his Son, ROBERT S. GREGG, D.D., Bishop of Cork, Cloyne, and Ross. Pp. 85. Dublin: Geo. Herbert.

We had the pleasure, in a recent Number, of recommending a very valuable series of Addresses to Children by the late Bishop Gregg—"The Story of Stories, and other Sermons,"—a book which, in many ways, stands almost alone. Such Sermons, we think, young people will read right through. The little book before us, an admirable Address to Sunday-School Teachers, deserves a wide circulation.

*Echoes from a Village Church.* By the Rev. FREDERICK HARPER, M.A., Vicar of Shalfleet. With Preface by Lieut.-Gen. Sir ARTHUR COTTON, R.E., K.C.S.I. Pp. 109. Nisbet and Co.

In his interesting preface to this welcome little volume, Sir Arthur Cotton observes that of Ministers in the Church of England who know and teach the way of God in truth, there is an increasing number. "We need to be reminded," he writes, "that the few evil men, of whom the newspapers are full, are not all who compose the Clergy of the Church of England, but that by God's grace there never were so many faithful men in her ministry, whose names are never hardly mentioned beyond their own parishes; who preach in such simplicity, clearness, and fulness as these Sermons exhibit, the truth of God; men in whose churches the pulpit and reading desk are in perfect accordance."

We heartily recommend *For the Master's Sake*, a well-written Tale of the Days of Queen Mary, by Miss HOLT (Shaw & Co.); a good gift-book.

A tasteful little volume—*The Christian Remembrancer Birthday Book* (R. A. Suttaby)—contains texts selected by the late CHARLOTTE ELLIOTT, and verses of poetry corresponding, chosen from her poems.

A really well-written story, true to life, with many touching passages, is *The Children's Kingdom*, by the Author of "Great St. Benedict's," and other impressive Tales. (J. F. Shaw & Co.) Boys and girls will read it with eagerness and profit.

*The Musical Hand-Bell Ringers' Instructor*, by Mr. S. B. GOSLIN (Warner and Sons), will prove, to a certain class, an interesting pamphlet. Many of the illustrations are curious.

In *The Church Sunday-School Magazine* appears a Paper on Plymouth Brethren, by the Bishop of Rangoon.

The political articles in *The Congregationalist* (Hodder and Stoughton) are, to put it mildly, decidedly partisan. It is stated that "the supporters of Lord Beaconsfield's policy avow a cynical contempt for any suggestion that the affairs of nations should be governed by Christian principle!"

No. 3 of *The Churches of Yorkshire* (Elliot Stock) contains an engraving of the Parish Church, Bradford.