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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN

OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

VOL. II.

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1880

THE

CHURCHMAN

APRIL, 1880.

ART. I.—BUTLER'S ANALOGY.

AMIDST the conflict of rival philosophies, Evolution, Positivism, Agnosticism, and any other of the protæan forms of unbelief in God, each internecine with the others, but all of them made "friends together" in their attack on the credibility of Christianity—(did it ever harm them?) what is a plain man of average intellectual advantages to do? If he, by the Grace of God, has already laid the burden of his sins at the foot of the cross, and has felt in his heart the powers of the world to come, and experienced the influences of the Divine Spirit, whereby he is able to cry Abba, Father; then all these fiery darts from the philosophies of the wicked one will be quenched and pointless against the heavenly armour wherewith he is clothed. He would not so much as stop in his course to notice them were it not for the need of the prayer, "Father, forgive them; they know not what they do." The language of his innermost spirit is *I know;* "I know that my Redeemer liveth;" "I know in whom I have trusted, and I am convinced that He is able to guard that which I have entrusted to Him against that day." Or if again, the man, though he be conscious of no such relations of his inner life to the unseen world, is nevertheless willing to give the Christian Truth a fair trial in his own experience, then again he will need no elaborate arguments of earthly origin to convince him that what Christ has promised, that also He is able to perform. Nevertheless it is essential to the honour of the Christian Faith that it shall be provided with an effective answer in respect to its reasonableness against serious questionings from whatever quarter they may come. For the Eternal Father has provided us, His children, with the bright and responsible gift of the intellect, as well as with that of the affections; with

minds, as well as with hearts; and the truths which come from and which appeal to, the many sides of our complex nature must be adapted to the satisfying of the necessities and the cravings of both these faculties, even when both of them are developed and improved to the utmost of their capacities. If, through error or mistrust, either of them be cultivated by appealing to it unduly rather than to the other—*i. e.*, if we habitually rely on the responses of the one rather than the other—the Nemesis of Disproportion will find us out, and amidst the pain of discomfiture will compel us to retrace our steps, and in some way make amends for the partiality and neglect. This then is the reply to the question—Why occupy our thoughts on the evidences of our faith? No doubt, arguing about religion will not save a man's soul; but arguments may deter the scoffer, for very shame's sake; and they may save other men from the pain of the endurance of the scoffing.

Now that form of philosophy which is presumed to furnish the most formidable weapons of attack upon the first principles of Butler's argument, is the hypothesis that there is no evidence producible for the existence of a directing and designing Will in Nature. That man (it assumes), or that creature, succeeds the best who accommodates himself the most completely to the things which chance to surround him; nothing has been prearranged, it asserts, for his existence or his welfare; the man becomes solely what his surroundings make him. Thus, a revelation becomes totally discredited, because the fashionable hypothetical philosophy of the day assumes the non-existence of a supreme Author of Nature, from whence alone the revelation could proceed.

I may here mention that when this new theory was first seriously propounded, it became the duty of so profoundly gifted a man as the late Sir John Herschel carefully to examine its claims to acceptance. I am told, on the best authority, that after having read Mr. Darwin's book, and before forming an irrevocable opinion about it, he requested a near and intelligent relative to read it again, on his behalf, and see whether he was right in concluding that its author made no reference to the action of an intelligent Will in Nature. On being assured that the case was so, "then," said the most illustrious expounder of Nature of this day, "then the hypothesis is not adequate to explain the facts." And so say I, forming my conclusion from those parts of Nature which it has been my duty to study as best I may. The hypothesis (and it is no more)—the hypothesis will not explain the facts.

In reference to the argument for design, and, so far, for the existence of a designing Mind in Nature, I propose to adopt the same principle which was not very long ago adopted with

success by a British judge when sorely perplexed by the contradictory evidence of professional experts. Men of great character and eminence for their knowledge of certain natural product gave the most contradicting and irreconcilable accounts of the nature and nomenclature of this same natural product; the one set affirming what the other explicitly denied. The judge in his perplexity threw aside the evidence of the professional experts, and appealed to the account given by men of average sense, and of common experience, as to the true nature of the substance with which they would be familiar. In like manner I propose to give here a very rapid, succinct, and general account of a small portion of those activities of Nature by which mankind have been furnished with products and materials conducing, perhaps more than anything else, to the development of their human intelligence, and to their progress in the arts and conveniences of everyday life. Important elements, in fact they are, and intimately concerned in the furtherance of social and civil development. And so, for the purpose of illustrating our argument, I must ask my readers to summon forth that divine creative faculty wherewith God has lovingly endowed us, for the clearer apprehension of His manifold works.

In imagination, then, I must ask you in spirit to ascend with me some old Silurian hill, on the primæval earth, ages upon ages before God had fitted it for the abode of man. Picture to yourselves some mighty stream, like the Ganges or the Amazon, rolling its waters from far distant mountains into an ancient sea. You observe the broad interminable belt of forest, which, stretching inland further than the eye can reach, rises in wild luxuriance from the swamps that fringe the stream. You may trace there the majestic pine, the graceful fern, the erect gigantic moss, fluted and towering columnar reeds, and a strange fantastic undergrowth, unknown to the flora of the age of man. The oak and the elm, the sycamore and the noble acacias of the West, you will not find in those swampy forests, for, as yet, such are not created. There are no cattle grazing upon a thousand hills, for God as yet has not clothed those hills with grass. In the thick jungle of these primæval forests you will not hear the young lions roaring after their prey, for, as yet, there is no meat provided for such by God. Those forests are tuneless of the glad carols of the birds, for, as yet, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after its kind, are not yet created for their food. Apart from the hoarse croak of the reptiles, and the shrill chirp of many an insect, there is the hush of the silence of non-existence amidst those matted fronds, save when the voice of the Lord is heard, in the thunder or the wind.

And if the strength of the creative gift of your imagination

you will still keep your stand upon your watch place, for ages beyond your power to count, you will see nothing but the decay and the renewal of that interminable umbrageous belt. The ferns will wither, the gigantic moss and the columnar reed will shrivel, and the pines will decay and fall to their mother earth, but all this only to make way for another and another succession of luxuriant growth. And so for ages; ages of waste do you think them? Wait awhile.

At length in the scene changes, and through some mighty pulsation of the yet unstable earth, ordained of God, you see the waters of the broad swampy margin deepen and deepen, and then pile upon pile of forest growth and forest decay are submerged and gone. Still wait awhile, for the lapse of years, I know not how many, for Science as yet has found no unit for the measure of cycles such as these; they are but as a day in the mind of that sublime intelligence who is the Lord of the ages and of the worlds above. Wait awhile, and then upon the broad and now silted margin of the everlasting stream, piles upon piles of other forest again rise and decay, and by slow successive pulsations of the uncompleted earth in their turn disappear beneath the swollen tide.

Now, if in spirit you saw all this, and only this, would you be able to decipher the meaning of the riddle? Would you imagine, for instance, that all this mysterious prodigality of decay would issue in the storing up of fuel for the future service of races of beings yet unborn? As you witnessed the successive growths and successive submergences of these forests, could you foresee or conceive in what way such an arrangement of things could one day conduce to the development of the genius of intelligent creatures, destined in the remote futurity to be the chiefest denizens of the earth.

I have not been amusing my readers with some fantastic creation of the brain. I have been reminding them of the mode of the Divine Action, during one brief stage of the Creation. And there are many like it. There is, for instance, the strange deposit of the various minerals, all of them turned to the unexpected service of developing the genius, and advancing the intelligence of the future man. Materials they are, stored away, to be, after the lapse of apparently interminable ages, converted into printing presses, and steam engines, and telegraphs, and telescopes, and microscopes; into the very means of deciphering what has been the work of the Creator, from the examination of what now is. Is all this, forsooth, a series of accidents? Is it only a succession of the survivals of the fittest? The appeal lies, not solely nor even chiefly to the philosopher in his closet; not at all to the hasty specialist, leaping to notoriety, the appeal lies to the common sense of reasonable beings.

In this way, then, of a majestic prescience, in this way of a loving anticipation, God created the Heavens and the Earth. He spake and they were created; He commanded and they stood fast.

I must pass over what Butler in the midst of his grave argument, for once, with even a passionate emotion, calls the ten thousand thousand other instances of a prescient design for the promotion of the material and intellectual advancement of God's earthly children. I proceed to the divine prearrangement for their moral progress. Butler, in the fifth chapter of his Analogy, enforces the conviction that the Eternal Father had so constituted human society as to render it peculiarly suitable for the discipline and education of His children into habits of virtue; which habits and condition of the moral character are intended to fit them for the more enlarged sphere of a future and a holy life after death. Bishop Butler describes the formation of these moral habits, as the "Business of Life;" as the chief object for which we were created and placed upon this earth.

But now comes another phase in the human history, and another corresponding phase of divine, *anticipative* intervention. That man has somehow reduced himself to a state of moral degradation (I need not give you the Scripture account of it), no one can doubt who takes a survey of human society, or of his own heart. We cannot but feel that we are, the best of us, very far gone from that righteousness which befits a child of God: sinful we are, and very sinning; and we are conscious of possessing little or no power in ourselves to lift ourselves out of our degradation. Perhaps the worst feature in this our human condition is the natural alienation of the heart from its filial relation to the Eternal Father. Nothing that human ingenuity has ever conceived could set this matter of sin and of alienation right. But here again, from the counsels of eternity, comes the most signal instances of the *anticipative* love, and the boundless wisdom of the Almighty Father of our spirits. I need not now describe the scheme of the Redemption of mankind, from this their low and lost estate, by the Sacrifice of the Incarnate Son of God upon the Cross, and man's restoration to the family of God by a loving faith in His Word. My present task is not so much to expound the doctrines of Revelation as to show, after the manner of our great Bishop, how closely they, *i.e.*, these revealed doctrines, harmonise with analogies which we find already in that human society wherein God has placed us. Nature and Grace, both proceed from the Divine Mind: the provisions of Nature and Grace we find are parallel, the one to the other.

And first then as touching Redemption by a suffering Redeemer. Society, the whole fabric of the moral world, is carried on, and

is held together by a law, by a scheme of natural intervention or mediation. I think we can name few joys we have ever felt, or few troubles from which we have even escaped, which we cannot trace to the intervention of others, and not rarely to an intervention effected with pain to the intervener.

Think of the little babe;—there it lies joyous, and redolent with the promise of the activities of life; yet utterly helpless, and dependent upon others' care. But think also of the pale face of her, whose strength scarce suffices to nestle her little one in her nerveless arms. Nay, without my bidding, some perforce recal to memory how the mother's pulse ceased to beat before she could utter a parent's blessing on her child. And what is all this, but the redemption of a life, at the cost of the sufferings of another? Pass onward a few years, and trace that child now walking with elastic step at his father's side; but look upwards at the father's face; you will not be surprised to find many a deep furrow there, furrows that bear testimony to anxieties and toils—anxieties and toils, that the bright boy at his side may have a good offset for the battle of life before him;—nay, anxieties and toils, sometimes deep and inevitable for the bare supply of that child's daily bread. And what means all this? What is it but redemption again; redemption secured at the cost of labours, and sufferings, and toils? And when is it that you cease to hear men speak of their "friends?" What other word more common among us? And what does that word "friend," for the most part, practically imply? Alas! for the most part it implies, not the confiding interchange of thought; not the sweet comparison of experience, and of hope, and of aspiration; not the pleasant suggestions which arise from community of taste—for such high privileges are reserved for those only who by patient continuance in well-doing have acquired the right and the capacity to enjoy them; but that commonest of words, "a friend," bears testimony to that commonness of weakness, which looks for aid from another's strength, to that commonness of wants, which seek their supply from another's abundance; it bears testimony to that commonness of troubles, which, not rarely, can be removed solely at the cost of another's pain, even greater than that which they assuage.

Think further even of the arts and conveniences of life; of the appliances, the inventions, the discoveries, which the Divine Father has ordained to enrich and ennoble life. Such results come at no man's light bidding. The discovery itself, the last link in the invention, may come, and in fact must come, at last, like a flash, but the happy thought comes to the man of genius only after days and nights, or even years, of patient continuance in intellectual toil. And when it does come to him, not seldom the health is failing, or the lamp of life has burnt low; or other

men step in, reaping the harvest of his toil, and leaving him only the gleanings of the field, the sowing of which was all his own. Meanwhile, the chief advantages accrue to society; the toil was all his own.

Now, such being the scheme, such the manner after which it has pleased the Eternal Creator to impart the joys, to assuage the sorrows, and to enlighten the ignorance of His creatures in this their temporary life, which endures but for three score years and ten, is there any thing which can reasonably jar upon our feelings, if we find that the Divine Father, in His marvellous beneficence has interposed, after a like, though in a higher manner, on behalf of His children, in those higher relations of theirs which endure for ever? Is there cause for a hesitating wonder if God, through the mediation, the intervention of His Divine Son, should give to man a distinct and living manifestation of all that a finite being need know, or can know, of the infinite character of the God of the spirit of all flesh? Is there cause, I say, for a hesitating incredulous wonder, if, in man's low estate, the Son of God should interpose in his behalf, and this interposition, this mediation, thus made on man's behalf, should be accompanied by the suffering and the death of the incarnate Redeemer. Even in this life, and among creatures of our earthly mould, perhaps for a good man, some would even dare to die.

Such extremity of intervention may indeed be, and must be, a matchless instance of unbounded love, nevertheless it would be all of a piece, in perfect harmony, in strict analogy with those other interventions in man's behalf, which by God's natural appointment we see every day involve the sufferings of the intervener. I cannot tell others, nor can I suggest to myself, why a righteous Creator permitted sin to defile the beautiful world which He had created. I dare not, in my partial ignorance, tax either His benevolence or His power, for, as I have said, we know not the whole of the case; neither do we know the nature or the requirements of Infinite Love, or of Power in its utmost perfection. I cannot even guess the whole reasons, why a loving and wise Father permitted sorrow, and ignorance, and misery to be the lot of all His children for a time; but as I see that in the natural world around us He has provided the mediation and suffering of one man, to remove the suffering or the ignorance of another, with what reason can any man cavil at a Revelation which tells me that man may be pardoned for his sins, and restored to the filial relations of a child of God, and all the varied ills of life removed or assuaged, through the humiliation, the life, the example, the death, the vicarious suffering of the Divine, the incarnate Son? These things are beyond my capacity to comprehend in their fulness, but they are not beyond my gratitude, or the poor return of my filial, dutiful love. So let us bow the

head and place ourselves at the foot of the Saviour's Cross. So let us stay our minds on God.

We come at length to the last element in the scheme of Revelation for the recovery of man. To Salvation by Faith in the Son of God; by faith in the incarnate, Divine, crucified, yet ever living, Redeemer.

Many are the attributes which in the Gospel are assigned to faith. By faith the Christian is said to stand; by faith he walks; by faith he is made pure; by faith he removes mountains; by faith he lives, he is justified, he is saved. But if these attributes assigned to faith are great, so also are the cavils with which men in all ages have been disposed to admit her claims; and many and grievous are the charges which are laid at her door. Let us try, then, to ascertain what this much-vaunted, much-misunderstood principle really involves. And here I observe, that if there is any one English expression which fully renders the meaning of the Hebrew original, it is *trustfulness of spirit.* The word actually adopted in the Authorized Version of the Old Testament is "trust:" and if one were to recount all the achievements attributed in the Old Testament to trust in Jehovah, one would have to repeat a large portion of the Old Testament itself; and the results of this trust in Israel's God are very much the same as those assigned in the New Testament to faith. Assigned, be it carefully observed, no longer to faith in God, simply as the Creator and Governor of the world, or even as the Covenant God of the Nation, but to faith in God, as the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and as our Father reconciled to His redeemed children, under the new and better Covenant of the Gospel.

But I must go further than this, further, that is, than identifying the principle of the New Testament "Faith" with the principle of "Trust" under the Old Dispensation; and I must show how this same principle of faith or trustfulness is the very key-stone to our social fabric, the very strength of our daily natural lives.

I observe, then, that just as in the illustration of redemptive suffering, which runs through the world of Nature, we took the mother's pitiable condition at the birth of her child, so here, in illustration of the continuity of faith, we shall take the instance of the growing child itself. For the first years of its existence its whole life is of a necessity a life of dependence and trust. In faith it seeks its natural food; in faith it nestles in its mother's breast; in faith it strives to stand; in faith it lisps the fond names of father and mother; and, blessed be God, in this Christian land in faith it sits upon its mother's lap, and with stammering lips it learns to call upon the name of Jesus. As years advance, the young child walks at its father's side, and gazing

in his father's face with unquestioning faith, learns from him and applies the first lessons of the life before him. Thus, we all of us, by the natural ordinances of God, are reared and nurtured as it were in the cradle of faith. But these early lessons of faith stop not here. In faith and patience he painfully learns the arts of maturer life. In faith he ploughs, in faith he sows, in faith he gathers into barns; in faith he launches on the deep; in faith he borrows; in faith he lends; in faith he devotes the years of his incipient manhood to manifold studies.

Hence we see that the faith in Jesus, the loving trust, I mean, in a sympathising, personal Saviour, whereby alone the Christian stands upright, the faith in Jesus, whereby the sinner is purified, justified, and saved, is after all no new principle, but rather the old and abiding principle of trustfulness, which alone gives cohesion to our own natural life. It is the old principle indeed —but the old principle heightened, intensified, and sanctified by the Spirit of God. It is the golden chain which unites the world of flesh with the world of spirit, assuring the child of Nature that he is also the Redeemed Child of God.

Thus, after the manner of our great philosophical divine, and in illustration and defence of his method, we have traced some of those many remarkable analogies which exist between the life that now is, and that dispensation of grace which the Sacred Scriptures reveal, as preparing us for the higher and enduring life beyond the grave. I know not what impressions the survey of this wonderful system of analogies may have upon the minds of my readers. Perhaps, what chiefly impresses my own, is the wonderful constitution of the Human Spirit. It is indeed fearfully and wonderfully made. What strange, what vast capacities, for good or for evil! It can degrade itself to the diabolical; it can be raised nigh to the Divine. The choice is ours; the help is from the Spirit of the Lord; and they that seek shall find.[1]

C. PRITCHARD.

---

[1] In this Paper—the distinguished writer will pardon our remark—a present-day chapter, so to speak, has been added to the Analogy. The Professor's replies to recent sceptical objections, particularly to the objections which come from followers of Hume, can hardly fail to do good service. We are glad to know that the masterly work of Butler, discredited as it is by Evolutionists and Scientists of various shades, keeps its place in Butler's University.—ED.

ART. II.—WHAT IS NIHILISM?

THERE are few spectacles more painful in the study of history than the fierce licence which so frequently animates a nation when seeking to set itself free from the fetters of a severe and harassing despotism. In the struggle upwards towards the light of liberty, so long as men are restrained by the control of loyal and disinterested leaders, the terrors of revolt are avoided, whilst the evils complained of are often redressed. It is that dark hour which inevitably wraps resistance in its gloomy folds, when men, maddened by the servitude of the past, escape from the government of those whose wisdom and foresight have successfully fought their battles, and, letting the reins lie loose upon their passions, give themselves up to every evil influence that possesses them. Accustomed to be controlled, they are ignorant in the wild moment of victory where to stop, what limits to set up, and what course to pursue. Hence, as the shade is but the proof of the light, almost every revolution which has sought the removal of legitimate sufferings has been attended by an after-revolution, which has made revolt synonymous with destruction, wholesale spoliation, and moral anarchy. It was so in England when the oppression and injustice complained of by Pym and Eliot and Hampden led to the terrors of civil war, regicide, and a military tyranny more hard and cruel than the most kingly despotism. It was so in France, when the righteous reforms advocated by just and tolerant men like Clermont Tonnerre, Lally Tollendal, and Montesquieu led to the revolutionary tribunal, the Reign of Terror, and the inauguration of the Goddess of Reason. The laudable desire of Germany to obtain for herself the advantages of constitutional government gave a stimulus to the predatory schemes and murderous designs of the Teutonic Socialists. The ambition which was the life-long work of Cavour, to create a united Italy, had to recognise as one of its results the daggers and firebrands of the Carbonari. France herself, with all her activity of intellect and fertility of resource, had to crush beneath her tread the flames of the Communists ere she succeeded in freeing herself from the thraldom of the Third Empire. And now we see Russia, the last of the family of nations who has declined to abjure absolutism, torn between two rival sections—the one, which seeks with philosophical prudence to dissolve an autocracy into a constitutional monarchy; the other, to raze the edifice to the ground, and on its site to erect an entirely new building, based on a foundation as immoral as it is impracticable. What the Mountain was to the Girondists in France, so the Nihilists in Russia are to the Constitutionalists of Moscow, Kiev, and St. Petersburg.

It was not to be expected that a country so vast, and with such inherent signs of weakness so useful to the agitator, as Russia, should escape the popular cry for liberal institutions which since 1848 has so earnestly made its voice heard. Her statesmen, her politicians, her lawyers, her novelists, have been loud in their moans that at the present day, with its levelling tendencies and spread of culture, such a despotism as that of the Czar should be permitted to exist. Can Russia, it was asked, with Liberalism outside her frontiers, long expect to obey the sway of one man, to have no appeal to parliamentary institutions, to read in the daily Press only what is sanctioned, to be subject to partial judicial decisions, degrading restrictions, and a humiliating *espionage*, and to meet with on every side, when opposition is raised, the chains of the dungeon or a living tomb within the mines of Siberia? These questions have, to a certain extent, been answered by the present Czar in the various reforms he has seen the necessity of instituting, and which will make his reign ever memorable in the history of his country. Within the last twenty years he has emancipated the serfs, he has sought to purify the current of justice, he has removed certain of the restrictions which hampered promotion to the people in the ranks of the army and the civil service, and he has abolished punishment by torture. Thus, he has gone a certain length, but he refuses to go further. He has granted a sip from the cup of liberty instead of a generous draught; he has tantalised thirst by awakening it; he sternly declines to quench it. The Constitutionalists demand—and with their demands, temperately urged, we most cordially sympathise—that the monarchy be established on a parliamentary basis; that the Czar be a Constitutional sovereign, not controlled but guided by the advice of his Parliament, which is to be the representative of the nation; that the Press be almost free; that the regulations as to conscription be modified; that the question as to the right of the soil be settled on a more liberal basis; that exile be no longer the rule, but the exception; and that religious toleration be the law of the State. These requests—as just and equitable as any to be found in the provisions of our Magna Charta or Bill of Rights—once granted, the political and commercial prosperity of Russia is assured. But it is not from the Constitutionalists—the moderate party which heads a revolution—that there is any cause for fear; it is from savage and relentless agitators, many of them rendered fiendishly discontented by their past miseries and oppressions, who are careless of consequences provided all in high places be overthrown and a radical change be effected. To this class belong the Nihilists, whose name and doings have now so evil a sound in the ears of Europe.

Of the various forms which Socialism or Communism is made

to assume it would be impossible to find one more cynically destructive, more hopelessly immoral, or more mischievously pernicious than Nihilism. It is not so much the enemy of a despotism as it is the enemy of the whole system of social organisation. It is the very creed of negation, as its name implies. "Seize hold of the earth and heaven," cried a Nihilist when asked to explain his faith. "Seize hold of the State and the Church, seize hold of all kings and of God, and spit upon them—that is our doctrine." If such be the faith—so awful in its blasphemy and sweeping in its destructiveness—can we be surprised at any act, however Satanic, of its disciples? In its grossness and intolerance Nihilism tramples under foot all that humanity honours and respects; it is Radicalism bereft of its senses surging to and fro amidst the multitude of men seeking whom and what it may devour. It does not create, it does not improve, it has but one aim, to destroy. All the old and holy associations in connection with religion, government, the family relations, good and evil, it effaces with the hand of a brutish intolerance. It rejects the ideas of the existence of a God, and of the immortality of the soul; it desires the abolition of all forms of worship and the substitution of science for Faith. "There can be no real liberty," it says, "where there is a belief in the supernatural." The sacred tie of marriage has no place in its creed; both sexes are to be on a perfect footing of equality; to each is to be allowed the same advantages and the same freedom of action; the relationship of marriage is only to exist so long as it is desired by both parties; whilst to add to the population is to fly in the face of one of the chief articles of Nihilism, which seeks to blot out from off the earth all the race of mankind. Man was made out of nothing, let him, it says, return to his original nothingness. The only study in the eyes of a Nihilist worth pursuing is natural science; he has all the hate of the animal boor for art, poetry, and the refinements of culture; "a good chemist," he sneers, "is worth all the poets and artists in the world." Like the Communist, the disciple of Nihilism is an advocate of perfect equality; he will have no privileged classes, for they are to be absorbed in the people; if they object to absorption they are to be put out of the way; all goods are to be in common—what an excellent doctrine for men like the Nihilists, drawn mainly from the lower classes, who have nothing!—and hereditary rights are to be abolished; there is to be no antagonism in the future between labour and capital, as the interests of the two will be identical; or, in plain English, their positions will be reversed, the wealthy capitalist will find himself a labourer, and a penniless labourer, thanks to spoliation under a new name, will find himself a capitalist. Russia is to be the property of the Russian people, not the country for an

Imperial clique or for a favoured coterie. The revenues of the State are to be handed over to the nation; the appointments now in the gift of the Crown are to be in the gift of the people; the days of patronage are dead, or, in other words, the patronage which was formerly exercised by the aristocracy is to be dispensed by the democracy. These are the leading principles of the Nihilists, women and men; and they are resolved upon asserting and carrying them out, no matter at what cost to themselves or at what hazard to the community at large. That the Nihilists have a courage which refuses to be intimidated, an organisation complete in its system and in its secrecy, and a vigour of purpose which makes them most dangerous, cannot be denied. Their faith is a pessimism of the most heinous kind. Seeing themselves surrounded by all that they deem evil, they aim at upsetting everything, government, religion, society, the family relationships, and in their stead to erect a new order of things. Their principles are those of the Socialist of the most advanced type, their agents may be with every class, and their weapons are those of the hidden assassin, incendiary, and miner.

To the members of a society of this kind the peculiar organisation of Russia is favourable. The system of castes into which the empire of the Czar is divided renders many of the tenets of the Nihilists most favourable to the ambitious middle classes. It has been ascertained that at the universities "young Russia" is specially favourable to the teaching of Nihilism. As the government of the vast dominions of the Czar is different to any other form of government, so is its aristocracy different from that of any other aristocracy. A prince may be a powerful general or an important statesman, or he may take your fare as he drives his drojky along the Nevski Prospect. In Russia there is no purely privileged class holding its lands and exercising its authority by virtue alone of its hereditary rights. The Russian authority is one composed more of office than of birth —it is more of a bureaucracy than an aristocracy. To be enrolled within the ranks of the *tchinovniki*, or civil functionaries of the State, is the ambition of every Russian gentleman. This order is divided into fourteen classes, and unless an aristocrat is a *tchin* he is comparatively a nobody. The superior classes of the *tchinovniki* are almost entirely composed of the *élite* of Russian society, and the middle classes consider themselves fortunate if they can be included even in its lowest ranks. To be a *tchin* of the first class is to be raised to so elevated a position as to be something more than merely human in the eyes of the Russian people. The exclusiveness of the *tchinovniki* is one of the grievances complained of by both the Constitutionalists and the Nihilists. In addition to this order there are various other castes, all established and systematised by the late

Emperor Nicholas, and transmitted by him to his son Alexander. The nobles are divided into *la grande noblesse*, who are of ancient race, and have been peers for centuries, and *la petite noblesse*, who are of a recent creation. The citizens consist of the inhabitants of the towns and the inhabitants of the country. The merchants are separated into three distinct classes. The clergy are of two sections, the black clergy or the monastic, and the white clergy or secular. The army is divided into the Guard and the Line. The rights of each caste are clearly defined, but the very head and front of this social edifice is *la grande noblesse*. It fills the superior classes of the *tchin*, whilst its sons are attached to embassies, officer the Guards, and accept lucrative sinecures salaried by a heavy and partial taxation. The people at large have to be satisfied with any of the crumbs that fall from the table of the *grande noblesse*, and to consider themselves fortunate if their hunger is in any measure appeased. Thus, we can easily see in the organisation of Russian life how numerous are the elements to promote discontent and irritation amongst an ambitious but impoverished nation. When once reform has set in it cannot be arbitrarily discontinued; liberty is general, not partial in its operations. The serfs have been emancipated, but it is impossible that emancipation can be made to halt there; other classes have to be released from their disabilities as important to the State as its peasantry. "Why"—cry the middle classes, anxious to obtain office in the *tchinovniki* and to hold commands in crack regiments—"Why show such kindness for the slaves of the soil, who are the most ignorant and the least deserving of the nation? Grant to the other classes similar benefits." Under a Constitutional Government reform must be progressive; it may march slowly, but it must still be moving on. We have seen this fact exemplified in our own country. When we removed the political disabilities under which Dissenters laboured, the next step was to emancipate the Roman Catholics, and the logical consequence of those two acts led to the passing of the Jewish Disabilities Bill. When we opened the ranks of the Engineers and Artillery to the test of competitive examinations, it was but the prelude to the general abolition of patronage which now prevails. It is impossible for a Constitutional Power to resist the legitimate demands of its subjects: a Despotic Power can resist, but, as we now see in Russia, at the hazard of its safety and stability.

Another source of Muscovite discontent should not be overlooked. Between the Russians and the Germans there is but little cordiality, yet the Teutonic element is largely distributed over the *tchin* and the army. Men, either Germans or the sons of Germans, hold the seals as Ministers, or wear the uniform of generals of division. The Germans, by their superior intel-

lectual capacity, their immense patience, and their intense industry, easily outrival the Russians in their race for office. If the Muscovite list be examined, it will be seen that the men who form the *entourage* of the Czar—who are his Ministers and Commanders-in-Chief—have names which end far oftener in *mann* and *heim* than in *koff* and *iski*. Hence the Germans are now as much hated in Russia as were the Scotch in England in the days of the Marquis of Bute. Nor can we forget that the controlling force of religion is painfully wanting in the Russian character. The Russian is superstitious, but he is not religious, and for this deficiency he is indebted to the creed of his country. It may suit the pretensions of a certain small section of the English Church, anxious to consolidate its newly-created position—like some *parvenu* who seeks a brilliant alliance—by a union with an old established branch of the Catholic Church to speak in terms of eulogy of the Greek Communion. As a matter of fact, however, the Greek Church exhibits the most debased form of Christianity that is, perhaps, in existence. Holding many of the errors of Rome, she has nothing of the discipline and intellectual culture which, it must be admitted, is conspicuous in the fold of the Vatican. Her creed is practically a degrading superstition; whilst her priests by their lives often plainly prove how feeble is the influence exercised by their religion over themselves. Among the higher classes the Greek Church is treated with silent contempt; her faith does not tend to elevate the mind to nobler things, nor does it deter men from following the course inclination prescribes. Where the national religion is lightly considered, a people are always more prone to run into excesses than where their passions are curbed by the restraining influences of a faith which inspires them with respect, and in many instances with attachment. Thus, the young men of Russia, busy with their studies in the universities, or with their hampered industries in the workshops, are ready at the outset to join in the cry of the Nihilists of "Down with all religion!" Hot youth, which is ambitious and yet observant, can see no grounds for the preservation of a creed based on silly and puerile miracles, and whose popes are openly given to scandalous habits. Having enlisted *la jeunesse orageuse* in the cause of dethroning religion, the Nihilists proceed to cast a deeper glamour over their victims. One of the most powerful fascinations of Nihilism is, that in many instances its ends seem so plausible that it is not until the whole of its doctrines is comprehended that its diabolical harmony becomes visible. Hence the reason why men far above the station of the middle classes have been accused as Nihilists, and have suffered for their temerity by exile or death. The articles of Nihilism are most comprehensive; they include the vicious as well as the

virtuous. On the one hand they breathe out threatenings and slaughter, slaying monarchs, insulting decency, and casting down religion; but, on the other hand, they preach civil equality, reform of taxation, liberty of the Press, the suppression of the *tchin*, and the more moderate proposals of the Constitutionalists. There have been many who have thrown in their lot with the Nihilists, tempted by the plausible portion of their programme, but who have had no intention of carrying out their schemes by the aid of the sanguinary clauses. But Nihilism, like the terrible *Vehm-gericht*, forces its followers to accept the whole of its teaching, and to him who resists it deals out secret but certain death.

Two courses, and only two, are open to Russia. She must accede to the demands of the Constitutional party, and thus introduce peace and prosperity into her kingdoms; or she must maintain a rigid despotism, and convert the Russia of Alexander into the Russia of Nicholas. She may reform her constitution altogether or she may leave it alone; she cannot patch it. Constitutionalism or Absolutism lies before her, which will she choose? Holding an important position in the councils of Europe, Russia must act as a Western, not as an Eastern Power. At the present moment she is an anachronism. Environed by nations who have had to yield to the pressure put upon them by their subjects and to grant a constitution, the mighty Muscovite Power has turned a deaf ear to the requests of her people, and rules with the tyranny of the sixteenth century in the middle of the enlightened nineteenth century. Not one demand has been placed before her which Prussia, Austria, Italy, France, Spain have not acceded to. Let her then grant these requests, and she will sound the knell of Nihilism and of social revolution. We are not amongst those who place much faith in the capacity of the Nihilists to overthrow an Empire. A few thousands of young men, without experience, without practical ideas, whose resources are pamphlets and tracts circulated amongst an illiterate people, and whose arms are the weapons of the murderer and the incendiary, cannot prove themselves victorious when pitted against a population of some eighty millions of souls. The danger lies in the possibility of the moderate party, irritated at the short-sighted and persistent refusals to its prayers, forming in despair a union with the Nihilists, and thus giving its sanction to excesses of which it disapproves. History teaches us how often and by what almost imperceptible gradations the Left has found itself acting in conjunction with the Extreme Left; and history, both ancient and modern, is surely full of solemn warnings against the rashness of those placed in supreme power running counter to the wishes of a nation. We do not say that the Czar cannot succeed in restoring the most

iron despotism that Government ever saw established, but we do say that his evil end can only be attained at the expense of alienating the hearts of his people, crushing the prosperity of his kingdom, and increasing tenfold the influence and mischief of those secret societies now plotting against his State. Nihilism is one of those parasites which battens only upon the miseries and sufferings of mankind. It cannot be stamped out by death or punishment; martial law and the rigours of a severe discipline fail to suppress it; it pays no heed to police supervision, the sentence of judicial tribunals, or the power of the sword. But its pestilential breath loses all its poison when once it has to contend against the fresh air of political liberty. We pray that He who is the King of Kings and Ruler of Rulers may so guide the counsels of him who wields the sceptre as the Czar of All the Russias that the painful agitation now rife in his dominions may be calmed by the introduction of a wise, a tolerant, and an enlightened policy.

ALEX. CHARLES EWALD.

ART. III.—ARE OUR SUNDAY SCHOOLS A FAILURE?

FEW more important questions can be asked in the present day than this—Are our Sunday Schools a success or a failure? The gradual rise of the intellectual standard in all our other schools, while it is of great value in expanding the minds of the young, and rendering them more intelligently receptive of instruction, has also led to the shortening of the time for religious teaching, and imparted a more secular tone to our elementary day schools. The absence of encouragement under the present Governmental regulations to Scriptural instruction has also undoubtedly weakened the interest taken in it except by pious and conscientious teachers. Other subjects pay; but the Bible does not. The test has therefore often proved too severe.

Then there is the impossibility in large and populous parishes of carrying out our Church's order of catechising on Sundays and holy days by the clergyman. George Herbert's beautiful ideal cannot be universally realised, however desirable it may be in the country. Nor does this, even when most effectively done, supersede the Sunday Schools. In the hands of a specially gifted catechist it may impart clear and correct knowledge of Divine truth. The great facts and doctrines of the Gospel may be questioned into and out of our children, and so impressed on the memory, and, with God's blessing, on the heart. Still, one essential element is wanting. The clergyman in the reading-

desk stands at too great a distance, and cannot exercise the individual influence so valuable in a class. There cannot be that close contact of mind with mind, of heart with heart, which often produces such happy results.

It may, indeed, be said with great truth that this is the special function of the Christian parent. We fully admit that the pious mother has a power that none can share. But how many parents have the requisite piety and knowledge, or leisure? As, then, neither the Church's ministers nor the parents alone can in most cases compass the work, and the Lord's command, "Feed my lambs," remains an inseparable part of His commission to His Church, some other agency is wanted, and what is there so suitable as that already existing in Sunday Schools?

Their growing importance is for these reasons generally admitted. But it is often anxiously asked whether the system is upon the whole fairly successful. Must we, as with an ominous shake of the head we are occasionally invited to do, candidly admit it to be a failure?

The centenary of Sunday Schools forces this question on every thoughtful Christian.

The institution has now existed for a hundred years, and may well be challenged for results. Any inquiry into spiritual results is indeed beset with difficulties; mere figures cannot represent them. Attempts to tabulate conversions are hazardous and presumptuous. Still, certain signs of spiritual life are to be looked for in all really successful work. An impartial comparison of some of these with the defects in the Sunday School system may therefore lead to a true answer to the question, and at the same time suggest a few practical improvements.

I. We will look first at the *favourable* side of our subject.

Here the remarkable and rapid progress of the movement at once demands our attention. Growth is an invariable mark of healthy life. The kingdom of God, though for the most part silent in operation, is always progressive. And if a work based on the principles of that kingdom is progressing, it may be assumed to be owned of God, and to be used as a channel of His blessing.

Now, that Sunday Schools have greatly increased in numbers and machinery even within the present generation, can hardly be questioned. We have only to go back to the year 1763 for their earliest germ. In that year the Rev. Theophilus Lindsay, Vicar of Catterick, in Yorkshire, made the first recorded attempts in this direction. But to Robert Raikes, a journalist, of Gloucester, with the co-operation of the Rev. Thomas Stock, then Vicar of St. Paul's in that city, has been attributed by general consent the first organised scheme of Sunday Schools.

Very happy is the conception of the artist, Mr. R. Dowling,

which it is hoped may be approved of by the Royal Academy, of representing, on the canvas, the origin of Sunday Schools. The first interview between Raikes and Stock is to be the subject of the painting. The scene is an old lane, now called Hare Lane, at the bottom of which Mr. Stock's house was situated. The figures of the two philanthropists are both portraits, that of Mr. Raikes' taken from an engraving, and Mr. Stock's from a silhouette now in the possession of his family. They are surrounded by groups of idle, dissolute boys and girls, engaged in fighting, gambling, and rude sports. Their future benefactors are evidently talking of the annoyance, and discussing the means of preventing it. That meeting was a simple incident, but resulted in momentous consequences. Well is it described by James Montgomery—

> Once by the Severn's side
> A little fountain rose;
> Now, like the Severn's seaward tide,
> Round the whole world it flows.

Very forcibly does that memorable conference remind us of the grain of mustard seed. Least amongst seeds was the first happy thought of those good men; but sown with earnest faith, and watered doubtless with much prayer, we now see it growing into a great tree, under whose branches multitudes of Christians have found shelter and safety.

(1) We may be asked for some estimate of the extent of the work. Its field is the world, and its world-wide character renders complete statistics most difficult to obtain. The Sunday School census, if made, would include the Continent of Europe, the United States, our Colonies and Missionary settlements—in fact, the greater part of the globe. This cannot be attempted, although we may observe in passing that the adoption of this institution by Christians of almost all denominations, from Roman Catholics to the Society of Friends, and even by Jews on their Sabbath days, is a presumption in its favour, and an indirect testimony of great weight to its necessity and importance. If, however, we limit our view to England and Wales, we may arrive at some approximate computation. As regards our own Church it is an encouraging fact that the Sunday School Institute has now about 2000 schools associated with it, contributing an income of 1005*l.* to its funds. The majority of our parishes, however, have not yet joined it, and until the expected returns from all the dioceses of England are received, complete statistics cannot be arrived at. But it may be reasonably believed that comparatively few of our 15,000 parishes are now without some gathering of children for Christian instruction on the Lord's Day.

With the Nonconformists there is no difficulty in obtaining full information about the extent of their work. They have been before us in developing this important agency. If we take the denominations represented by the Sunday School Union, the Wesleyan Methodist Sunday School Union, and the schools of the Baptist body, the figures are ready to hand. Connected with the Sunday School Union are 4358 schools, 105,937 teachers (of whom 90,113 were formerly scholars), 964,305 scholars (of whom 48,489 are "church members"). The Wesleyan Methodists number 6169 schools, 117,516 teachers, 760,199 scholars, besides 74,429 young persons in Bible or select classes. The Baptists, who have no Sunday School Union, furnish an approximate return of 3476 schools, 42,216 teachers, 419,317 scholars. As, however, many of these last belong to the Sunday School Union, and the schools are not classified in the Report of that Union under their denominations, these figures will not furnish correctly the grand totals from all three sources. Still, if we were to assume that *all* the Baptist schools are included in the Sunday School Union, we should even then have an aggregate of 10,527 schools, 223,453 teachers, and 1,798,933 scholars. And if it should be found that equal numbers are connected with the Church of England (and this is surely a very modest assumption), we shall then have about 20,000 schools, 500,000 teachers, and 4,000,000 scholars in connection with the Church and Dissent. Contrast even such a numerical result with the little handful of neglected Arabs collected in Gloucester by Raikes and Stock 100 years ago, and do we not see most palpable evidence of satisfactory growth, and are we not ready to exclaim, "What hath God wrought!"

(2) But it may be justly said that large numbers do not prove success. We are reminded that very many who had for years attended our schools now neglect all religious ordinances, and live as baptised heathen; and if this be so, are not the schools a failure? At first view there appears to be too much force in this objection. If this could be said of *all* our scholars the indictment would be proved. But we may reply both negatively and positively. Suppose that ever so small a remnant have been savingly benefited, where would they have been, and what would have been their influence upon society, but for Sunday Schools?

How many, again, though not actually converted to God, are at least restrained from evil, and made more honest, more sober, more chaste, more intelligent, in fact, better citizens and more useful men and women. Is not even this a decided gain? When, too, in sickness or bereavement, the hitherto careless are awakened, the slenderest modicum of religious knowledge proves of the greatest value. Laid up like a fuel in the memory, it may have been overlaid by the worldliness of later years, and ter-

ribly damped by sin, and yet it is at length kindled by the Holy Spirit into a flame of heavenly love and consecrated service.

More positive and direct results are by no means wanting, although they cannot be always traced. The lapse of too many scholars is indeed a mournful fact, patent to all observers. But the growth of the seed in good ground is not always so evident. The processes of spiritual, as of natural, husbandry are generally slow, gradual, and at first secret. The once heedless boy or girl grows after a while thoughtful and obedient. Impressions are made, which are deepened at confirmation. Then he becomes a regular and devout communicant. Under the faithful preaching of the Gospel and other means of grace his character ripens and develops into the happy and useful Christian. A variety of good influences have thus been brought to bear upon him, and no one in particular can be pointed to as the instrumentality God has been pleased to use. Still, in many such cases, the first germs of life may have been sown in the Sunday School Instances of this kind may be very frequently traced in every well-worked parish.

If, however, we would see results in a more distinct form, and on a larger scale, we must visit the Sunday Schools of Lancashire and Yorkshire. The impressions of such a visit are not easily forgotten. There we find this institution occupying a place in the Church's machinery, and even in the social system, seldom attained elsewhere. Not only are the numbers large in those teeming centres of population, and are they carried on with an intense, though rude heartiness, an *esprit de corps* characteristic of the North, but we are struck with a mark of success too rare in our Southern or Midland counties.

It is delightful to enter large rooms, and even churches, filled with hundreds of young men and young women, who have grown up in the schools, and with the ripening of their intellects are athirst for more spiritual knowledge. The Sunday School has thus become a religious and social factor of such importance amongst the good influences at work in those crowded hives of industry, that the late eminent educationist, Sir Kay Shuttleworth, did not hesitate to attribute to it in great measure the exemplary patience and heroic courage of the operatives during the Cotton Famine. We may not, of course, claim for this or any other human agency the production of unmixed good. Two important drawbacks often cause serious anxiety. There is the danger lest so popular an institution degenerate into a mere system of routine. In some cases, too, it is apt to become the rival, and not the handmaid, of the Church, and there is danger lest attendance at the class be substituted for regular worship in the House of God. Still, looking at the general, and often very blessed results, we can hardly admit such schools to be a failure.

(3) Connected with this last, one more class of results must not be omitted from even this cursory review of the subject. The Reports of the Church Pastoral Aid Society furnish important testimony to the value of these schools as the nucleus from which the entire system of parochial organisation has grown. An instance known to the writer, and recorded some years ago, will serve our purpose.

A conventional district was formed out of three parishes of a large manufacturing town, and a curate appointed to the charge of it. It was almost virgin soil, which the clergy of the original parishes had been unable to cultivate, and consequently was overrun with weeds. A good infant school was the only existing institution, and the two large rooms of the school-house the only centre of operations. Services were begun in the upper room, and largely attended. But it was soon found that the permanent success of the work would be best promoted by the formation of a Sunday School, and a Bible class for young men. So the event proved. These became the principal feeders of the Church, and sent forth a healthy influence throughout the district. The parents and friends of the scholars were thus brought under the sound of the Gospel. In about two years, regular and devout congregations filled the upper room, with a proportionate band of communicants. And now, after ten or eleven years, that district has grown into a well-organised parish, while a beautiful and well-filled church overtops the original school-house, as a tall and handsome daughter might look down on her much-loved, but diminutive mother.

II. We have now heard one side of the question. The impartial and judicial mind will ask, What has the other side to say? By listening to their objections we may learn more than from the panegyrics of too partial friends. What, then, are the alleged signs of failure? They are not hard to find, and are sufficiently humiliating.

(1) We hear much said, and with too much truth, about inefficiency of teachers. Because we cannot always command the same disciplined minds as in the day schools, the efforts made in Sunday Schools are despised. But must not they who make light of the work on account of the weakness of the instruments, have forgotten St. Paul's words—"You see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called" (1 Cor. i. 26)? A clear understanding of the Gospel, and a heart full of love to Christ and His little ones, these are indeed essential; without them no success can be expected, however shining may be the other qualifications. Aptitude for teaching is also most important, but may be acquired by practice. Is there, then, no truth in this objection? We must shut our eyes to the facts if we were to

say so. May not St. Paul's rebuke to the Corinthian Church be applied with respect to this to the Churches now? "Do you set them to *teach*, who are least esteemed in the Church?" It is still too often thought that any ignoramus will do for a Sunday School teacher. The youngest and least experienced are impressed into this service without much inquiry into even motives or piety. If so, can we be surprised at the difficulty in keeping order, the hazy, indefinite quality of the teaching, and the absence of results? But this is just the problem which, in many places, appears insoluble. In rural parishes, and not a few of the poorest in towns, better material is not forthcoming. What is to be done? One of two courses lies before us. We must either improve what we have, or find better. The recruiting sergeant under our system of voluntary service cannot pick out at will the finest or most respectable young men as recruits. Within certain limits he takes what he can get; and then, by drill and discipline, moulds them into shape. It is often the same in the Church militant, and much may be done by Bible classes, model lessons, and the like, to raise the tone of our schools. Moreover, in many cases the other alternative may be more practicable than it seems. Persons of higher culture and riper experience sometimes need only a little more persuasion to serve. They are slow to put themselves forward, and wait to be invited. In this matter, too, should not the more opulent parishes stretch out a helping hand to the poorer?

(2) But, again, there rises up the oft-canvassed question, How shall we retain our elder scholars? At the age of fourteen or fifteen they drift away from us. The girls go to service, while the lads enter situations at a distance from home, or assert their independence. These are hard facts which sorely try the faith and patience of clergymen and teachers. It is true that this difficulty has been often surmounted amongst ourselves. Perhaps the Nonconformists have more successfully grappled with it. In the Report of the Sunday School Union for 1879, it is stated that 11,335 scholars have become "Church members" during the year, and that the total number of such members is 48,489, or five per cent. of the whole. These are gratifying results. But what of the great majority who do annually elude our grasp? The fish somehow slip out of the net. Is there not a cause? Are the meshes too wide? The length and want of heartiness in our Church services increase the natural distaste for religion. Sermons adapted to educated adults do not interest or instruct ignorant children. In the schools, moreover, sufficient regard is not always paid to their advance in years, if not in intelligence, and scholars who stand on that ambiguous border-land between childhood and maturer years, resent being treated as children. More judicious classifi-

cation into separate Bible classes may therefore lessen the evil. Special services for the young in the church, if short, bright, and simple, as well as school-room services for infants during the hours of public worship, all tend to make religion more attractive, and attach the young to it.

(3) Once more it is urged that the crass ignorance of the simplest facts and doctrines of Christianity betrayed by many that have passed through our schools is a proof of failure. We sadly admit the premiss, but deny the conclusion. In the parable of the sower three parts of the seed are lost, while the remainder bore fruit. So it has always been, and yet the Kingdom of Heaven is not a failure. At the same time must we not in candour set much of this ignorance to the account of the want of system and completeness in the teaching? More general adoption of uniform and consecutive lessons, such as are provided by the Institute, would be likely to leave more distinct and lasting impressions.

(4) Lastly, not to notice other than serious objections, we are told that even of those really benefited, the greater part join the ranks of Dissent, and forsake the Church of their fathers. At the recent Diocesan Conference at York a clergyman is reported to have said—

> He thought in very many of our country parishes, Sunday Schools were a *dead failure*. They had a certain number of Sunday School teachers, most estimable persons in themselves, who had the will, but were entirely without the power, to teach; and a good many Sunday Schools were doing harm instead of good. When he went to his present parish some years ago, he found that some of the teachers were teaching the children in the morning, and going to the Meeting-house themselves in the afternoon. In many parishes he would substitute children's services for Sunday Schools.

It is hard to see why this clergyman should not have thought of improving, instead of closing, his school. The Archbishop of York, in his reply, while warmly defending the system in general, admitted that "there was a great deal of looseness as to the teaching in the Sunday Schools;" but his Grace traced this evil to its true source when he added—"It was the clergyman's fault if the teaching in the schools was not sufficiently definite, because he himself would take care to regulate what it would be by the classes of instruction which he would form." This is undoubtedly the best remedy for the defect. It cannot be denied that too often, under the soundest Evangelical influence, there is amongst the lower classes a great absence of such an understanding of the distinctive principles of our Church, as would enable them to join intelligently in her services, and keep them from straying away to other communions. Yet this would be much seldomer the case, if the clergyman, being himself sound

in the faith, were to make his personal influence felt in the oversight of his schools and the training of the teachers. By a skilful interweaving of the Catechism, Articles, and Formularies of the Church with the great foundation principles of the Gospel, the scholars would, as a rule, grow up Churchmen as well as Christians, and while they learn to love Christ best, would value their Church also.

What, then, is the conclusion of the whole matter? Is it not this, that while we cannot for one moment admit that an agency which God has so manifestly blessed, and is becoming so increasingly necessary, can be pronounced "a dead failure," it is, after an existence of a century, still in its infancy, and needs to be fostered and guided with the utmost care and wisdom in every parish, if we would not abandon the lambs of Christ to the secularising influences of the age?

For the results achieved let us thank God, and resolve, by His help, to see greater things than these. The promise is unto us and unto our children, and if the Church will plead that promise more believingly, and put forth her energies more unitedly, God will pour out a more abundant blessing on her offspring.

WILLIAM BURNET.

ART. IV.—THE AUTOGRAPH MANUSCRIPT OF "THE IMITATION OF CHRIST."[1]

AMONG the triumphs of religion over materialism and mere speculative dogma, not the least is to be found in the latter history of the Four Books of Thomas à Kempis concerning the Imitation of Christ. The French dreamer, Auguste Comte, whose career was to a great extent a systematic and unwearied warfare upon the foundations of religion found it necessary to work out a kind of philanthropic cultus before he died; and, in his dogmatizings on what he called the "religion of humanity," he had to support the religious feeling necessary to his latter aims by means of other fuel than could be gathered from the teachings of the positive philosophy. Of the Comtists, the sect who made, and perhaps still make, some attempt to reduce to practice the quasi-religious *régime* of their master, we hear but little

[1] "The Imitation of Christ:" Being the Autograph Manuscript of Thomas à Kempis, De Imitatione Christi, reproduced in Facsimile from the Original in the Royal Library at Brussels. With an Introduction by Charles Ruelens, Keeper of the Department of Manuscripts, Royal Library, Brussels. London: Elliot Stock, 62, Paternoster Row, E.C. 1879.

now-a-days; but it will ever be memorable that two of the books most commended by the leader in the infidel school of "sociology," and inventor of the "religion of humanity," are the two great religious books of the Middle Ages, the "De Imitatione Christi" of Thomas à Kempis and the "Commedia" of Dante Alighieri. The epic poem of the grim and glorious Florentine connects with the material and vital interests of the great world at a thousand points; and thus the mere secular reader is never at a loss to find his account in its study. But the work of Thomas à Kempis is religious or nothing, Christian or nothing, devotional or nothing: it has no concern with "the world, the flesh, and the devil," but to renounce them utterly; and it is an astonishment that he whose aim was to supersede Christianity, who in his character of historical philosopher even endeavoured to depreciate the personal character of the Man Christ Jesus, and to exalt St. Paul as the true founder of the Christian religion, yet found it in his heart to recommend to his disciples in the most strenuous terms the constant study of the book of Thomas à Kempis concerning the Imitation of Christ.

There is matter for a considerable essay here, in the examination of the causes of this attitude of the founder of Positivism; but we have merely glanced at it in passing to another and later chapter in the history of the mediæval book of devotion. It is by no means generally known, not even widely known, though it might be, that the author's own manuscript of this book is still in existence. For nearly four hundred and fifty years it has withstood the ravages of time, passing through troublous epochs, and being carried from place to place as if under special guardianship; and now, after more than four thousand editions of it have been printed, after the sweet and peaceful soul that dictated it has passed homeward, and the patient and devoted hand that wrote it has been laid to rest for more than four centuries, the regular and beautiful manuscript remains to us, a standing proof of the authorship, and a rebuke to those who have vainly attempted to convey to other heads the glorious fame of the humble monk of Mount St. Agnes, and a key whereby the learning of these latter days has unlocked the venerable secret, that he whose life was a poem has left us what, no less in form than in matter, is also a poem.

Early in the seventeenth century a dispute arose as to the authorship of the book which had already obtained such vogue throughout the civilised world as to be only second to the Bible in the extent to which it had been circulated. The manuscript known to have been written by Thomas à Kempis in 1441 was, of course, appealed to throughout the dispute; but it was argued against his authorship—for the handwriting was never in dispute—that he was but the transcriber of that particular treatise.

In the same volume with it, in the same autograph, are other treatises, of which the authorship is undisputed; and the whole have so much more in common than mere handwriting that the critical innovators of 1604 never had much reason on their side. However, the controversy raged off and on for a long time; and it remained for the learned Dr. Carl Hirsche, of Hamburg, to settle the matter finally. When examining the manuscript of 1441, now in the Royal Library at Brussels, for the purposes of a critical edition of the text on which he was engaged, he observed certain peculiarities not previously taken into account, such as signs of a division into chapters, an entirely individual method of punctuation, used by the author to mark, not only the grammatical construction, but also the rhythmical structure of the work; and on pushing his investigation to other works of Thomas à Kempis, he found that the same system of punctuation characterised them also. "His style of punctuation," we are told by Mr. Charles Ruelens, the keeper of manuscripts in the Brussels Library, "is quite unique; it indicates the external structure of the sentence, marks its outline, and establishes the most complete harmony between the sentence and the internal structure of the ideas."

The fruitful study of Dr. Hirsche, while it establishes beyond dispute the identity of the author of the "De Imitatione" with the author of other books which Thomas à Kempis unquestionably composed, has also laid bare the form of the "Imitation," thus explaining for the first time certain contemporary references to the treatise as a *metrical* work. As Mr. Ruelens says, "the rhyme and the rhythm, which pervade alike the 'Imitation' and all the undoubted works of Thomas, are well-defined characteristics which mark an identity of style which is most remarkable, and which cannot be mistaken."

To compare a great thing with a comparatively small thing, this discovery recalls to mind that of Mr. Skeat in regard to the authorship of those "Rowley Poems" of Thomas Chatterton, which lasted the literary world of Great Britain nearly a century for controversial amusement. The pseudo-mediæval poetry of the Bristol boy, beautiful as it is when once the jargon by which he disfigured it is mastered, could never influence much the feeling of men, and is, of course, a small affair when compared with a devotional book such as that of Thomas à Kempis. But just as the material for settling whether Chatterton or a fifteenth century monk wrote the "Rowley Poems" existed for Tyrwhitt, Wharton, Malone, Milles, Bryant, and Sherwin, as well as for Mr. Skeat a hundred years later; so the material for determining the authorship of the "Imitation" was as accessible to the disputants of 1604 as to the learned doctor of Hamburg more than 250 years later. What was lacking in each case was not even sagacity: no

doubt enormous sagacity was wasted in both disputes; but it was the essentially modern feature of minute and realistic analysis, in which the imagination is admitted to play a part, though under the most rigorous control. It was this that the bibliopolists and critics of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries alike never dreamed of. Many a dreadful word in the unimaginable vocabulary of Chatterton's "Rowley Poems" Mr. Skeat ran to earth as a misprint or other peculiarity of the editions of Baily's and Kersey's Dictionaries which the extraordinary boy-poet made use of in his word-manufacture; and this might have been done just as easily by the veriest dunderhead of all the disputants on the wrong side of the Rowley controversy. Even so, the characteristics in the demonstration of which Dr. Hirsche has deserved so well of the literary world, were just as accessible to those who consumed time and patience in trying to rob à Kempis of his glory, as they were to the German student.

The manuscript of the "Imitation of Christ" is, in a literary point of view, from mere association, a real treasure; and it is a thing of interest to all who hold dear the aspirations of a loving and chastened spirit and a gem of devotional exercise; but this manuscript's interest increases again when it places the matter of authorship beyond the painful pale of controversy, and yields up to the scrutiny of science the secret of its mystic rhythm and cadence. At any time to possess an exact reproduction of so treasurable an autograph would have been an uncommon gratification to the learned; but as the matter now stands, the desire of owning the counterpart of Thomas's manuscript will pass far beyond the circle of the learned; and it was a happy thought of Mr. Elliot Stock, whose many admirable publications in facsimile are well known, to reproduce this manuscript. It is *àpropos* of Mr. Stock's facsimile, just issued with a preface by Mr. Ruelens, that we have been led to make these few remarks on the "Imitation;" and we must not quit the subject without a few words of welcome and praise for such a remarkable and interesting literary curiosity. The original has been reproduced page for page, of the exact size, by means of a combination of photography and the ordinary processes of the press; the paper used for the facsimile is of the character and quality of the original; and the binding is beautifully imitated from that of a devotional book of the fifteenth century. Mr. Ruelens' preface gives all the information one wants as to the history of the book; and the whole result is a dainty little volume which stands alone in all respects.

We have treated the subject from mainly a literary point of view; the doctrinal errors and defects of the "Imitation" must be considered in another Paper.

Art. V.—ATTRACTIVENESS IN RELIGIOUS SERVICES.

THE instinct of reverence is planted in every heart. This instinct requires adequate expression. The expression is found in prayer, and praise, and devotion. Prayer—the pleading of realised want. Praise—the utterance of grateful love. Adoration—the felt wonder and awe of a heart bowed before the majesty, and excellency, and glory of God. These lie at the root of all religious worship; these are the elements of which the sacred incense is composed, which, kindled into a flame by Divine grace, ascends to God as a sweet savour in Christ—in the language of the Song of Songs, "as a pillar of smoke, perfumed with frankincense, and myrrh, and all powders of the merchant."

Such worship the Christian feels to be the nearest approach to heaven that he can enjoy upon earth. It is one of his greatest pleasures to lay his hopes and fears, his desires and aspirations, the tears of his sorrow and the honours of his thankfulness, at the feet of Him whom, in the spirit of adoption, he can call "Abba, Father." Alone, in his private chamber; or in the pause from daily toil; or in the field where he meditates at eventide, his heart goes up to God, and for the time being all external things may be so kept in abeyance that "whether he be in the body or out of the body he cannot tell. God knoweth." In "The Excursion" Wordsworth beautifully expresses my meaning:—

> In such access of mind, in such high hour
> Of visitation from the living God,
> Thought was not; in enjoyment it expired.
> No thanks he breathed, he proffered no request:
> Rapt into still communion that transcends
> The imperfect offices of prayer and praise.

Time and place here are of no concern. Morning, noon, or evening, or in the still watches of the night, it matters not. Nor is it of any moment whether we worship on the mountain-top or in the lowly valley, or on the sounding shore or under the shadowy branches of the over-arching trees. At all times, and in all places, we may have "fellowship with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ;" we can "come boldly unto the Throne of Grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need."

There is no difficulty about worshipping under such circumstances as these. It is when the Christian leaves his solitude,

when he meets his brethren in public assembly, that a difficulty is experienced. It is evident that, when numbers meet together for the purpose of praise and prayer, there must be some forms as vehicles of confession, adoration, petition, thanksgiving. Certain rules must be laid down, certain regulations enjoined, with a view to maintain order and ensure decency. The combined worship of an assembly should have a prescribed ritual, so that while it may be acceptable to God, it may also be profitable to man. This leads us to inquire whether the New Testament provides any standard of ritual for Christian worship, and how far the principle of making our services attractive by art and music, by dress and decoration, is authorised under the present Dispensation, or is profitable to the worshippers themselves. As to the Old, we know that God gave to the Jewish people an imposing ceremonial and an elaborate ritual. Their religious ceremonies were moulded after a pattern which was truly and absolutely of Divine origin. The Levitical system had much sensuous beauty, and much external magnificence. The vestments of the high priest were rich and splendid. The altars were made of pure gold or fine brass; the curtains of the sanctuary were bright with the fairest colours, and inwrought with rich embroidery. The worship of the Temple borrowed from art all that art had of its purest and best; there was fragrant incense and melodious music; all the beauty that ingenuity could devise, or wealth furnish.

But now comes the question, Is the worship of the Tabernacle, or of the Temple, to be a model for the Christian Church? And the answer must be in the negative. The Levitical system was typical and temporary, as truly as were the bleeding sacrifices which formed its most essential part. It has all passed away, together with the shedding of blood. In Old Testament times the Church of God was in her nonage. She was under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the Father. During her childhood state she was conversant with what St. Paul does not hesitate to call "weak and beggarly elements;" and he warns his converts against a return to these, and the hard and fruitless bondage which they engender.

But if the Levitical ritual is not to be our model for Christian worship, may we not go forward, as some plead, to the Apocalyptic vision of St. John, and mould our services after the pattern which the beloved disciple saw in Patmos? And here, again, the answer must be in the negative.

The Book of Revelation is symbolical, its symbols being derived mainly from the Temple service; and it sets forth heavenly things under earthly imagery. It is dangerous to apply these symbols to the worship of the Christian Church; for, to be consistent, we must not make an arbitrary and un-

authorised selection of the figures, but must deal with the whole. Thus, if we find one angel with a golden censer full of incense, and argue from this the duty of offering incense at our services, we find another angel with a censer which he fills with fire off the altar, and casts it on the earth. Is this also to be one of our prescribed rites? Are we to abolish every distinction between the ministers and the people because we find that in heaven the whole number of the redeemed are made "priests unto God?" Are we to do away with houses of prayer because the New Jerusalem is without a temple?

These hints illustrate the difficulties that beset the way of those who maintain that the visions of St. John give us a model for Christian worship. Have we, then, anywhere in the New Testament a definition of true and acceptable worship?

We have; and in the words of our blessed Lord Himself: "The hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship Him in spirit and in truth, for the Father seeketh such to worship Him. God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth."

How is this worship to be secured? Not by any external process. Outward forms cannot create inward spirituality. They may be its expression; they are not its source. The heart is the seat of true worship. Holiness of heart is the gift of the Holy Ghost. Holiness of life is conformity to Christ. Holiness of worship is the outgoing of the soul in prayer and praise to God. But then, when many gather together for united prayer, there must be language which all can agree to use—concurrent confession, adoration, supplication, thanksgiving. I need not say that our English Prayer-book—"this golden censer which was purged from its dross at the time of the Reformation"—provides us with forms of worship, simple and noble, well fitted to bring us in faith, love, and penitence to the mercy-seat of Almighty God. But though true worship allows of forms, as instruments of devotion, the forms must always be of a subordinate and secondary character. They are means to devotion, but cannot of themselves constitute devotion. From being helps they may be easily transformed into hindrances. And this latter they become when they overlay the spiritual life instead of setting it forth; when they are prized for their own sakes, and not simply as a vehicle of approach to God; when they tempt men to stop short with them, instead of pressing through them to Him who will be worshipped in spirit and in truth. Here is our danger. We need a form wherewith to clothe our public devotions; yet such is the deceitfulness of the human heart that the form may, and often does, become the occasion of formality. Did not God once and again cast a slight upon the Temple worship of His own appointment, and

condemn the gifts and sacrifices which Himself had ordained, because the people regarded them not as means, but as ends; not as any avenue of approach, but as barriers between the worshippers and their God?

And, therefore, since even lawful forms are an element of danger to the soul, care must be taken not to multiply them unnecessarily, and so to order them that they may prove to be a blessing, and not a curse. If all the worshippers were spiritually-minded; if, like "the King's daughter," they were "all glorious within," the danger would be little or nothing, and we should rise above all outward forms into spiritual communion with God. And not only so, but we should acknowledge that the mere worship of God was in itself attractive; that it needed nothing external to give it a charm. We should feel like David of old, "A day in Thy courts is better than a thousand:" we should exclaim with the patriarch at Bethel, "This is none other than the house of God; this is the gate of heaven."

But all who worship God in word are not worshippers in spirit; and others there are who find no pleasure in the services of the sanctuary. To them the Sabbath is a weariness, and the words of the Psalmist a satire, "I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go into the house of the Lord." And these, I suppose, are the persons chiefly intended when we talk of making our services attractive. The idea is of throwing out some bait, of offering some bribe to the unspiritual, in order to draw them to the worshipping assembly. And so an earthly element is to be introduced into our worship, and the tone is to be lowered, in order to attract the alienated mind.

Now I go all lengths in granting that our services should be attractive, with the attractiveness of warmth, and earnestness, and life. There should be nothing by its slovenliness or coldness to repel, but everything by its fervency and devoutness to win and to please. Nor are we to forget the young of our congregations who are drawn to churches where the services are highly æsthetic. And we should be anxious, moreover, to win the indifferent and the unholy, under the Gospel sound.

But even so, I question the expediency of introducing doubtful attractions, by which you flatter that which is congenial to the natural man, and minister to his self-deception; whilst you hurt the really spiritual mind, and introduce things which are only of the earth, earthy, into a worship which should be holy, and heavenly, and pure. Are we to invite men to the house of prayer, and promise them as a bribe what befits the art-gallery and the concert-room? Is the eye of faith ostensibly to "see Him who is invisible," whilst the eye of sense is going out to the jewelled reredos or the gaudy vestment? Is the ear of faith professedly to hear Him who speaketh from heaven, and yet to

be on the stretch for the concord of sweet sounds? Are not rather our whole feelings in the house of God to be dominated by the thought, "The Lord is in His holy temple: let the whole earth stand in awe of Him?"

Let us consider to what extent music and other æsthetic agencies may be lawfully employed in rendering Divine service attractive, as it is termed, to the masses of the people with whom we have to do.

I lay down one broad general principle. In all the arrangements, whether as regards the place or the service, everything should be made subordinate to intelligent spirituality. A Christian congregation meets for the purpose of uniting in prayer and praise; to receive instruction; to have their minds enlightened, their judgment convinced, their sluggish affections made to stir and throb with life. Whatever promotes these purposes ministers to edification; and with this object nothing must interfere. This does not exclude beauty from the architecture and arrangements of our churches. The places set apart for the worship of God should not be mean, or poor, or squalid. We should not be content that "the ark of God dwell in curtains," while we ourselves "dwell in cedar." The best which any man can bring to God is not too good: the richest is not too rich for Him. Art and song may be as ministering handmaids setting forth the glory of His name. The house built by human hands for Divine worship should be dignified and impressive; for, as we are material as well as spiritual, we must not disdain the aids which external objects may give to the piety of the worshippers. At the same time, let us take care that the whole be in harmony with the pure Christian faith restored to us at the Reformation.

And then as to music in our services. What are the principles that should regulate the song and psalmody of the Church?

To answer this question we must have an intelligent perception of the reason why we sing at all. Is it to satisfy the lovers of artistic taste; or is it that the congregation may give utterance to the united expression of its joy, its thankfulness, its trust, its love, and its praise? God has bestowed upon us the divine gift of music, that through its help emotions which would otherwise yearn in vain for utterance, may find their natural expression. In heaven itself the perfection of praise is expressed in song. Music has always been giving expression to the spiritual life of the Church, from the early time when Pliny heard "hymns sung to Christ as God;" and the great gift of sacred song has ever been employed in the worshipping congregation.

But it is to be remembered that Church music is no mere entertainment for those who have a musical taste; it has a high and proper place in the worship of God, a holy and solemn

function to serve. But let its kind be devotional, not artistic. Anthems and services which, from their difficulty, prevent the general congregation from taking part in them are, to my mind, unsuited for public worship. To stand and listen while a choir performs is but a vicarious worship after all, if it be worship in any sense of the word. All of us know how, when listening to the anthem, with its duet, and solo, and quartet, we have exchanged the attitude of the worshipper for that of the critic, and have found ourselves comparing the different excellence of the treble, the tenor, and the bass. This ought not so to be. A choir is useful to lead and support the multitude of untrained and unprofessional voices: else may the singing degenerate into a medley of discordant sounds. But the province of a choir is to lead the song of a congregation, not to monopolise it. In our service of song, let harmony be subordinate to melody; let the tunes be sweet and simple, such as all can join in with pleasure; let our hymns be expressive of true religious feeling, whether of prayer or praise; let us remember that our whole worship is to be "in spirit and in truth;" and then I think there will be no lack of attractiveness in our service: especially, and most particularly, if to this be added devout praying of the Prayers, good reading of the Lessons, and warm and earnest preaching of the gospel of the grace of God. As to framing our services after such a model as will attract the multitude, and draw them to our churches, I doubt the expediency of such an attempt. Grant that we may attract men and women of the world by elaborate ritual and ceremony, by architectural adornment, and by sensuous music. What have we gained? What have they gained? You have helped to make for them the unwelcome bondage of the Sunday as easy and agreeable as possible. You have enabled them to put on the outward appearance of devotion when there was no inward reality. You have sent them away self-satisfied, because they have mistaken their pleasure in the glory of art and the melody of song for true religion, and have been content to draw nigh to God with their lips while their hearts are far from Him.—

There is no greater danger incident to an elaborate ritual than that of mistaking emotion for religious feeling. The music of soft voices; the pealing tones of the organ; the fragrance of incense; the mellow light streaming in through the painted window, and casting a subdued glow over floor, and pillar, and aisle—these adjuncts may thrill the soul with delight, but they lift it not up to God in true and acceptable worship. Even John Milton, Puritan as he was, felt the power of such things upon the senses:—

> But let my due feet never fail
> To walk the studious cloister pale,

And love the high embowered roof,
With antique pillars, massy proof,
And storied windows, richly dight,
Casting a dim religious light;
There let the pealing organ blow
To the full-voiced choir below,
In service high and anthem clear
As may with sweetness through mine ear
Dissolve me into ecstacies,
And bring all heaven before mine eyes.

Alas! feelings so excited have often only to do with the bodily organisation, and may be far removed from spiritual experience.

As to the amount of music to be introduced into our services, this must be governed by the Scriptural law, "Let everything be done to edification." Tastes differ; and if harmony, in another sense, is to prevail in a congregation, the personal preference of a small minority must yield to the desire of a large majority; always supposing that no Scriptural rule or principle is violated in spirit or in practice. These and like matters must be left to the prayerful decision of individual congregations. Only let large-hearted charity prevail, both with minister and people.

In these days of doctrinal tergiversation the laity have reason to be jealous of the clergy; and the clergy have need of great caution in introducing unnecessary changes. But let confidence be deserved on the one side and conceded on the other. Let priestly rule be renounced by the minister, and unworthy suspicion discarded by the people.

While discussing the use of musical and other æsthetic adjuncts of Divine worship, let us not omit the great and more legitimate attraction of a well-enunciated liturgical service. This depends largely on the capacity and deportment, and devotional preparation of the officiating minister. Let the Prayers be solemnly and impressively prayed, not read. Let the Lessons, and other portions of Scripture be intelligently and seriously read, not hurried over, or drawled. Let there be no intoning, or monotoning, or other haziness of human devising: no airing of man's crotchets, no obscuration of God's glory.

And as regards the sermon, let it be to the point, and not wandering; let it be long enough to discuss the subject propounded, not so long as to produce weariness; let it be solid enough to convince the understanding, and fervent enough to warm the heart. Above all, let it be full of Christ and empty of the preacher; and let it be delivered in fervent prayer for, and entire dependence upon, the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven.

Such a service, in all its parts—prayer, praise, and preaching

—will prove, as I believe, attractive to the great mass of our congregations, when the fopperies of ecclesiastical dress, the mummeries of sacerdotal imposition, and the sensuous attractions of dramatic music, shall have faded into well-deserved oblivion.

Finally, let one and all, whether in the desk, the pulpit, or the pew, endeavour to make the services of the sanctuary as edifying as possible. By the earnestness of our prayers, by the intensity of our praise, by the fervour of our thanksgiving, by the intelligence and spirituality of our "Psalms, and Hymns, and Spiritual Songs," let all strive to "worship God in spirit and in truth."

Thus, while we worship, shall our souls be filled with joy, and be blessed by the presence of Him "whose we are, and whom we serve." And thus shall we realise the blessed fact that we "dwell in God, and God in us."

CHARLES D. BELL.

ART. VI.—HOSPITALS.

PART I.

OF late years an infinite variety of charities have endeavoured to gain the support of the English public. We may read with pleasure the statements which show that although in this nineteenth century the prosperity and wealth of England have advanced by gigantic strides, we have increased our charitable gifts in a similar ratio, and cheerfully pay a tax of several millions a year to support the good objects around us. But from most of our various societies and institutions having, directly or indirectly, a religious object in view, there are not many which all classes and creeds can agree in forwarding.

Hospitals stand almost alone in being a work of charity of such a Catholic nature that Jew and Gentile, rich and poor, Englishman and Foreigner, Churchman and Nonconformist may assist in the management, and may participate in the bounty.

But the work of eleemosynary healing is done in various ways and by the help of different agencies.

Of these the general hospitals do the great proportion, and are looked upon as the centres of medical skill, and as the institutions where the study of disease may be carried out with every means at hand for the physician or physiologist to investigate the secrets of Nature. The work done by a general hospital is to take under its care all who suffer from disease or accident, so far as its space and means allow, and so long as

they be fit persons from both a social and a medical point of view —to provide medical skill, a trained staff of nurses, suitable food, a supply of good drugs and instruments, and healthy wards. With these duties must be dovetailed the task of using the patients and their ailments as subjects for education and training.

The wards occupy most of the space of a hospital, and they look quiet, orderly, and comfortable. Yet a hospital is often the scene of sad and painful sights. Especially is this the case in the room—suitably placed near the front entrance—for the reception of accidents and severe medical cases. Many have drawn their last breath in this room, when sufficient strength is not left to allow of their being taken into the wards. Another department not to be visited by those who would avoid a ghastly sight is the *post-mortem* room. This (while always discreetly kept out of sight) is of huge importance if properly worked. Not only is it valuable in a scientific point of view, but it acts as the detective department of the hospital. Here all secrets are disclosed, the doctor's surmises are proved or disproved, and the treatment the hospital has given may be criticised. Knowledge, too, is here gained for the benefit of living patients, and with the prospect of a *post-mortem* examination, the house-physician is anxious to show that he has fully and carefully examined his patient for all possible enlightenment.

There are parts of the building which will be interesting especially to a non-professional visitor, such as the kitchen, the steam laundry, the nurses' dining and sleeping rooms, and the vast stores of linen needed for so large a population.

Such is a very faint outline of some of the work done in a general hospital. When the scheme is efficiently worked, who can wonder that the poor are grateful for its benefits. And yet in times not long gone by, it was not so. An idea was then strongly rooted in the public mind that in-patients were used and abused as a vehicle of instruction to students, and that the bodies of those who died were handed over to the demonstrator of anatomy.

There is a very real charity which may be done by a general hospital at a trifling cost, and which is combined with useful instruction to the students of its school. It is the maternity department. By its connection with the hospital, women are treated at their own homes, without expense to themselves, and with the knowledge that if the least difficulty occurs, the advice of a highly-skilled obstetric physician is at once available. And while noticing this department I am glad to take the opportunity of observing how valuable in their distinct and yet similar work are other societies: such as the Surgical Aid, for supplying instruments and artificial limbs to the poor; the Rupture Societies; the dispensaries, who do much the same work as

the out-patient department of hospitals, but, of course, without their power of taking in any cases which may require in-door treatment; the nursing institutions, which supply trained nurses to the sick poor, especially to those whose cases are too chronic to be suitable for hospital; and, finally, maternity charities, for treating women at their own homes. All these, while not doing, are assisting in doing, the work of hospitals.

I cannot leave the subject of general hospitals without reference to an important work which they all should (and mostly do) have in connection with them, called the Samaritan Society. One would have thought that this name implied the work done at the hospital, which is always ready to treat a man who is "half dead," rather than the kindness shown to those who have already been well-treated and nearly cured. But whatever its name, the society undertakes that no patient leaves in real distress, and if required sends him to a convalescent home for complete restoration to health. These convalescent homes are an economy to any hospital that can afford to support one. It may be readily understood that each patient there costs much less than in a hospital worked at high pressure, containing every needful appliance and arrangement for severe and bedridden cases, who can do but little to help the nurses.

Special hospitals have of late years come greatly into fashion. Faults are often found with them, and with reason, for the system of having hospitals for a single ailment is carried much too far, and harm is done by the existence of so many of a special nature. A long list of such hospitals occurs at once to one's mind. We have orthopædic hospitals for club foot, hospitals for hip disease, hospitals for stone in the bladder, hospitals for diseases of the chest, hospitals for diseases of the throat and ear, ophthalmic hospitals, and hospitals for epilepsy. Having gone the whole length of the body, one would think this was all; but the promoters of specials will not leave the general hospitals any work they can help. There are also lying-in hospitals, and others for cancer, for the skin, for fistula, for the teeth, for women, for children, for heart disease, and even for so unattractive a complaint as ulcerous legs. Besides these, we find hospitals for Frenchmen, for Germans, and for seamen. How is it that the patients in these hospitals are thought to be better treated than in the general hospital? The answer in too many cases is, that to be known as the physician or surgeon at a hospital leads to both a practice and a name; and then a special hospital is often started by a man whose ambition is greater than his practice. The commencement is frequently a dispensary, which gradually grows until it has sufficient strength to expand into a hospital. Then a few fashionable names are secured, and care is taken to draw statistics showing how many thousands there are who are found to

be suffering from the disease in question, refraining, of course, from any hint of the fact that the general hospitals are ready to take this class of cases, that the lack of a school makes their treatment more expensive, and less useful in an educational point of view, and that no surgeons are superior in skill to those found at the old-fashioned general hospital. And they are supported by the habit of Englishmen of thinking this sub-division attractive; and by the consequence of this, that they receive a large amount of support. In London the specials now greatly preponderate. To fifteen general hospitals there are fifty-one specials —nearly all, by the way, in the West-end. No one who understands the subject can honestly believe that patients there are more skilfully, or even more suitably, treated than in a general hospital. "Moreover, this splitting up of specialities with a more than Egyptian minuteness has a tendency to destroy that unity of disease which the philosophic mind should always keep in view." The specials, besides, have no school, and so much opportunity for instruction is thrown away. So clearly is this latter the case, that at least one of the general hospitals in London offers certain facilities of admission to those suffering from some of the diseases treated by special hospitals, in order that its own students may not be without instruction in such complaints. But the number of diseases treated by special hospitals has grown from the one or two which are really essential. And some are essential. For instance, the fever hospitals must exist, although there are general hospitals which have a department for infectious cases. Patients with brain disease, also, whether they be lunatics or imbeciles, should be treated in a separate institution. With regard to ophthalmic hospitals, their oculists are usually the same men as the surgeons of the neighbouring general hospital, and, although the disease may be as easily and as well treated in the latter, yet it is held by some that so all-important an organ as the eye should have its separate institution. If a special hospital were ever required, it would seem to be needed by the Jews. They require separate food, a separate butcher, a different Sunday, and separate wards. Reasonable, indeed, it would be that they should have a special hospital, supported by their own wealth. Yet all their customs and religious observances are duly attended to by the general hospitals.

I believe that if a central body existed which controlled all the hospitals, many of the specials would be found unnecessary, and their disappearance would save the large amount of income they draw to the disadvantage of the more useful ones, and would also save much expense by reducing the multiplicity of small staffs, who act in some rivalry instead of in cordial co-operation with one another.

The country hospital or infirmary is much like a London general hospital, only on a smaller scale. It is usually in a country town of some size, and is a matter of interest to all the townsfolk. The principal practitioners of the town are the medical men of the hospital; and as the local firms and manufacturers are ever ready to help its exchequer, the managers do a vast amount of real charity without great anxiety or difficulty. The little village hospitals, too, which have sprung up largely of late years are an admirable conception. They have the advantage of being so small that every patient is known to the acting superintendent and at his discretion is made to pay, or is excused paying, something towards his cost, according to his means and to the state in which his family is left through his absence.

Our attention is often called when abroad to the hospitals of other countries, and often, if from their mere size only, they are well worthy of inspection. Some, such as at Vienna and Milan, are on an enormous scale, containing as many as 2800 or even 3500 beds. They are mostly supplied with funds by the great sums they have received and do receive as legacies. The hospital at Boston, in America, is divided into classes. There are free beds, including a large number which are endowed, the donors having to some extent the right of selecting the patients. There are also beds, the occupants of which pay $1 a day, but less, or even nothing, if the governor thinks fit. And also a few very comfortable private rooms are kept for those willing to pay $5 or $6 a day. On the day I saw it there were 110 free patients out of a total of 136; and, in the year previous, 1427 patients had been admitted, of which 970 were free. They spend $63,000 a year, and each patient costs nearly $10 a week. A similar plan is adopted at the hospital at the Hague, in Holland, except that in it none are admitted free, except, of course, those whose employers pay the charge. There are in it no less than five classes of patients, who pay respectively per diem 15, 7·50, 3, 1·50, and 1·20 francs.

In Paris a plan is in practice which seems to me to be well worthy of attention by all hospital managers. All the hospitals are under the control of the *Assistance Publique*, and are obliged to take all their stores, drugs, food, wine, instruments, &c., from one central store, from which they are supplied at reasonable prices. Could one bring this about in London, a large saving in cost would be made, while in many articles a superior quality would be secured to that now provided. By the same central system it is arranged that all medical students are able to walk any and all the hospitals, and gain every experience that is to be learnt. With us medical education is conducted in a different manner. Any hospital whose staff desire to use their beds as a vehicle of medical instruction do so, if they have the sanction of the

governors of the hospital. The principle on which it is founded usually is that the staff receive the fees from the students, and, of course, manage the school at their own expense. A building for its use is usually supplied by the governors in return for the undoubted advantage thus gained by the hospital. A school is beneficial because it attracts a higher—or rather the highest possible—rank of medical men, who unite treatment of in-patients with lectures to the students. It is a pecuniary gain because, were the school not in existence, the numerous appointments to resident posts in the hospital (*i.e.*, the house-physicians, house-surgeons, &c.), must be highly paid instead of there fortunately being keen competition for them. The relations between the hospital and the school vary at different hospitals. In some the treasurer or principal official has entire control over the school, in others the school is entirely under the management of the medical staff, with the important exceptions that the governors have in their own hands the selection of members of the staff (who are also the lecturers at the school), and have the complete ownership of the buildings, while in other cases the governors and the staff are united in the management.

Only second in importance to the medical treatment is the nursing of the patients. It is satisfactory, therefore, to find that nothing in hospital management has improved so much as this. A higher class of women are now engaged than formerly. While in former days the nurses were women of a low class, they now are appointed to undertake an office which is almost looked upon as a science. Ladies are now usually placed as superintendents of the nurses of three or four wards, containing from thirty to sixty patients. Trained in nursing, and having probably undertaken this calling from a real taste for and love of the work, they are found to be most useful in their care for the patients and their overlooking of the nurses. A proper training both of the nurses and of the ladies, usually called sisters for distinction, fits them for their duties, and a good superintendence equally ensures comfort and enforces discipline. The nurses will be found better trained where the lady superintendent holds classes for the efficient instruction of her probationers—and this plan is in some large hospitals expanded into lectures given by medical men on such subjects as physiology, anatomy, and dressing, while certificates given after each examination give a practical result to their study. It follows that this department is the origin of one part of the great good done by hospitals. A constant succession of women well trained in a subject which comes almost naturally to them go out from the hospital to those who lie ill at home, whether among the well-to-do or the poor, or to use their skill in their domestic life. To those unacquainted with the subject, it may be thought that the duty of a hospital nurse must of necessity

be very hard, and no doubt none but strong women should be selected, but I doubt if the work is as hard as is often required of a nurse employed in illness in a private house. For in this case, where the illness is severe, the work involves night as well as day duty, and the nurse has upon her a heavier responsibility, owing to her not having, as in hospital, a resident physician or surgeon always within call. In a hospital the hours of commencing and of going off duty are regular and exact, and counting both day and night nurses, and including the head nurses, there will generally be found as few on the average as four patients under each nurse. But although training is essential, it may be said of a nurse, *Nascitur, non fit.* No superintendence or authority can make a good nurse out of an unsuitable disposition. Her duties are undefinable, and yet multifarious. Her theoretical knowledge will be constantly put to the test. Besides which she must be ready to make a bed, fetch anything that may be wanted, from a dinner or some medicine to a glass of water for a thirsty patient, to cut up food for a patient with paralysis or a broken spine, and last, but not least, never show partiality among her patients, or lose her good temper. In short, her office is such that she must be trusted, and therefore trustworthy.

The department for out-patients is and always ought to be a branch of a hospital. It is rarely properly understood by the public, and is often blamed undeservedly. Yet it fulfils a duty of unbounded importance, and in it a vast amount of good is done, while it is an economy, as I shall endeavour to show, if properly managed. This department is naturally linked with the rest of the establishment of a hospital. The out-patients use the same store of drugs, dressings, &c., as the in-patients, and are seen by members of the same staff. The mode of admission to the out-patient department varies greatly. A large proportion of the patients are admitted by letters given by the governors and subscribers. It is found that this plan practically works well, and that the patients could hardly be better chosen from the ranks of those who are poor, and in need of superior medical advice. The governors value their privileges, and not only is it found that great care is exercised in the distribution of the tickets, but their great value to those who come in contact with the poor induces many to subscribe. The staff of the hospital use this department for a most legitimate purpose—namely, to keep those who have been in-patients under proper care for a time, if they are of opinion that they need no longer occupy a bed. By this means valuable beds are vacated for the benefit of other sufferers, while the man is enabled to return to his work, or the mother to her children, without losing the advice and help which he or she gains by a weekly walk to the physician or surgeon in the out-patient department. The economy here is

obvious—instead of a cost to the hospital of 22s. a week, the patient is treated once a week at a cost of say 7d. to 9d. a visit. And it is still more marked in out-patients who suffer from such complaints as diabetes, heart disease, and many forms of surgical ailments, for they are well able to pay the visit to the hospital, and receive almost as decided good as if they were inmates of the wards. Some patients are seen in this department as rarely as once every two or three or even six months, and thus receive all the advantages of skilled advice by a general supervision. The multitude of minor accidents, usually known under the head of "casualties," supply many of the out-patients. Every hospital, especially those near to factories or docks, has thousands of these casualties annually. Most of them are sent away after the house surgeon has dressed the wound, or a bandage has been applied; but there are many who, though not injured enough to be taken into the accident ward, should be under care for a few days. Here, then, again we find the necessity of the department in question. The patient has perhaps a splinter of wood in his arm, or has had one of his fingers reduced by half-an-inch by a machine. After the first dressing in the receiving-room, which is, of course, always open and ready by day and by night, he continues under the care of one of the out-patient surgeons as long as may be deemed needful. All this work affords an excellent field for experience to the students, when combined with the instruction given by the physician or surgeon as he takes each case. They, of course, find among the in-patients by far the best opportunities of gaining information, but the out-patient department allows of knowledge being gained of rapid diagnosis, and of treating minor forms of disease. But the importance of the out-patient department is not fully explained without showing that it is the best means of choosing the in-patients. The governors may be relied on to choose the out-patients, and from these the medical men select those suitable to be occupants of the wards. By this means some of those who attend when only feeling a little "out of sorts" are found to their surprise to have some serious disorder requiring immediate and careful treatment. Complaints, however, are made against this department. It is said that the foul air from the out-patient rooms finds its way into the wards, and thus harm is done instead of good. This, however, could only arise from very faulty arrangements, and should be easily remediable. It is also said that the out-patients have to waste many hours in the waiting-hall before they see the doctor. This is, I fear, true at some institutions, but most untrue at others, and where it is the case, a reduction of the numbers who attend, or an increase in the out-patient staff, is a much required reform. As to the length of time bestowed on each patient's case, there is much variety at different hospitals. At

the London Hospital in Whitechapel I had it taken out lately, and found that on the day when the numbers and the time were taken, each patient occupied on the average 5½ minutes of the physician's time. More could hardly be expected if a guinea were paid for each visit, and it must be borne in mind that the visit is shortened by the assistance given by the students, but a little lengthened also by the clinical instruction given on the patients. A committee of representatives of thirteen of the London hospitals met in 1878 and 1879, and has drawn up a most valuable Report on the out-patient arrangements at the London hospitals. The Report shows, with other information, that—

In the year 1877, 539,311 out-patients were received into the thirteen hospitals referred to, of which number less than a half (238,303) were furnished with cards or letters, entitling the holders to attend for a continuous period, shorter or longer, according to the custom of the respective hospitals, while 301,008 persons were summarily dealt with on their first application, and in hospital language are known as casualties. It is important to note, that in the endowed hospitals, which contribute more than a half of the total number of out-patients, and in at least three of the subscription hospitals, the practice is followed of reckoning as fresh cases such as have their cards renewed periodically, to enable them to continue their attendance; while at several hospitals the casualties are registered afresh each time the patients attend. There is no accurate means of determining to what extent these practices would effect the general total of out-patients given above; but on a rough calculation, it would probably be found to diminish it by about a third.

Of this number it must be remembered that very many are not out-patients in the ordinary sense of the term; some are maternity cases, treated at their own homes, as I have already described; or dental cases, who have come in to have an aching tooth extracted; or a casualty of so trivial a nature that five minutes' treatment by the house-surgeon does all that is wanted. The out-patient departments of our hospitals undoubtedly need modifications to suit modern changes, but they are slowly mending, and do not, except in rare cases, deserve the severe strictures made upon them by those who would improve them off the face of the earth.

The question of payment by patients, the finances of hospitals, and the importance of unity of action must be discussed in the next Number.

J. H. Buxton.

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

FOUR canons of interpretation have been suggested, whereby to identify the doctrine of the Real Presence in the language of the Fathers. A writer, it is asserted, may confidently be understood to teach that the true Body and Blood of Christ are in the consecrated elements at the Lord's Supper:—

I. If he holds the objective view. Those who hold this view "lay the essence of the Sacrament, not in the action, but in the Sacrament itself: they believe that in or behind the outward visible element there is a heavenly gift given to us of God."

II. If stress is laid upon the act of consecration.

III. If effects are attributed to the consecrated Sacrament (that is, to the consecrated bread and wine), which can only belong to the Body and Blood of Christ.

IV. If there is maintained an attitude of extreme reverence in presence of the Sacrament.

The four tests are intimately dependent one upon another, and the strength of all four lies in the first. The word "Sacrament" or "Eucharist," it will be observed, is attached absolutely to the consecrated elements, the "outward visible element." The use of the word in this sense is the prevalent fallacy that extends throughout the whole of the Sacerdotal argument, and lies like a destructive rottenness at the very base of the superstructure. In the Article in *The Church Quarterly Review*, of October, 1879, which has given occasion to these Papers,[1] the word "Eucharist," or the word Sacrament, employed as interchangeable terms, occur no less than ninety-two times, and each time in the sense of the outward visible element, while on every occasion the argument depends wholly on this sense of the words. Accustomed, as most persons are, to use the word Sacrament, or Eucharist, in its wider sense of the whole ordinance, and not of one special part, it requires considerable care on the part of a reader to understand the word consistently in the sense of the author, rather than in that with which he is himself familiar.

I. Since the first of the four canons embodies the prevalent fallacy of the whole, it will need to be examined with the greater care. It is needless to repeat the words, since they will be under the reader's eye, while these lines are being perused. The test turns on a serious misconception of the Evangelical or Calvin-

[1] See THE CHURCHMAN, vol. i. p. 453.

istic doctrine, that is, of the doctrine of the Church of England. It is not correct to say, that the essence of the Sacrament is held to lie in the action, that is, in the act of administering, or of receiving, the consecrated bread and wine. When the word Sacrament is appropriated simply to the outward visible element, it is evident that a part is substituted for the whole. A Sacrament, as defined by the Church of England, consists of two parts, an outward visible sign, and an inward spiritual grace. The two together, not either one of the two, constitute the Sacrament. Not any outward visible sign, but that particular outward visible sign which was ordained by Christ Himself, and that inward grace of which it is the means, constitute in their combination the Sacrament. That this is the positive teaching of the Church of England may be seen by comparing the twenty-fifth Article with the Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments. The Article explains that the "five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel;" and the Homily explains the reason, because some of them want one, and some want another, of the two parts, the outward ordained sign or the inward grace which constitute in their union the Sacrament of the Gospel. If either part is absent from an ordinance, that ordinance is not a Sacrament. Nor is it possible to assert one part to be more essential to a Sacrament than another. The Church of England, therefore, does not place the essence of the Sacrament in the action, for to do so would be to contradict her own definition: the Evangelical view of the Lord's Supper does not place the essence of the Sacrament either in the act of administering or in the act of receiving, for to do so would be to repeat in another form the precise mistake which its theological opponents are charged with making. The outward visible sign is a part, and a necessary part, of the Sacrament; but it is not itself the Sacrament. So the action is a part, and a necessary part, of the Sacrament; but it is not itself the Sacrament. Where, then, is the essence of the Sacrament? Simply in the Sacrament itself, with all its parts complete, that is, in the perfect ordinance, and in the authority which instituted it.

As it is desirable that every step of this argument should be supported by authority, in order that it may not appear to express the view of any particular writer, the following passage is subjoined from Archbishop Cranmer:—

First, this word Sacrament, I do sometimes use (as it is many times taken among writers and holy doctors) for the Sacramental bread, water, or wine; as when they say that sacramentum est sacræ rei Signum, "a sacrament is the sign of a holy thing." But when I used to speak sometimes (as the old Authors do) that Christ is in the

Sacraments, I mean the same as they did understand the matter; that is to say, not of Christ's carnal presence in the outward Sacrament, but sometimes of His Sacramental presence. And sometimes by this word Sacrament I mean the whole ministration and receiving of the Sacraments, either of baptism or of the Lord's Supper; and so the old writers many times do say, that Christ and the Holy Ghost be present in the Sacraments; not meaning by that manner of speech that Christ and the Holy Ghost be present in the water, bread, or wine (which be only the outward visible Sacraments), but that in the due ministration of the Sacraments according to Christ's ordinance and institution, Christ and His Holy Spirit be truly and indeed present by their mighty and sanctifying power, virtue, and grace to all them that worthily receive the same."—"Cranmer's Answer to Gardiner." Preface.

In this ordinance, therefore, our Church teaches that the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper. She believes, therefore, and all her faithful members must believe, that there is, in a true sense of the words, a real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ; but it is a presence in the ordinance not in the elements, to the faithful only, to those "who rightly and worthily receive," not to all without distinction of character. In the language of the twenty-eighth Article, "The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith." In the precise, trenchant language of the lamented Dr. Stephens, it is "given by God, not by the priest; taken by faith, not by the hand; eaten by the soul, not by the mouth."—("Argument in Sheppard *v.* Bennett," p. 78.)

Will any one say, that the fact of this presence being heavenly and spiritual detracts in the slightest degree from its actual reality? Are heavenly things less true than the ephemeral phenomena of the earthly state? Is the spirit of man less actual than his body, and the consciousness of the spirit less trustworthy than the delusive impressions upon the senses? If there is one point more than another, on which modern philosophy speaks with decision, it is on the reality of the human spirit and of all that enters into its experiences. The materialistic tendency, which believes in nothing but what can be touched and handled, is to be deprecated everywhere; but above all in that theology, which deals with unseen things and with that great Spirit, who is throned in the midst of them, the source and centre of all life. A spiritual presence is more real and actual, and is attested by more trustworthy evidence than any bodily presence can be. That word "Spiritual" seems, indeed, to carry two senses, and to whichever one of the two we

look, the real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper is so asserted, that not to recognise it is an act of the grossest unbelief. On one side a spiritual presence means a presence to the spirit or soul of a man; but on the other side it also means a presence of which the Spirit of God is the Agent. We are made partakers of Christ by the operation of the Holy Ghost. This the Homily on the Sacraments strongly asserts. "The Communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord, which by the operation of the Holy Ghost—the very bond of our conjunction with Christ—is, through faith, wrought in the souls of the faithful." The scheme of belief asserted in these words is easily filled up. We are made partakers of Christ, not by bodily contact, but by spiritual union through the agency of the Holy Ghost. If, therefore, we could ascend into heaven and actually touch with the fingers of our body the glorified flesh of the Lord Jesus Christ, we should not be partakers of Him or of His life, save by the operation of the Holy Spirit, "the bond of our conjunction." What, then, can it conceivably matter to the efficient action of the Omnipresent Spirit whether the Body of Christ be actually present "on the altar in our churches," or whether it be seated as the Church of England teaches in Heaven, and in Heaven only? The work done by the Holy Ghost, and therefore the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ which He conveys to us, cannot be more real in the one case than in the other, unless the sovereignty of the Holy Ghost be blasphemed by calling into question either His Omnipresence or His Omnipotence. So far as concerns the reality of the Presence of Christ, nothing in the world is gained by asserting the Lord's bodily presence on the altar; nothing is lost by denying it. The presence in the ordinance is real and actual; how real and actual words are wanting to express. And if so, all the mingled blessedness and solemnity of partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ are there also; all the awe, and reverence, and tender emotions called into play by the conscious participation of the Body that was broken for us, and of the Blood which was shed for us on the Cross. Nay, such a Presence, and such a Communion as the Church of England teaches, is a far nobler and grander thing, and carries with it conceptions infinitely more exalted than the bare cold material communion of the Church of Rome and of her sympathisers.

It is not meant that this Presence is attached exclusively to the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, or that it differs in kind from the communion with Christ enjoyed by the soul in other portions of the Christian life. The Body and Blood of Christ, that is, the virtue and efficacy of His atoning sacrifice and death, underlie the Sacrament of Baptism as much as they underlie

the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Nay, further, it is this and this alone to which all access unto God is due. We "enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which He hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, His flesh," Heb. x. 19, 20. "Therefore," the writer concludes, "let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith," and he prolongs the exhortation, but without a syllable that can be thought to refer to the Lord's Supper. With a reference equally general St. John asserts that "Our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ," 1 John i. 3. There appears to be no difference *in kind* in the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ enjoyed in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and that enjoyed in all other intercourse between the soul and God; but there may be a superiority *in degree* in proportion to the greater solemnity of the ordinance, the time and purpose of its institution, and the touching and pathetic character of the emblems which bring almost visibly before the soul's eye the sacrifice and death of the Son of God. In asserting the reality of the Presence of Christ in the highest and most special act of Christian communion, it is not necessary to depreciate, as many do when they apparently assert that there is no worship without the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the dignity and solemn greatness of the soul's habitual intercourse with God. We do not maintain the Presence in the Lord's Supper the less strenuously because it is the same Presence which vivifies every means of grace, and extends its meritorious efficacy through the whole scheme of saving love.

Anglo-Catholic writers have been far too apt to forget, that Evangelical Christians believe in the Real Presence of Christ in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, as devoutly as Anglo-Catholics believe in the presence of the material body under the forms of bread and wine. The mistake is a prolific one: not a few of the erroneous quotations that occur in catenas are caused by it. For instance, the following words of Rückert are quoted as if they contained a decisive admission that the doctrine of the Real Presence in the elements was the doctrine of the Early Church:—

> That the Body and Blood of Christ were given and received in the Lord's Supper, that became the general belief from the beginning, even in a time when written records had not yet arisen, or were not yet sufficiently spread to have an influence. And the same belief remained throughout the following time; the Christian community never had any other, and no one in the Ancient Church ever opposed it, even the Arch-heretics never did so.—*Church Quarterly Review*, October, 1879, p. 205.

Well, what then? We accept the statement as cordially as the highest Anglo-Catholic can do. But it has no bearing what-

ever on the contest between us, for it only states what we assert to be our own belief. The difference only arises when we read between the lines, and then we read differently. We read, "that the Body and Blood of Christ were given and received in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper." Sacerdotalists read, "in and under the consecrated bread and wine of the Lord's Supper." The words of Rückert only assert the former, and say nothing whatever upon the latter proposition. So when it is said that the consecrated bread and wine are the Body and Blood of Christ, the Evangelical Churchman entirely endorses the sentiment. "Our Lord hesitated not to say, 'This is my Body,' when He gave the sign of His body" (Augustine "Contra Adamantum," tom. viii. p. 124). The Church of England devoutly repeats the words in her office, "The Body of Christ, which was given for thee. . . . . The Blood of Christ, which was shed for thee." But if this be so, of what possible use can it be, in a controversy of this kind, to quote passages which only express what both parties to the controversy equally believe? Here, again, it may be well to pause, and to give authorities:—

The doctrine of a real spiritual presence is the doctrine of the English Church, and was the doctrine of Calvin and of many foreign reformers. It teaches that Christ is really received by faithful Communicants in the Lord's Supper, but that there is no gross or carnal, but only a spiritual and heavenly presence there; not the *less real* however for being spiritual. It teaches, therefore, that the bread and wine are received naturally; but the Body and Blood of Christ are received spiritually. The result of which doctrine is this: it is bread, and it is Christ's body. It is bread in substance, Christ in the Sacrament; and Christ is as really given to all that are truly disposed, as the symbols are: each as they can: Christ as Christ can be given; the bread and wine as they can; and to the same real purposes to which they were designed; and Christ does as really nourish and sanctify the soul, as the elements the body.—Quoted from Jeremy Taylor on the "Real Presence," sec. i. 4, by Bishop Harold Browne. Exp. p. 678.

Again:—

It is admitted on all hands that the reception of the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper is in the nature of means to an end. And as to the end itself, however variously it may be described, there is no dispute among those who profess to hold the doctrine of our Church. All fully assent to the statements made in her Communion Office, as to the nature of the benefits enjoyed by those who, "with a true penitent heart and lively faith, receive that holy Sacrament" as consisting in that spiritual union with Christ, which is expressed in the words, mainly borrowed from the language of Scripture, "Then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood; then we

dwell in Christ, and Christ with us."—"Remains of Bishop Thirlwall," vol. i. p. 262.

The same assertion is made by Hooker, B. v. s. 67, though considerations of space compel the omission of the passage.

We behold with the eyes of faith Him present after grace, and spiritually set upon the table; and we worship Him which sitteth above and is worshipped of the angels.—Bp. Ridley, "Disputation at Oxford," *Church Historian*, vol. vi. pt. ii. p. 500.

To the right celebration of the Lord's Supper there is no other presence of Christ required than a spiritual presence, and this presence is sufficient for a Christian man, as a presence by which we abide in Christ, and Christ abideth in us; to the obtaining of eternal life if we persevere. And this same presence may be called most fitly a real presence—that is, a presence not feigned, but a true and faithful presence.—Bp. Latimer, "Disputation at Oxford," *ibid.*, p. 501.

Thus it appears that the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper has been the doctrine of the Church of England since the Reformation. But this doctrine is different almost *toto cælo* from the doctrine of the Real Presence in the visible outward elements after consecration. Consequently, passages which prove the first—and they are to be found abundantly all down the line of Christian literature—are as far removed as the poles from teaching the second.

The primary conception on which the first of the four canons under discussion is based, "is thus found" to be "false." The division of the two opposing schemes of belief into objective and subjective must, therefore, be utterly rejected. The words themselves are novel and ambiguous in the highest degree. Scarcely any two writers use them in the same sense. Subjective presence may be employed to express a presence created by the action of the soul itself and having no reality distinct from it, and such a meaning is rejected by the Evangelical as firmly as it is rejected by the Sacerdotalist. The presence of Christ, if it be real, must be equally objective, whether it is objective in the soul, or objective in the outward elements. If it be not objective, it is not real. Accordingly, Bishop Thirlwall, whose acuteness as a thinker none will call into question, applies the word "objective" to that spiritual presence in the rite which has been stated to be the doctrine of the Church of England:—"Many . . . . . have lost sight of what I venture to call the objective reality in the Sacrament" (*Remains*, vol. ii. p. 277). But when this distinction fails, it is not true to say that in the Evangelical view the grace of the Sacrament has "no necessary connection with the outward elements; for the act of receiving the bread and wine is part of the ordinance of

Christ, and, if it were omitted, it would no longer be the Sacrament that He has ordained. "The reception of the Sacrament, says Bishop Thirlwall, "is an integral part of the divinely appointed memorial" (*Ibid.*, p. 280).

Neither is it any longer possible to interpret the word "Sacrament" or "Eucharist" as necessarily meaning in the language of the Early Fathers the elements, and not the ordinance. It is admitted that the words have sometimes been used of the rite, sometimes of the elements. Cranmer, in a passage quoted (p. 46), states himself to have used them both ways. Hooker does so in the passage quoted on p. 51. The Church of England does so in the Twenty-ninth Article:—"The sign or Sacrament of so great a thing." But because the words are used in two senses, one proper, the other derivative, it is monstrous to assume that the Fathers always use it in its derivative, and not its proper meaning. Yet this is what is asserted in the first of the four Sacerdotal Canons. It may, indeed, be disputed whether the Early Fathers ever used "Sacrament" or "Eucharist" for the elements alone. The passage commonly quoted is from Justin Martyr:—"This food is called by us the Eucharist" (*Ap.* I. c. 66); but the word translated "food" is τροφὴ, which properly denotes, not what is eaten, but the benefit derived from eating. Thus it is used by Sophocles for children: ὦ τέκνα Κάδμου τοῦ πάλαι νέα τροφὴ (*Œd.*, T. i.). It is translated by Scapula, "Alitura, nutrito, educatio; item nutrimentum, alimonia, victus;" by Stephens, "Alitura, nutritio;" by Damm, "Alitio;" by Dunbar, "Nourishment, food, aliment;" by Donovan, "Nourishment, aliment, food." The word is as nearly as possible equivalent to the "strengthening and refreshing" of the English Catechism, where it is indisputable that the Catechism is speaking, not of the elements, but of the rite or ordinance. In this case Justin may have used it for the whole Sacrament, as he has clearly done in another passage. He says that the offering of fine flour made under the law was "a type of the bread of the Eucharist." Again:—"Who in every place offer sacrifices to him—*i.e.*, the bread of the Eucharist and also the cup of the Eucharist" (Dial. with Trypho, pp. 139, 140).

What was meant by the word "sacrifice" by the Early Fathers, in such passages as the one just quoted, may be seen from passages like the following:—

> The Lord, brethren, stands in need of nothing; and He desires nothing of any one, except that confession he made to him. . . . . He saith, "Offer unto God the sacrifice of praise, and pay thy vows unto the Most High, and call upon me in the day of trouble; I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me." For "the sacrifice of God is a broken spirit" (Clement, 1st Ep. s. 52).

Sacrifices, therefore, do not sanctify a man, for God stands in no need of sacrifice, but it is the conscience of the offerer that sanctifies the sacrifice when it is pure, and this makes God to accept (the offering) as from a friend (Irenæ. c. Hær. b. iv. c. 18).

From all these it is evident that God did not seek sacrifices and holocausts from them, but faith and obedience and righteousness, because of their salvation (Irenæus v. Hær. b. iv. p. 429. Ante Nicene Fathers).

It appears, therefore (to sum up what has been said), that the essence of the Sacrament is to be found in no one part of the rite, but in the whole complete ordinance, and in the authority of Christ, by which it was instituted. By virtue of this institution the Body and Blood of Christ are "verily and indeed taken and received of the faithful in the Lord's Supper." This presence, being real, is objective to the soul of the faithful recipient. Hence the first of the four Canons altogether fails. It does not follow in the least that the Fathers who hold an objective view, who "place the essence of the Sacrament in the Sacrament itself," and who believe that "there is a heavenly gift given us of God," therefore believe that this gift is attached to the bread or wine, either in, or under, or behind, the outward visible elements. Consequently, they cannot justly be quoted in support of the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated bread and wine of the Lord's Supper.

But when this first of the four Canons fails, all the other three will be found to have lost the very foundation on which they rest.

II. The second canon is this, "any Father may confidently be understood to teach that the true Body and Blood of Christ are in the consecrated elements of the Lord's Supper, if stress is laid in his writings on the act of consecration." Consecration, according to the Church of England, is the act of solemnly setting anything apart for a sacred use. A curious proof of this is afforded by the fact that the Church has provided no authoritative service for the consecration of her fabrics. The services actually used among us, and most wisely and rightly used, are used simply on the authority of the individual Bishop. It has often been stated, and so far as the writer knows without contradiction, that the late Archbishop Whately never used a service on such occasions. He attended formally to accept the building, and to complete the legal documents by which it was set apart for the service of Almighty God, but that was all. The consecration of such churches was as complete and valid, as if he had used the beautiful and becoming service generally employed among ourselves. So appropriate is some service of the kind, that it is difficult to understand why the compilers of the Liturgy did not provide a suitable office, unless it was that they desired to dis-

courage the Popish notion, that a moral quality of holiness could be attached, by virtue of consecration, to outward material things. Consecration is the act of setting apart, not all bread and wine in general, but a special portion of bread, and wine to represent the broken bread and the outpoured blood (ἐκχυνόμενον) of the crucified Son of God. By that act it ceases to be common bread and wine, and represents *unto us*, the "Body of the Lord Jesus Christ that was given for us, and the Blood of the Lord Jesus Christ that was shed for us." To treat it with irreverence is the sin, with which St. Paul charges the Corinthian Christians. They did not "discern the Lord's Body." To them the bread and wine in the Sacrament were just the same as all other bread and wine, and no more; means for satisfying bodily appetite, but having in them no sacred meaning, set apart for no divine purpose. Nor is it correct to say that in the Evangelical view the consecrated bread and wine are "mere symbols;" for they are integral parts of an ordinance in which by the special appointment of Christ, the Body and Blood of the Lord are "verily and indeed taken and eaten by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

No doubt the world is full of symbols. To many minds every outward thing is a representative of some inward and heavenly truth. There may be symbols in almost every object that we see, and in almost every act that we do; for the wondrous unity of the Mind of God pervades everything, and produces corresponding unities everywhere. But such things are symbols of man's making, and not of God's appointing. In the service of His worship he has commanded three symbols to be used, and only three; and these three things not always and everywhere, but as organic parts of divinely instituted ordinances—water in the Sacrament of Baptism, and bread and wine in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. A representative meaning which our own minds may attach to things is evidently widely different to a representative meaning which the Lord Himself has, by special enactment, authoritatively attached to them. If a Church should appoint a hundred Sacraments, they would not be Sacraments of the Lord's appointing; and they would be distinguished from the two, which are of the Lord's appointing, by a line as broad and deep as that which separates the human and the divine, man and God.

Nor does it follow that every symbol of which it may have pleased God to make use in the course of His dealings with mankind, should therefore be on the same footing as water in Baptism and bread and wine in the Lord's Supper. It has pleased God to use seed as a symbol or illustration of the Word of God, just as in the Old Testament the seven ill-favoured kine in Pharoah's dream were used to symbolise the seven years

of famine, and the bonds and yokes of Jeremiah to represent the calamities impending over Judah. In such cases God, condescending to employ human language, has made use of symbols, spoken or acted, to express His will; but He has nowhere made it a part of our religious duty that we should make use of them also. He has employed them as vehicles of revelation, but not ordained them as acts of worship. He has used them once in words, which will indeed abide to all time, but He has not made them parts of an ordinance of perpetual obligation, for "as often as we eat this bread and drink this cup, we do show forth the Lord's death till He come." Great importance attaches to the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, for they are an essential part of this ordinance, and in their absence it would no longer be the Sacrament that Christ has ordained.

Now, let it be remembered that the tenderness and awe, the soul-saddening pathos and adoring affection which centre round the Sacrament, depend wholly on the reality of the presence of Christ, and not at all upon the mode of it. It has already been shown that the Evangelical believer holds to the reality of this presence as strongly as the highest Anglo-Catholic can do. They only differ as to the mode; and if one mode of this presence can be more rich in grand and adoring thoughts than another, it is that of the Evangelical; for the presence of the whole Christ to the soul is a more lofty and exalting communion than the presence of the natural flesh of Christ to the outward and material lips. Consecration, therefore, does not necessarily involve more to the one than to the other; and no line of distinction between two schools can possibly be found in an estimate that may be common to them both.

III. The third proposed canon is as follows:—"A writer may be understood to teach that the true Body and Blood of Christ are in the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper, if effects are attributed to the consecrated Sacrament (that is, the consecrated elements) which can only belong to the Body and Blood of Christ."

The words imply that spiritual effects are to be attributed to the Body and Blood of Christ—that is, to the Body and Blood of Christ as distinguished from the other portions of the indivisible person and two-fold nature of the Lord Jesus Christ. But Scripture teaches no such thing: the Church of England, following Scripture, teaches no such thing. No doubt in many passages of the Word the body, and especially the blood of Christ, are specified as essential conditions of the atoning work of Christ. Thus, "He made peace with the blood of His Cross;" but it is not the blood, but HE who voluntarily shed the blood who is said to have made peace—that is, the entire Christ, God and man in one. So in the words of institution, "This is My

body which is given for you;" "My blood which is shed for you." Again, the efficacy is in the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the emphasis on the word "My." Still more strongly St. John speaks, "The blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin;" where, if the word "blood" be pressed, as being the cause of salvation apart from the Deity of the person (see Acts xxi. 28), it would follow that the Body of Christ occupied no part in the work. But, according to the usage of Scripture, the blood stands for the whole atoning sacrifice and death of Christ. There is only one passage in Scripture in which saving virtue is attributed to the material flesh and blood of the Lord; and then it was wrongly attributed, and the mistake called forth the instant and almost indignant rebuke of the great Master, "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing." Had it been otherwise, how could St. Paul have written "Henceforth we know no man after the flesh; yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more" (2 Cor. v. 16). See Waterland "Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist. Works," vol. vii. c 3.

But we are told "the Gospel conception of the Flesh of Jesus is that it is instinct with Divine and eternal life, which flowed forth from Him into the souls and bodies of all, who worthily came near Him. Whence St. Paul, speaking of His glorified Flesh, calls it *πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν*, quickening or life-giving spirit." The mistake is so extraordinary, that it is equally difficult to believe that it can have been made intentionally, or have been made unintentionally. The reference is to 1 Cor. xv. 45, where alone the phrase, "a quickening spirit" occurs. But it is not used of the flesh of Christ, but of the entire Christ, as the federal head of His people in accordance with the argument of St. Paul in the fifth of the Romans. The first man Adam (*ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδάμ*) was made a living soul; the last Adam (*ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ*) was made a quickening spirit. The omission of *ἄνθρωπος* in the second half of the contrast is, to say the least, remarkable. The word *ζωοποιέω* only occurs in the New Testament twelve times. Twice it is used of the human body without any specification of the agent; once of the law; once of Christ; three times of God absolutely, and five times of the Spirit; but not in one single passage of the flesh of Christ. This canon consequently falls to the ground, and is only invested with the slightest shadow of plausibility by that equivocal use of the word Sacrament, to which repeated attention has already been called.

IV. One more canon alone remains to be considered. "A writer may be understood to assert the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper, if he maintains an attitude of extreme reverence

in the presence of the Sacrament." This has been already answered by anticipation, and it is only necessary to bear in mind that the word Sacrament is again used equivocally. It is not to be assumed that the Fathers used the word for the elements and not for the ordinance. It has already been pointed out that Evangelical Churchmen believe Christ to be actually present in the ordinance, and that the Body and Blood of Christ are "verily and indeed taken and received of the faithful in the Lord's Supper." The only matter in controversy is, where Christ is present and how? Is He present in the elements or in the heart; by material contact or by living faith? Let not one word in these Papers be supposed to depreciate the vast and incalculable importance of this difference. The one mode differs from the other, as widely as piety differs from superstition. But, so far as the actual presence of Christ is concerned, it is not a whit more true and actual, more solemn and life-giving, on the one system of belief than on the other. Extreme reverence is becoming in both cases equally. In point of fact there has existed, in all times of the Church, considerable diversity in the amount of importance attributed to the Sacraments in the scheme of salvation, and consequently in the language in which men of different schools, and even of the same school, have spoken of them, and especially in regard to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Mental constitution and devotional habits have widely modified them. The mistake of supposing that Evangelical Churchmen do not regard the Lord's Supper with profound emotion is only a corollary of supposing, that they do not believe Christ to be truly present in the ordinance to every faithful heart. The mistake lies at the very bottom of the Anglo-Catholic treatment of this subject. To assume that every one who maintains an attitude of extreme reverence towards the ordinance therefore believes in the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the elements, is as opposed to logic as it demonstrably is to fact.

How it is opposed to the logic of the question has already been pointed out. That it is opposed to fact admits of easy demonstration. But it may be well to establish the fact by actual quotations. Their number might be indefinitely multiplied; but the following will suffice. The authoritative language of the Church of England claims precedence. It is taken from the Homily, which contains the emphatic warning to take heed lest of a Sacrament the Lord's Supper be made into a Sacrifice:—

> The true understanding of this junction and union, which is betwixt the body and the head, betwixt the true believer and Christ, the ancient Catholic Fathers, both perceiving themselves, and commending to their people, were not afraid to call this Supper, some of them, the salve of immortality, and sovereign preservative against death; other, a classical communion; other, the sweet dainties of our Saviour,

the pledge of eternal health, the defence of faith, the hope of the resurrection; other, the food of immortality, the healthful grace, and the conservatory to everlasting life. All which sayings, both of the Holy Scripture and of godly men, *truly attributed to this celestial banquet and feast*, if we would often call in mind, O, how would they influence our hearts to desire the participation of these mysteries, and oftentimes to covet after this bread, continually to thirst for this food.—"Homily," xxvii. Pt. i.

In the same devout spirit writes Bishop Jewell:—

We make no doubt to say that there be certain visible words, seals of righteousness, tokens of grace; and do expressly pronounce that in the Lord's Supper there is truly given unto the believing the Body and Blood of the Lord, the flesh of the Son of God which quickeneth our souls the meat that cometh from above, the food of immortality, grace, truth, and life; and the Supper to be the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, by the partaking whereof we be revived, we be strengthened, we be fed unto immortality, and whereby we be joined, united, and incorporated into Christ, that we may abide in him and He in us.—"Bp. Sewell's Apol.," Pt. ii.

No doubt can possibly be entertained of Hooker's sentiments in the face of his express declaration, "I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ, when and where the bread is His body, or the cup His blood: but only in the very heart and soul of him which received them." Yet the lofty language in which he enlarges on the dignity of the Sacrament is very remarkable:—

The very letter of the word of Christ giveth plain security that these mysteries do, as nails, fasten us to his very Cross, that by them we draw out, as touching efficacy, force, and virtue, even the blood of his gored side; in the wounds of our Redeemer we there dip our tongues, we are dyed red both within and without; our hunger is satisfied, and our thirst for ever quenched; they are things wonderful which he feeleth, great which he seeth, and not heard of which he uttereth, whose soul is possessed of this paschal lamb, and made joyful in the strength of this new wine; this cup hath in it more than the substance which our eyes behold, and this cup, hallowed with solemn benediction, availeth to the endless life and welfare both of soul and body, in that it serveth as well for a medicine to heal our infirmities and purge our sins, as for a sacrifice of thanksgiving; with touching it sanctifieth, it enlighteneth with belief; it truly conformeth us unto the image of Jesus Christ.—Hooker, "Eccl. Pol.," b. ii. s. 67.

The same manner of language in speaking of the Lord's Supper is to be found in writers of a very different class to Hooker, and who would be considered in our own day to stand among the lowest of Low Churchmen. The theologicall ectures of Archbishop Leighton contain an exhortation before the Communion. "This is it," he writes, "which render a vast number

unworthy of such an honour: they approach this heavenly feast without forming a right judgment of themselves or of it." He proceeds:—

Consider with yourselves, I pray, think seriously, what madness, what unaccountable folly it is to trifle with the Majesty of the Most High God, and to offer to Infinite Wisdom the sacrifices of destraction and folly. Shall we, who are but insignificant worms, thus *provoke the Almighty King to jealousy*, as if we were *stronger than He*, and of purpose run our heads, as it were, against that Power, the slightest touch whereof would crush us to dust. Do we not know that the same God, who is an embracing and saving light to all that worship with humble piety, is, nevertheless, *a consuming fire* to all the impious and profane, who pollute the sacrifice with impure hearts and unclean hands. . . . . If there be any, let their guilt and pollution be ever so great, who find arising within them a hearty aversion to their own impurity, and an earnest desire for holiness; behold, there is opened for you a living and pure fountain, most efficient for cleansing and washing away all sorts of stains, as well as for refreshing languishing and thirsty souls. And He who is the living and never-failing fountain of purity and grace, encourages, calls, and exhorts you to come to Him. *Come unto me all ye that are a-thirst*, &c.; and again, "*All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will by no means expel or cast out* (Joh. vi. 3).—"Leighton's Works," Lond. 1835, vol. ii. pp. 512–513.

The next extract is taken from the "Memorials of Dr. John Love," a Scotch minister, who flourished about a hundred years ago:—

"This cup is the New Testament in my blood," 1 Cor. xi. 25. A New Testament indeed—a new and surprising thing. Think of God making a Testament in favour of guilty rebels. Wonder, O, heavens, and ye that dwell therein: look down and wonder. God, instead of pouring out wrath on sinners executes a Testament in their favour; making over good things to them. And what are those things? Are they heaven and earth? Are they all creatures? No, He makes over *Himself* to them, in His infinite attributes, riches, and fulness, with all that He can do for them. Is not this a *New* Testament indeed? and is it not made in as new a manner? It is made "in My blood," saith the Lord of Hosts; "Nails, and spears, and agonies did let out My blood, that it might fill this cup, to be put into thine hand, O, heir of hell." "Memorials of Dr. Love," vol. ii. p. 226

One closing quotation shall be given from a Nonconformist Divine of eminence in our own day:—

Anglican theologians derive an immense, but illegitimate advantage from the way in which their theory is commonly discussed. It is implied that all other Protestant theories deny "the Real Presence" of Christ in the supreme rite of the Christian Faith. This implication we passionately resent. Christ is present at His table, though not in the bread and wine which are placed upon it. He is there, as a

Host with His guests. We do not meet to think of an absent Lord, or to commemorate a dead Saviour; we receive the bread from His own hands, and with it all that the bread symbolises; we drink the cup in His presence, and affirm that we are His friends—that through His blood we have received "remission of sins," and that we have "peace with God" through Him. He is nearer to us now than He was to those who heard from His lips the words of instruction. It was "expedient" for us that He should go away; for He has come again, and by the power of His Spirit we abide in Him and He in us. In being made partakers of Christ, we are "made partakers of the Divine Nature," and become for ever one with God.—Ecclesia, "The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper," by the Rev. R. W. Dale, p. 300.

According to Anglo-Catholic canons, every one of these writers must be supposed to maintain the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper. Such a conclusion is a *reductio ad absurdum*. Not one of the suggested canons holds good. They really contain in themselves the assumption of the whole matter which has to be proved, and from themselves they extend the fallacy into the language they are professedly employed to interpret, and put into it a meaning which the language itself does not contain. Are there, then, no true canons which can be adopted? In truth they are unnecessary, if men will only read the language of the Fathers in the light of their times, and not view it through the colouring of later controversy. But if any such rules are desired, they can be readily gathered out of what has been already said. But the brief statement of them, and their application to the language by those Fathers, on whose testimony the matter in dispute is made to hang by Anglo-Catholic consent, must be reserved for another and a closing Paper.

EDWARD GARBETT.

ART. VIII.—LYRICS, SYLVAN AND SACRED.

Lyrics, Sylvan and Sacred. By RICHARD WILTON. George Bell and Sons.

THOSE who have read Kingsley's description, in his "Alton Locke," of the toilworn tailor's escape from the city and first enjoyment of the country, will never forget it. You seem to breathe the fetterless air, and bask in the smokeless sunshine, and to echo back the songs of the birds, and almost to be drawn up into the blue crystal deeps of the sky. And many will be conscious of the same mastery of quiet rural joys over the spirit

in these pages. Mr. Wilton, in his opening lyric to the reader, says:—

Thy happy lot it may not be
To see the lark spring from the lea,
Or breathe the dewy odours fine
In wood or lane;
But there are other fields Divine,
Which in dim city may be thine,
Where thou the Flower of flowers mayst see,
And catch the Spirit's melody:
Nor thine alone, but also mine,
In wood and lane.

Here the key-note is struck of this choice cluster of songs. The poet's intense delight in the works of God always seems to draw him, and the reader who will yield to the witchery of his music, nearer to the Father, Son, and Spirit, for Whose pleasure they are and were created. All Nature seems to this sweet singer a transparency, through which he looks on things unseen and eternal. Let one specimen suffice—a beautiful sonnet, and yet not more beautiful than scores of its companions:—

THE LIFTING OF THE MIST.

A mist is on the mountain-top, and hides
The flushing heather with a weeping trail;
From crag to crag it hangs a cloudy veil,
Which, hour by hour, immoveable abides.
But, lo! the curtain suddenly divides
To unseen fingers of a gentle gale;
And purple heather once again we hail,
Decking with beauty the grey mountain-sides.
A mist is on things heavenly, and the mind
Labours to see what still eludes its eye,
And fondly feels for what it cannot find.
Oh! for a gale celestial, is our cry,
To rend the clouds which baffle us and blind,
And flash upon us purple Calvary!

Many of these admirable sonnets are strictly sacred, of which, again, we can only select one as a representative. But *ex uno disce omnes*:—

THE BRAZEN SERPENT.

I hear a sharp "exceeding bitter cry;"
I see a wild and horror-stricken crowd,
Strong men and children in fierce anguish bow'd—
The writhing limb, drooped head, and filming eye.
I see a symbol strange, uplifted high,
A coiled serpent, like a banner proud;
I hear a burst of gladness rising loud,
Responsive to a look of ecstasy.

I see a sinful, suffering, dying world—
Like ocean, dark with cloud, and toss'd with storm.
But lo! a blood-red banner is unfurled,
Which floats around a gracious, drooping Form;
And through the dimness falls a mighty voice—
"O, earth, earth, earth, behold, believe, rejoice!"

The grace of Mr. Wilton's versification, and often the condensation of thought in few words, make us long that he would enrich the Church's Hymnody with some of his sweet songs. Very few of these lyrics can be called hymns; and yet the beginning and close of his "Ode on Easter Day" is worthy of a high place in the Church's Hymnal:—

1.

The Lord is risen indeed:
The chains and bars of Death are swept aside;
Our debt is fully paid, our Surety freed,
And we are justified.

2.

The stone is rolled away:
Sin's huge obstruction is no longer seen;
Our manifold transgressions are to-day
As though they had not been.

3.

Wide open stands the door:
Eternal Justice smiled, and it was done;
The powers of darkness could prevent no more
The rising of our Sun.

4.

He shows His glorious face,
And scatters mortal shadows with His eye:
Earth is all radiant with the light of grace
Beneath a cloudless sky.

* * * *

11.

Then let my life display
The Spirit's fruit of self-forgetting love,
That all the world may know, from day to day,
My Treasure is above.

12.

So at the trumpet's sound,
My slumbering dust Christ's quickening power shall share,
And rise again immortal from the ground
To meet Him in the air.

To those who know Mr. Wilton's former work, "Wood-notes and Church Bells," no commendation of another volume of songs by this cunning warbler is required. Once again the time of the singing of birds is come, and the voice of the turtle is heard in our land; nor will any patient listener be disappointed of hearing heaven's music from an earthly lyre.

E. H. Bickersteth.

Reviews.

Spent in the Service: a Memoir of the Very Rev. Achilles Daunt, D.D., Dean of Cork. By the Rev. F. R. Wynne, M.A., Incumbent of St. Matthias, Dublin. Second Edition. Hodder and Stoughton.

A BRIEF notice of the first edition of this Memoir has already appeared in our columns. Inasmuch, however, as amongst the many able and devoted Ministers of Christ who have adorned the annals of the Irish Church, few have surpassed Achilles Daunt in ability, and still fewer, if any, in zeal and devotion, we gladly avail ourselves of the opportunity which is afforded by a second edition of "Spent in the Service" to say something more respecting its subject.

Whatever profession he had adopted, Achilles Daunt was a man who was destined to make his mark in the world, and to produce a powerful impression upon his contemporaries. The late Dean of Cork possessed those qualifications, both moral and intellectual, which need only the favourable concurrence of external circumstances in order to ensure for their possessors professional distinction or literary fame. After obtaining high honours at Trinity College, Dublin, where abundant evidence was given of his wide sympathies, his refined taste, and his sound scholarship, Achilles Daunt wavered for some little time in regard to the choice of his future profession. The fondly-cherished hope and desire of his parents was that he should take holy orders. His own inclinations and aspirations were in the same direction. On the other hand, he had many misgivings respecting his qualifications for the ministry, and other influence was brought to bear upon him by those who thought that his talents, combined with his family interest, would ensure him success at the bar. The struggle does not appear to have been of long duration. In the year 1855, when Achilles Daunt was twenty-three years of age, he was ordained to the curacy of St. Matthias, Dublin; and from that time a life-long friendship commenced with its incumbent, the Rev. Maurice Day, the present Bishop of Cashel. Within a few months of his appointment to this curacy, he was presented by Lord Carlisle, then Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, to the living of Rincurran, adjoining Kinsale, and close to the family estate, on which his father and mother were then living. Here, as in his curacy at Dublin, the young rector threw his whole soul into the work of the ministry, and his energies of mind and body were absorbed in his efforts to promote the moral and spiritual welfare of his parishioners. Much of his time was devoted to the religious education of the young. He laboured diligently amongst the soldiers of the garrison at Charles Fort, to which he was appointed chaplain, and also amongst the sailors of the crowded harbour of Kinsale. In addition to his three Sunday services, he held frequent meetings in different parts of his parish for the exposition of the Scriptures and for prayer, and he devoted much of his time to parochial visitation and to classes for confirmation candidates and for servants. After spending upwards of ten years in Rincurran, Mr. Daunt accepted the proposal of the Bishop of Meath to become his domestic chaplain, and to hold the living of Stackallen.

He had not been long rector of Stackallen, however, when he was urged to succeed Mr. Day as the incumbent of the important church of St. Matthias. At first Mr. Daunt hesitated, but after consultation with his father, to whom he had committed the decision of his future destiny, he wrote, on the 2nd August, 1867, formally accepting the offer.

It was here that the great work of the late Dean of Cork was accomplished. He was, in the highest sense of the word, an Evangelist. The church, which had been uniformly well attended during the incumbency of Mr. Day, was now crowded to overflowing, and the aisles were blocked with men who stood throughout the whole of the service. Shortly after the appointment of Mr. Daunt, the first Church Convention met at Dublin, and the city was filled, not only with the most influential of the clergy and laity of the Church of Ireland, but also with the delegates from the country and their friends. The accommodation provided in the church of St. Matthias, which was a plain structure, proved utterly insufficient, and it was resolved to improve and enlarge it. The second concert-hall in the Exhibition Palace was, in the first instance, secured as a temporary arrangement whilst the alterations were going on. After a few Sundays it was found necessary to remove to the large concert-room, which was capable of accommodating three thousand people. Every available seat was at once occupied, and when the hymns were given out the burst of sound almost drowned the great organ. Men who would have shrunk from entering a church felt much less dread of a music-hall. Many Roman Catholics were found amongst the congregation, some of whom sought spiritual aid in private from the preacher. The labours of Mr. Daunt at this time were unceasing. After the exhausting services of the Sunday, he was in the habit of receiving a number of young men belonging to Trinity College to spend the remainder of the evening; and the freshness and charm of his society predisposed them to receive the more readily the words which he addressed to them on the one subject which was ever nppermost in his heart. In the sick-room Mr. Daunt was as welcome and as successful as in the crowded church. He came as a messenger from God, and, whilst his voice was soft and his manner gentle and winning, he never shrank from the faithful delivery of his message. Beneath his abundant labours, his strength soon began to give way. "My life," he used to say, "will not be long, but I must work while it is day."

As soon as the new Constitution of the Disestablished Church came into action, Mr. Daunt was appointed one of the diocesan nominators. He was also chosen to be the representative canon in St. Patrick's Cathedral for the united diocese of Dublin and Glendalough. In 1871 he was appointed to the Deanery of Cork by his old and highly-valued friend, Bishop Gregg, who was most anxious to secure the near presence and active co-operation of one whom he had long known and loved. Here he engaged heartily in every religious work connected with the Cathedral. He succeeded in attaching to himself the choir, both men and boys, and in throwing into the stately services of the Cathedral all the fire and fervour which had characterised the services of St. Matthias.

The days of Achilles Daunt were now visibly numbered. Brain and heart were seriously affected, and entire rest and quiet were imperatively enjoined; but the Dean of Cork had learned the lesson of waiting as well as of working. Much of his time was spent in the enjoyment of domestic society, and in correspondence with his friends. Occasionally he ventured to address a meeting or to preach a sermon; and though at times he found "waiting" to be "hard work," as he expressed himself when writing to a friend from Hastings in the autumn of 1877, nevertheless he learned to submit with patience and resignation to the chastening hand, and he "longed for the Home where there shall be no going out, no variableness nor shadow of change."

On Sunday, the 31st of March, he preached at Whitehall, and expressed himself as "happy in the privilege of doing angel's work." On the 11th of May he returned to Cork after an absence of twelve months. On his way through Dublin he preached in the Church of St. Werburgh, and

took part in the services of St. Matthias, but the exertion was too much for him, and he was compelled to sit down, overcome by emotion. When he reached Cork he found the aged Bishop on his death-bed; and, on the 26th of May that honoured and faithful servant of God entered into rest. The first part of the funeral service was performed in the Cathedral, and the Dean preached an impressive sermon. This sermon was his last. In vain he was begged not to proceed to Dublin, where the body of the Bishop was to be interred. He thought it his duty to go, and when the voice of duty seemed to Achilles Daunt to call, no earthly motives or considerations had power to restrain him. On the 9th of June he took part, for the last time, in the administration of the Holy Communion. On the following Sunday he was confined to his bed, when part of the service for the day was read to him, and he asked for the general thanksgiving and the hymns, "Rock of Ages" and "Jesu, lover of my soul," and was heard repeating several of his favourite passages of Scripture, ending with "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever." The following day he lost consciousness, and after a few hours, during which he breathed with difficulty, but apparently without suffering, his spirit passed from the body. His funeral was a spectacle such as Dublin has rarely witnessed. Roman Catholics and Protestants, Churchmen and Dissenters forgot their differences, and followed side by side the remains of one whose heart's desire for his brethren was that they might be saved, and whose life was spent in promoting the temporal and eternal welfare of all who were brought within the range of his influence. It was thus that the sun of Achilles Daunt went down while it was yet day, and the light in which so many had rejoiced to walk was extinguished upon earth, to be rekindled on that day "when they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever."

A Lady's Life in the Rocky Mountains. By Isabella L. Bird, author of "Six Months in the Sandwich Islands," &c. Pp. 290. Second Edition. Murray. 1879.

MISS BIRD wrote, a few years ago, a series of letters from the Sandwich Islands, which were published, and form one of the best works of the kind; and the letters in the volume before us, which will have no doubt a large circulation, are full of interest. A lady's journal, like Mrs. Brassey's, a record of travelling experiences which is chatty and familiar, rather than formal and polished, is sure to be read, provided always that it be graphic, lively, and original. Miss Bird's letters are never dull; incident and description of scenery are happily mingled; and the style is simple and attractive. Each day's or each weeks narrative is not dressed up after the fashion of the well-known incident in Dr. Johnson's "Tour to the Hebrides." Her letters from a log cabin read really like the letters of one who is roughing it in the Rocky Mountains. That Miss Bird roughed it her letters show. Once she was thrown by a horse as a grizzly bear came out of the tangle just in front of her; one night a beast (fox or skunk) rushed in at the open end of the cabin, and on another the head and three or four inches of the body of a snake were protruded through the chink in the floor close to her. She killed a rattle-snake close to the cabin; deadly snakes, and snakes "harmless, but abominable," were plentiful. In this said cabin there was no table, no bed, no basin, no towel, no glass, no window, no fastening on the door; the roof was in holes, the logs were unchinked, and in one wood wall there was a great hole. Here, the other people slept under the trees; there was neither lamp, nor candle, only the

unsteady light of pine knots. To spend eight hours and a half in the broiling sun, lost on the prairie; to be thrown by a half broken-in horse on the hard gravel, and kicked into the bargain; to be kept awake by the claw-sharpening of a skunk whose lair is under the logs of the sleeping hut, and who must on no account be disturbed for fear of the dreadful odour, which could be smelt a mile off; to lie all night wrapped up in a roll of blankets by a pine-log fire at the foot of a snow-topped mountain, and now and then to listen to the noises of wild animals prowling near; to help to drive to the *corral* a thousand head of half wild cattle; to write letters when the inkbottle has to be kept close to the fire to prevent it from freezing; to be reduced to lower than half rations from long-lasting snow falls—these form part and parcel of the healthy and exciting pleasures of roughing it settler fashion in the Rocky Mountains.

The climate in Colorado, it appears, is something delightful. Its curative effect, indeed, can hardly be exaggerated. Of the settlers high up in the health-giving mountains, Miss Bird writes:—

All have come for health, and most have found or are finding it, even if they have no better shelter than a waggon tilt or a blanket on sticks, laid across four poles. The climate of Colorado is considered the finest in North America, and consumptives, asthmatics, dyspeptics, and sufferers from nervous diseases, are here in hundreds and thousands, either trying the "camp cure" for three or four months, or settling here permanently. People can safely sleep out of doors for six months of the year. The plains are from 4000 to 6000 feet high, and some of the settled "parks," or mountain valleys, are from 8000 to 10,000. The air, besides being much rarefied, is very dry. The rainfall is far below the average, dews are rare, and fogs nearly unknown. The sunshine is bright and almost constant, and three-fourths of the days are cloudless. The milk, beef, and bread are good. The climate is neither so hot in summer, nor so cold in winter, as that of the States, and when the days are hot, the nights are cool. Snow rarely lies on the lower ranges, and horses and cattle don't require to be either fed or housed during the winter. Of course the rarefied air quickens respiration.

In travelling through the Territory, extensively, as she did, Miss Bird found that nine out of every ten settlers were cured invalids. Statistics of medical works on the climate of the State (as it now is), represent Colorado as the most remarkable sanatorium in the world. But for persons who have a small capital, and no agricultural experience, to try to make a living by farming in Colorado is a great mistake. Some settlers lead a life of dreary drudgery. Miss Bird mentions the case of a Dr. H., a physician in good practice in England, who was threatened with pulmonary disease, and emigrated. He did not know how to saddle or harness a horse. Mrs. H. knew nothing of house work. They were cheated in land, goods, oxen, everything; they could not afford a "hired man;" grasshoppers destroyed the crops; and "smartness" took advantage of the struggling gentleman-farmer in every bargain.

A letter written from Denver gives some information about this "smartness." Miss Bird writes:—

The truth of the proverbial saying, "There is no God west of the Missouri," is everywhere manifest. The "almighty dollar" is the true divinity, and its worship is universal. "Smartness" is the quality thought most of. The boy who "gets on" by cheating at his lessons is praised for being "a smart boy," and his satisfied parents foretell that he will make a "smart man." A man who over-reaches his neighbour, but who does it so cleverly that the law cannot take hold of him, wins an envied reputation as a "smart man," and stories of this species of smartness are told admiringly round every stove. Smartness is the initial stage of swindling, and the clever swindler who evades or defies the weak and often corruptly administered laws of the States, excites unmeasured admiration among the masses.

These remarks, writes Miss Bird, in a footnote, would be endorsed, with shame and pain, by the best and most thoughtful among Americans. It is right to add, however, that the picture of morality in the Western States is not without cheering colours. In districts where liquor is prohibited there is no crime. In several of the stock-raising and agricultural regions through which Miss Bird travelled, where whisky was practically excluded, the doors are never locked, and the miners leave their silver bricks in their waggons unprotected at night. "There is no danger and no fear." Women are everywhere respected.

From Miss Bird's book, together with "Wanderings in the Western Land," by Mr. Vivian, M.P., recently reviewed in these columns, a very clear idea may be drawn of the districts now being opened up to English tourists.

The Philosophy of Jesus Christ as unfolded in the Physical Aspect of His Miracles. By the Rev. RICHARD COLLINS, M.A., late Principal of Cottayam College, Travancore. Elliot Stock. 1879.

THIS is a small book on a great subject. Among the mountains of Ceylon the author penned pages worthy of most serious consideration here in Europe. He lays no claim to originality, yet he has shewed how profitably diligent thinking may work an almost unnoticed vein of knowledge. The treatise is religious, as might be expected from the writer's position; it is not less truly scientific, for his acceptation of "science" is the only sound one—namely, the "*knowledge of fact.*"

The central argument is that the miracles wrought by the Son of Man give us evidence of the origin of matter and force, that Nature cannot give this evidence, that the recognition of these as facts is needed in the interest of true science.

It is regarded, at the outset, as a serious error that some writers, Archbishop Trench for one, have used the word Nature so as to include the supernatural. Another error is held to be the overlooking the physical aspect of the miracles, as if there were nothing to be learned from it, the moral and religious being counted as the whole value of the mighty works. Here our author commends himself to reason and ought to command general assent. The first error leads to endless confusion of thought, the term Nature being employed with such widely differing extensions of signification. And the second error is really both irreverent and unscientific—irreverent because it treats as valueless the manner in which the great Teacher dealt with things material. Not thus ought His actions to be slighted who in all things had reasons for His doings, and whose lightest word and smallest particular of method had significance for those who would heed and learn. Clearly and temperately the partial and faulty ways of philosophers, ancient and modern, are demonstrated, and the ground prepared for drawing out in forcible contrast the manner in which our Lord manifested His power. The following will give a good sample of the style:—

What Christ did was to hit the blot on all previous systems, both physical and ethical; and this He did with an authority that struck all His followers. . . . . It is with His physical teaching alone that we have to do here. His method was not by dialectics or criteria; but by illustrations, by acts, by facts, which could reach man's understanding at once, and in a way that admitted of no discussion. He took men by the hand, and led them into the very arcana of Nature, and showed them there, not by word of mouth, but by facts which appealed at once to their five senses. Just what man wanted to know, to keep his science in harmony with his ethics and his religion, was revealed in Jesus Christ's philosophy. Beyond this there was no need. . . . . But there was a need that man should know, what the cosmos itself could never reveal, the origin of matter and force; and that was the one lesson of Jesus Christ's

physical philosophy. . . . . He put it before men's eyes, so that it might admit of no question, that matter, force, vital force, are the outcome of and are subject to WILL. He established that as the axiom of the universe; and it is only by faithfulness to that axiom that science can be God-like as well as human. That was the axiom without which all the deep thinkers of old were working in the dark. Socrates and Plato seem, indeed, to have seen it afar off; and even Anaxagoras touched it by his doctrine of *Nous* as the moving force of all, notwithstanding that he still held to the doctrine that creation, generation, and destruction of matter were impossible. That is the axiom which, if accepted to-day, would suffice to reconcile Science and Religion.

As there have been in God's works natural great truths lying before men's eyes waiting to be noticed, yet remaining for ages practically unseen, so in His word there are truths which are passed by without their existence being heeded. The book before us is fitted to do good service in calling those who hurry to and fro to stand still and pay due attention to what is very nigh unto them. Many a chemical and metallurgical discovery has been made by more careful examination and treatment of what had been thrown aside as worthless. Thus in the neglected *physical* aspect of Christ's miracles may be found what will richly repay all labour; and Mr. Collins, as one who has sought and found precious metal, invites others to be fellow-workers.

We cannot follow him in this brief review in his application of the principles laid down to the cases adduced, especially the miracle at Cana, where the water was made wine. Suffice it to say that he presses the argument home to establish the supremely important position that Jesus did in that miracle actually show Himself as Creator. Now, if this can be reasonably made good by the evidence contained in the history, it must cut the roots of all shallow materialism, and, further, must convict of unscientific errors those who have talked the most loudly of the unthinkableness of creation and of the inherent potencies of matter.

Turning from the physical to the moral and spiritual, we see that while our author, for his particular purpose, dwells so much on the former, he does in fact prepare a stage for the better exhibition of the latter in its supremacy. Remembering the beginning of Genesis and the beginning of John's Gospel, it is only what might be expected that when "the Word was made flesh" and dwelt among us, and manifested forth His glory, He should show Himself to be not only Redeemer, but also, as He was in the beginning, *Creator*. In an unscientific age, and among an unscientific people, as we understand the word "scientific," the physical aspect of His mighty works was but little heeded; now, in this time of exacting systematizing investigation, Christ's miracles must be either denied, which is infidelity and unreason, or they must be accepted with all their accompanying lessons and consequences, in which latter case the position will be reached which our author has already taken up, and around which he has traced with skilled hand lines of defence which go far to make it proof against assault. His arguments will bear much extension. He has sought rather to be clear than copious and his pages are worthy of all the attention they will receive from those who are concerned for the progress of true science, which cannot be severed from the knowledge of Him by whom and for whom are all things.

Supernatural Revelation; or, The First Principles of Moral Theology. By the Rev. T. R. BIRKS, Professor of Moral Theology, Cambridge. Pp. 240. Macmillan & Co. 1879.

THAT a notice of this ably-written work has not appeared in THE CHURCHMAN before the present date we regret; it was our intention to review it, in an early number, at some length, while strongly recommending it. A brief notice, however, may serve to show its character.

In the main it is a reply to the anti-supernaturalism of that notorious work misnamed "Supernatural Religion," but it also deals with Mr. Mill's posthumous essays, and various sceptical writings.

In an interesting Preface Professor Birks remarks:—

For forty-two years I have had the great privilege of unfolding and maintaining the great truths of the Word of God both by speech and writing, as a clergyman of the English Church. For the future I expect to be restricted chiefly to the second means alone. The obligation to maintain and unfold Christian truth through the Press is thus increased; especially since I hold the office of Professor of Moral Theology in the University of Bacon, Newton, and Milton. Attacks have been made and are still in progress on Christianity and on all the foundations of our Christian empire, by three allied systems of error—Ultramontanism, Agnosticism or Secularism, and the Liberationism which would banish the name of Christ from the whole world of politics.

The learned Professor then quotes the caution of St. Paul concerning "profane and vain babblings," a caution which applies with equal force to the varieties of unbelieving thought in our days as to the Gnosticism of the first century. He proceeds:—

One great duty of Cambridge at this crisis, is in the study of nature to abide steadfastly by the inductive principles of the philosophy of Bacon and Newton, so well carried out by many Cambridge students of these later times. But this implies the further duty to refrain from that unbridled license of the imagination in scientific subjects, which leads many to dignify plausible or even unplausible conjectures with the name of science.

Conjectures in science, adds the Professor, have great use, but this depends on our never confounding them with proved facts. Again, this same principle of careful and inductive search, he says, must be applied to the study of Scripture:—

The Word of God will else be overlaid with ambiguities, uncertainties, and partial misconceptions, human traditions, distortions, and corruptions of its genuine meaning, which not only obscure its heavenly brightness, but are liable to become a great encouragement to the assaults of open unbelief.

In the fourth chapter, "Reason and Supernatural Revelation," Professor Birks shows how the claim of Christianity is to supply fresh facts, with full evidence, centering in a unique Person:—

The words and acts of such a Person are supernatural only in this sense, that they lie outside the very narrow and limited bounds of the previous experience of individual men in their brief earthly lifetime. Instead of lying outside the domain of Reason itself, they are those added experiences which raise man out of darkness into a region of dawning light.

The tenth chapter, "the Constant Element in Nature," and the eleventh, "the Miraculous Element involved in the whole Course of Nature," vigorous, clear, and full of matter, will well repay a careful study. The concluding chapter, "the Revelation in the Old and New Testaments one Harmonious Whole," is, we think, particularly good; its remarks on the two forms of German Rationalism, the mythical and the naturalist, which contradict each other, and its sketch of doctrinal Rationalism, are clear and effective. One note of this valuable work, indeed, is that it supplies a summary of the most remarkable sceptical objections during recent years, together with—a fundamental point—a closely reasoned and thoroughly Scriptural reply. We quote three or four striking sentences of comment on the fancy that a supernatural revelation is needless:—

A few jackdaws in Christian countries may strut about in borrowed feathers, and may boast of an "absolute religion," which they have stolen from the Bible, and then carved and mangled till it is no better than a bleeding corpse. This residuum is a law without any sanction, a morality without life; the

worship of a Being wholly unknown, without any remedy for conscious guilt, or any clear hope of life beyond the grave, or of any deliverance from the dark despotism of death. There is in fact no myth so purely mythical as the dream of some philosophers in their dotage, that the light of man's reason has made all supernatural revelation superfluous.

Plain Reasons against Joining the Church of Rome. By R. F. LITTLEDALE, LL.D., D.C.L.. Pp. 196. S. P. C. K. 1880.

THIS book may be regarded as a sort of sequel to the famous Capel-Liddon controversy; it is significant of a change in the attitude of Ritualists towards Rome. During the last few years "Catholics" in the Church of England have to some extent shown themselves Protestants. The stream of perversions, apparently, has almost ceased; and in newspaper and magazine discussions on such questions as Why do not the Ritualists become Romanists, Ritualists have not exhibited an excess of tenderness. Roman Catholic controversialists, in fact, have of late been hard put to it. Mr. Gladstone came into the lists, particularly against Ultramontanism, a few years ago. The Roman Catholics voted against him on the Irish University Bill, a Bill which would have placed the higher education of Ireland, to a great extent, under Ultramontane rule; and the right hon. gentleman's three pamphlets against Ultramontanism formed his reply to the wire-pullers of the Vatican. And now Dr. Littledale comes to the front. Notorious for his attacks upon the Reformers, he may be regarded as a leader among the Ritualists; and his present action is, in its way, a sign of the times. The Ritualists are tired, no doubt, of being alternately patronised and rebuked by Romanists. At the time of the Capel-Liddon controversy, we thought that Mgr. Capel made a little mistake; either his judgment or his temper was at fault. At all events, ultra-Churchmen—entirely excepting, of course, the unexplainable Dr. F. G. Lee—are now attacking Popery. Dr. Littledale, who, whatever else may be said of him, is a controversialist of considerable ability, writes these Plain Reasons against Joining the Church of Rome; and his attack is evidently no feint; he strikes hard, and with a will. He says, it is true, that his book is "defensive, and not aggressive, in design;" he addresses—not born Roman Catholics—but those who have seceded or are tempted to secession. Nevertheless, his book, as we have said, is an attack upon Romanism, earnest and bitter, as well as clever. It is, indeed, a remarkable work, and in many respects satisfactory. That it is so we proceed to show.

First, however, we must remark, though perhaps this is scarcely necessary, that the work has serious defects, and is not altogether free from error. Dr. Littledale's silence on certain points is significant. Weighed in the balances of a sound and sober Protestantism, his book is found wanting. We mention two points, and these are vital—viz., the Mass, and the Confessional.

To show the character of the work we give a few extracts.

In the section headed "Roman Creature Worship," it is stated that in direct rebellion against the plain letter and spirit of both the Old and New Testaments, the Roman Church practically compels her children to offer far more prayers to deceased human beings than they address to the Father or to Christ:—

> It is not true, as is often alleged in defence, that the prayers of the departed Saints are asked only in the same sense as those of living ones, with the added thought that they are now more able to pray effectually for us. The petitions are not at all limited to a mere "Pray for us;" but are constantly of exactly the same kind and wording as those addressed to Almighty God, and are offered

kneeling, and in the course of Divine Service, which is not how we ever ask the prayers of living friends.

Dr. Littledale gives some specimens from the "Raccolta" (Eng. Trans., Burns and Oates, 1873), a collection of prayers specially indulgenced by the Popes, and therefore of absolute authority in the Roman Church. We quote one of these prayers, as follows:—

"Guardian of virgins, and holy father Joseph, to whose faithful keeping Christ Jesus, innocence itself, and Mary, Virgin of virgins, were committed, I pray and beseech thee by these two dear pledges, Jesus and Mary, that being preserved from all uncleanness, I may with spotless mind, pure heart, and chaste body, ever most chastely serve Jesus and Mary. Amen."

Dr. Littledale also gives some extracts from Liguori's "Glories of Mary," and he adds, with justice,—

If this be not blasphemy against the Lord Jesus Christ, and a formal denial of His power to save and His being the way to heaven, there are no such sins possible. Yet, even before Pius IX. made Liguori a "Doctor of the Church," the Congregation of Rites decreed in 1803 that, "In all the writings of Alphonso de' Liguori there is not one word that can be justly found fault with."

One quotation from Liguori is shocking in the extreme; and we give it with reluctance. "At the command of the Virgin, all things obey, *even God*"!!! *Imperio Virginis omnia famulantur, etiam Deus.*

In the section headed "The Blessed Virgin more Worshipped than God or Christ," it is shown that in practice she receives not only the *same* in kind but *more* in quantity. We quote one proof paragraph:—

One of the most general private devotions in Roman Catholic countries is the Angelus, recited thrice daily, with three Hail Marys in each recitation, so that she is addressed at least *nine* times a day in prayer.

Again, Dr. Littledale observes that—

When special altars of Mary are erected, when hundreds of priests belong to orders, such as the Marist Fathers, peculiarly vowed to her service, when *votive gifts and offerings, such as were of the nature of sacrifice in pagan times, as lights, incense, and flowers,* are incessantly made to her, and when, finally, the Mass itself is celebrated again and again in her honour, and her Litany is usually sung before the Sacrament in the rite of Benediction, surely, "the Mass is converted into Worship of the Blessed Virgin."

We note with pleasure, we may remark in passing, that Dr. Littledale here rebukes—we have italicised the words—the offering of "lights, incense, and flowers." Lord Beaconsfield, in "Lothair," has written of Popery as "mediæval superstitions, which are generally only the embodiments of pagan ceremonies and creeds." And his "Mr. Phœbus," who asserted that true religion is the worship of the beautiful, and set up the statue of a nymph in a favourite grove of his island, spoke of the Greek Church peasants there as performing unconsciously the religious ceremonies of their pagan ancestors. It is worthy of note that a Ritualist refers to sacrificial lights and incense as quasi-pagan votive offerings.

Concerning the Roman worship of "St. Joseph," Dr. Littledale gives some striking facts. It is not yet claimed for Joseph, we read that he, like Mary, rules our blessed Lord in heaven; but his cultus, too, has been forced on of late years, and—

That dogma is already seen in germ in Faber's hymns, and elsewhere:—

> With her Babe in her arms, sure Mary will be,
> Sweet spouse of our Lady, *our pleader with thee;*

so that here Christ Himself, as well as the Blessed Virgin Mary, intercedes with St. Joseph, who is thus set positively above God Himself. This goes even beyond the new Trinity substituted for the old one;—

Jesus, Mary, Joseph, I give you my heart and soul;
Jesus, Mary, Joseph, assist me in my last agony;
Jesus, Mary, Joseph, may I breathe forth my soul in peace with you;

a prayer indulgenced with 300 days, in the "Raccolta." St. Joseph has now been "granted the title of universal patron, guardian, and protector of the whole Church."

The sections on "The Mass Traffic" are interesting. It is shown that the Church of Rome lies justly under the accusation of being what is called, in France, *La Réligion d'Argent*, and that the necessary result of the shameful system is to encourage rich people to continue in sinful courses.

In writing on "Roman Untrustworthiness," Dr. Littledale remarks:—

The Roman Church, which professes to worship Him who has said, "I am the Truth," is honeycombed through and through with accumulated falsehood; and things have come to this pass, that no statement whatever, however precise and circumstantial, no reference to authorities, however seemingly frank and clear, to be found in a Roman controversial book, or to be heard from the lips of a living controversialist, can be taken on trust; nor accepted, indeed, without rigorous search and verification.

Proofs of this assertion are adduced; and, after referring to the received principle of the Roman Church that no faith need be kept with heretics, Dr. Littledale adds—"the controversial and theological writings of Roman divines *perfectly swarm with falsehoods.*" Such language from an out-and-out Protestant would probably be reckoned too strong by some Reviewers who are nominally Protestant; but Dr. Littledale gives chapter and verse, and he is not likely to be sneered at as an Exeter Hall polemic. We give a single specimen of his proof-quotations:—

Perhaps the most curious example of all is a French New Testament, printed at Bordeaux in 1686, with archiepiscopal approval. Here are two instances of its renderings: "He himself shall be saved, yet in all cases as by the *fire of purgatory*" (1 Cor. iii. 15). "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter days some will separate themselves from the *Roman Faith*" (1 Tim. iv. 1). The outcry at this audacity led to the destruction of the edition, now excessively rare; but there is a copy in the Library at Lambeth and another in the Chapter Library at Durham.

On the "Moral Failure of Roman Catholicism," Dr. Littledale writes strongly, but he has reason on every point. With the statistics concerning crime and immorality in Roman Catholic countries, published some years ago by Mr. Hobart Seymour in, if we remember right, *The Christian Advocate*, he is probably not acquainted. He quotes Ravenstein, however, as to England, showing that in this country Roman Catholics contribute from "three to five times their fair share of crime." And, as to holy Rome itself, he observes that it is Rome which has "*sunk lowest, longest, and oftenist.*" The fact is that Romanism is at its worst where it has had entire liberty and long monopoly. It winks at vice, and considers ignorance the mother of devotion:—

While the weapon of excommunication, with all the awful penalties attached to it, is freely employed to punish anything which seems to involve lack of submission to the hierarchy, it is never wielded against adultery, brigandage, murder, or other great crimes against God and society; such, for example, as agrarian conspiracy in Ireland, which has often found sympathisers among the Roman Catholic clergy.

One other point we may touch upon, although our space is already exhausted—viz., the suppression in popular Roman catechisms of "that part of the Ten Commandments which forbids the making of graven images for the purpose of religious honour." In the new edition of his book Dr. Littledale has altered his language upon this point. The facts remain,

however, that in many Romanist catechisms the commandment against image-worship is not to be found, and that not one Roman Catholic in a million knows that image-worship has been forbidden by the Word of God. Dr. Littledale writes:—

> Even in Schneider's "Manuale Clericorum," a popular Jesuit book in Latin, for the use of students for the *priesthood* (Ratisbon, Pustet, 1868), where there is a very full set of questions for examination of conscience on the Decalogue, extending over pp. 403–411, there is no hint whatever at the Second Commandment, which is entirely suppressed; but the first question under the First Commandment is, "Has he believed everything which the Holy Roman Church believes, or held an opinion contrary to the Roman faith in any matter?" Bellarmine's Catechism cuts out the Second Commandment entirely.

In the *Guardian*, while we write, we observe a letter which gives a popular French catechism from which the Second Commandment has been excluded.

Short Notices.

The Maidens' Lodge. None of Self and all of Thee. A Tale of the Reign of Queen Anne. By EMILY SARAH HOLT. Pp. 250. Shaw and Co.

There are few modern works of fiction which we rate as highly as those written by Miss Holt. "Margery's Son," "Clare Avery," and "The White Rose of Langley;" tales of the Marian Persecution, of the Tudor times, and of the Lollards; all deserve warm praise, as carefully studied and admirably written. From a purely literary point of view, indeed, these writings may claim to have many charms; but the aim of the gifted writer, we feel sure, has been throughout distinctively and decidedly Christian. With the volume before us, a tale of Queen Anne's reign, we are greatly pleased. Its sketches of life and manners are graphic, and not a stage in the story is in the least degree dull. The key-note of the work is given in the Huguenot strain—

> Mon sort n'est pas à plaindre,
> Il est à désirer;
> Je n'ai plus rien à craindre,
> Car Dieu est mon Berger.

Cetshwayo's Dutchman. The Private Journey of a White Trader in Zululand during the British Invasion. By CORNELIUS VIJN. Translated from the Dutch, and edited, with Preface and Notes, by the Right Rev. J. W. COLENSO, D.D., Bishop of Natal. With portrait of Cetshwayo. Longmans.

The title-page explains, sufficiently well, the character of this work. Mr. Vijn is a young Hollander, who for some three years traded in Zululand; and his statements have an interest of their own. Dr. Colenso's preface is, in the main, a bitter attack on Sir Bartle Frere.

The Acts of the Apostles, I.—XIV. With Introduction and Notes. By J. RAWSON LUMBY, D.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity. Pp. 188. Cambridge Warehouse, 17, Paternoster Row.

A valuable little volume, one of the best of that useful series, "The Cambridge Bible for Schools." Professor Lumby's notes are terse and suggestive. On verse 1 he calls attention to the word "began;" St. Luke's second "treatise" is still an account of what the Lord does and teaches. The note on ix., verses 4 and 7, brings out the force of the accusative and genitive after ακουειν, as in xxii. 9; St. Paul's companions heard a sound,

but they did not understand what was said. The clear, simple, reverent, comments, thoroughly scholarly, on this passage, and on other passages, may be very favourably contrasted with Canon Farrar's. On xiv. 15, we observe, the meaning of ὁμοιοπαθεῖς, "subject to like sufferings" is not mentioned.

Life Lost or Saved. By SELINA DITCHER. Pp. 290. New Edition. Nisbet.

Earnest, affectionate, faithful words on true religion; well-written, and practical throughout, entirely free from sentimental Evangelicalism.

A Word for Sunday. By the Rev. J. C. RYLE, M.A. Pp. 40. W. Hunt & Co.

This valuable Paper contains the substance of Mr. Ryle's Address on the Lord's Day, delivered at the Annual Islington Meeting, in January last. The wish expressed by many to have the Address in a more permanent form has induced the distinguished writer to publish it, and it will have, no doubt, a very large circulation. Clear, vigorous, pointed, full, and thoroughly practical, the argument is interesting from beginning to end. The notes, we may add, are exceedingly good. We have read this Paper, on a most important subject, with the greatest satisfaction, and heartily recommend it, as peculiarly a Paper for this time. We know nothing like it.

The Child's Life of our Lord. By SARAH GERALDINA STOCK, Author of "Lessons on Israel in Egypt and the Wilderness," &c. With Illustrations. Pp. 320. Marcus Ward & Co.

By an inadvertence which we regret, the deeply interesting and attractive book before us was not mentioned in our New Year's list of gift-books. It is an excellent work, and we heartily recommend it. In a series of forty-seven chapters, most carefully written, the "Life of our Lord" is brought before children.

The Clergy Directory and Parish Guide. An Alphabetical List of the Clergy of the Church of England, with their Degree and University &c.; a list of Benefices, with the population, annual value, &c. Pp. 624. T. Bosworth, 198, High Holborn.

A cheap and useful book.

Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the Church Congress. Official Report. Edited by the Rev. F. W. EDMONDES, M.A., Rector of Coity. Pp. 600. John Hodges, 24, King William Street.

The Report of the Church Congress of 1879 has an interest of its own; held at Swansea, one of its chief subjects was, naturally, the Church in Wales. The Report seems well edited, and, with the exception of speeches in the Welsh language, is as full as possible. Unlike other Church Congress Report volumes, which have merely a paper cover, the volume before us is neatly bound in cloth.

The Clergy List for 1880. John Hall: 38, Parliament Street, London.

This useful compendium, as is well known, is prepared with great care; its information, brought down to the time of issue, is reliable. In the present volume there are some additional statistics; and the names and addresses of the Members of the Houses of Convocation have been printed in full. One portion of the work, the alphabetical list of Benefices in England and Wales (with post town, net value, population, incumbent, curate, patron, &c.) takes up no less than 263 pages of close print.

The Book of Household Management. By Mrs. BEETON. New Edition. Pp. 1296. Ward, Lock & Co.

Mrs. Beeton's "Book of Household Management" has been well-known in a very wide circle for several years. The present edition, "entirely

new, revised, and corrected," bears on its title-page the announcement "*three hundred and thirteenth thousand*; such a fact speaks for itself. Cookery, management of children, recipes, medical, sanitary, and legal memoranda, servants, &c. &c., such are some of the chapter headings. There are many woodcuts and coloured illustrations; there is a good index.

Apparitions: a Narrative of Facts. By the Rev. BOURCHIER WREY SAVILE, M.A. Second Edition. Pp. 280. Longmans & Co. 1880.

The object which Mr. Savile had in view by the publication of a work on Apparitions is "to show that there is sufficient evidence for believing in the appearance, about the time of death or shortly after, of deceased persons to those living on the earth." Mr. Savile's name is a guarantee for the piety, good sense, and literary judgment of the work.

Poetical Remains and Letters of the Rev. Thomas Whytehead, M.A. With a Preface by the Dean of Chester. Daldy, Isbister & Co.

This is an interesting and profitable volume. Mr. Whytehead, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, in the year 1837, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of New Zealand in the year 1842, entered into his rest in the year 1843, aged 27. He was a Christian of singular sincerity and thoroughness. A few years ago, when the new chapel of St. John's College, Cambridge, was erected, the roof was adorned with a series of painted figures illustrating each century of the Christian era with portraits of its representative men. Thomas Whytehead was chosen, together with Henry Martyn, William Wilberforce, William Wordsworth, and James Wood, to represent the nineteenth century. Mr. Whytehead's name will be familiar to many of our readers from the beautiful hymn which opens thus:—

> This world I deem
> But a beautiful dream
> Of shadows that are not what they seem;
> Where visions arise,
> Giving dim surmise
> Of the sights that shall meet our waking eyes.

Stoicheiology: or the Science of the First Principles of Christian Doctrine. An Historical and Speculative Exposition of Articles VI., VII., VIII. Pp. 243. By the Rev. JOSEPH MILLER, B.D., Curate of Christ Church, Salford. Hodder & Stoughton.

We have quoted one of the title-pages of this volume, a portion of a not completed work on the Thirty-nine Articles, the first volume of which we have not seen. In our judgment the exposition is decidedly too "Speculative." The author is right, possibly, in supposing that "the excellent text-books on the Articles" with which we are familiar, Burnet, Browne, Boultbee, Jelf, and Hardwick, are "out of date with reference to the new currents of theology." But certainly we cannot approve of "currents of theology" because they are "new." Wordsworth's lines concerning

> —blind Authority, beating with his staff
> The child that might have led him,

may be quoted, no doubt, to show the unwisdom of denouncing inquiry; and of a reverent, earnest inquiry we have not the slightest fear. As to doctrinal works, however, we have always thought the *ad Clerum* remark about not taking ὁ πονηρος into the pulpit, unless the Preacher was quite sure he was able to put him out again, a very wise remark. Mr. Miller, evidently has read a great deal, but he has not given himself time to digest it. If we were reviewing his work at length, we should feel bound to

take exception to several of his remarks. We mention only one point. In the opening sentence on "Holy Scripture containeth all things . . . ." he says that this clause "would almost indicate" that Holy Scripture "*only contains* the Word of God." This is a most unhappy, as well as uncalled for, remark. If Mr. Miller's exposition were more "historical" and less "speculative," he would have pointed out how the Article was directed against the statement of the Church of Rome as to traditions, and is in no wise inconsistent with the statement that the Bible *is* the Word of God.

Japan and the Japan Mission of the Church Missionary Society. By EUGENE STOCK, Editorial Secretary of the Society. With a Map. Pp. 140. Seeleys.

This publication eminently deserves the title *multum in parvo.* On the people of Japan, the two religions of Japan (Shintoism and Buddhism), Old and New Japan, Jesuit Missions, and Protestant Missions, ten chapters are both interesting and instructive. The Mission of the Church Missionary Society takes up five chapters; and the story, we need hardly say, is well told. In the concluding chapter comes the question, "What are the Prospects of Christianity in Japan?" a question not easy to answer. "The replies given by different observers," writes Mr. Stock, "differ. There are no doubt Europeans and Americans in Japan who, like some of the English in India, confidently affirm that the Missions are a failure, or perhaps doubt their existence, although they may have lived next door. Mr. Griffis, in the book already quoted so often, says, 'It is hard to find an average 'man of the world' in Japan who has any clear idea of what the missionaries are doing or have done. Their dense ignorance borders on the ridiculous.'" Again, we read, that Mr. Griffis says, "A new Sun is rising upon Japan. Gently, but resistlessly, Christianity is leavening the nation. In the next century the native word *inaka* (rustic, boor) will mean heathen." Precisely, we may add, as in the early days of Christianity, *paganus*, a rustic, "meant heathen." "The danger to Japan now," writes Mr. Stock, "is from Socialism, Nihilism, and Atheism, which are rearing their grim heads above the sea of perplexing doubt in which the sudden influx of education has plunged the national mind."

Lives of the Leaders of the Church Universal, from Ignatius to the present time. As edited by Dr. FERDINAND PIPER, Professor of Theology, Berlin. Translated from the German and edited, with many additional lives, by H. M. MACCRACKEN, D.D. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1880.

Some three years since it was suggested to Dr. Maccracken, of Toledo, Ohio, that he should undertake the translation into English and the editing of the lives of the Christian leaders for all the days of the year, recently published in Germany under the editorship of Dr. Piper; further, that he should add to the work the life-stories of leaders in the Church in America, and in certain pagan lands, passed over by Dr. Piper. To these suggestions Dr. Maccracken agreed. Concerning Dr. Piper's work it is stated that in the year 1850 that divine offered, in a Church-diet at Stuttgart, this thesis: "The whole Evangelical Church in Germany is interested in forming a common roll of lives for all the days of the year, to be settled on the foundation of our common history, and thus to be made a bond of union of the churches in all the countries." The completed biographies were published in 1875. The work met with great favour; and the roll of names contained in it was officially published and commended by the German Government. A large proportion of the second volume gives the lives of American Christians, such as Jonathan Edwards, Francis

Asbury, Albert Barnes, and Judson. The work, on the whole, is well done.

Six Plain Sermons on Penitence. By the Rev. W. H. Cleaver, M.A. J. Masters and Co.

These sermons—where preached it is not stated—are termed "plain." To us, on the briefest examination, one point seemed "plain": the Sermons do not set forth the Gospel. After observing, in a prefatory note, the expression "the Sacrament of the Altar," we turned to a page in the middle of the book and read these words:—"If your life's work be to deepen penitence, sacramental confession must not be ignored."

United Temperance Mission, held at Newport, Mon., 1879. Edited by Rev. R. Valpy French, D.C.L., Rector of Llanmartin. Pp. 315. Tweedie and Co.

This volume contains a report of the speeches at the Temperance Conferences held in Monmouth last year. "Ministers of various denominations," medical men, and representative laymen from different parts of the country, discussed the moral and religious aspects of the great question which had brought them together. Among the speakers were Dr. B. W. Richardson, Mr. Kirton, I.O.G.T., Canon Barker, Rev. Dawson Burns, Mr. R. C. Morgan, and Canon Wilberforce.

Ecce Christianus. Pp. 340. Hodder and Stoughton.

Here is "an attempt to ascertain the stature and power, mental, moral, spiritual, of a man formed as Christ intended." It opens with a quotation from Mr. Gladstone's praise of *Ecce Homo*, and desires to free men "from the trammels which ecclesiasticism has thrown round" them. The book is very "Broad;" but apart from this, it lacks judgment, and—in spite of what some people might term "fine language"—is flabby and feeble. A specimen sentence—one is enough—may be quoted:—"It is almost as certain as anything can be that the ceasing of all transgression of the laws of Nature, which are the laws of God, would slowly but surely eliminate every disease, which is only the manifestation in the body of a moral, disorder in the soul."

How to write the History of a Parish. By J. C. Cox. Pp. 112. Bemrose & Sons.

An interesting little book, with a very tasteful cover. Registers, Bells, Rolls, and so forth, are the chief topics.

Messrs. W. Kent & Co. have published two admirable little volumes, *Poems of Wordsworth*, "selected from the best editions." These dainty, gilt edged, beautifully printed books, form portion of "The Miniature Library of the Poets," a choice series.

A good cheap edition of *the Works of William Paley, D.D.*, has been published by Messrs. Ward, Lock & Co.

We can recommend *Notes on the Revelation of St. John the Divine.* The notes extracted chiefly from Elliott's "Horæ Apocalypticæ," and arranged for insertion in Bagster's Polyglot Bibles, each column in the Notes containing the interpretation of the corresponding column in the Bibles. By S. H. G. The pamphlet is published by Messrs. S. Bagster & Sons.

A pleasing little book is *Counsel and Might* (Nisbet & Co.); prayers and meditations selected from sermons by Dean Vaughan.

The 8th volume of *The National Church*, a useful periodical, organ of the Church Defence Institution (9, Bridge Street, Westminster, S.W.), contains a mass of valuable information.

ART. X.—THE MONTH.

A GENERAL Election is about to take place. The startling announcement was made on the 8th,—by Lord Beaconsfield in a single sentence, by the leader of the other House in an explanatory speech. According to the Chancellor of the Exchequer the Session had fulfilled its main purpose by making proper provision for Irish distress; and the Spring is a convenient season for the elections. In a letter to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, the Premier's manifesto, stress is laid upon the danger which "distracts that country. A portion of its population is attempting to sever the constitutional tie which unites it to Great Britain in that bond which has favoured the power and prosperity of both. It is to be hoped that all men of light and leading will resist this destructive doctrine." In the later paragraphs of his letter Lord Beaconsfield refers to foreign affairs:—

> Peace rests on the presence, not to say the ascendancy, of England in the Councils of Europe. Even at this moment the doubt supposed to be inseparable from popular election, if it does not diminish, certainly arrests her influence, and is a main reason for not delaying an appeal to the national voice.

The leaders of her Majesty's Opposition welcomed the Ministerial announcement; and vigorous addresses from eminent Liberals were quickly issued. By the Home Rule section of the Opposition, also, a manifesto, an address to Irishmen, was published; but its language is more likely to injure than to aid the Liberal party in their contests on this side the Channel. The main point in the addresses and speeches, so far (March 20th), whether Tory or Liberal, is the Foreign policy of the Ministry. Other questions, however, religious, ecclesiastical, educational, must come to the front. The *Guardian*, which has strongly supported Mr. Gladstone, pointed out, on the 10th, that those who desire to assume Ministerial responsibility ought now to speak, not upon the critical question of foreign policy only, but on the great points of domestic policy which must be taken up in a new Parliament. The *Guardian* remarks:—

> We ought to know what is really meant by voting for the Liberal party—who are its real leaders, and what is the relation between the Liberal "Centre" and the Left wing, so ably led by such men as Mr. Chamberlain, and, it would seem, favoured in some points by men of greater name. Churchmen in particular have reason for inquiring what is likely to be the policy of a Liberal Cabinet towards the Church, not only in the matter of Establishment, but also in respect of giving her free play for her development and independence.

One result of the elections—said to be probable—would be truly deplorable, namely—a Liberal Ministry at the mercy of a band of Roman Catholic Home Rulers. Lord Hartington, however, in his statesmanlike address to North-east Lancashire, declared that the demand for Home Rule is "impracticable;" his Lordship considers that "any concession or appearance of concession in this direction would be mischievous in its effects to the prosperity of Ireland, as well as that of England and Scotland."

The election which will excite the greatest interest, probably, is the contest in Midlothian between Lord Dalkeith and Mr. Gladstone. In his address the noble earl observes:—

I am a supporter of the maintenance of the Established Church of Scotland, which I believe to be in imminent danger. My eminent opponent has promised that before it is disestablished it shall have a "fair trial." I must, however, remind you that between his pledge to his supporters that the question of the Irish Church was "outside the practical politics of the day" and his scheme for its destruction there was but an interval of three years.

Lord Derby has, at length, formally separated from the political connection in which he "was brought up."

A correspondent of the *Guardian*, "Ex-Gladstonian," refers to a recent speech in Marylebone by Mr. Gladstone, "extolling Nonconformists for having consented to place their own policy and beloved conviction [disestablishment] in the shade." "Ex-Gladstonian" writes:—

Churchmen have hitherto been instructed that "disestablishment" might be the policy of the Liberation Society; but that it was a calumny upon Nonconformists to assume that their profession included and absorbed the acceptance of disestablishment. Mr. Gladstone propounds a different theory—namely, that disestablishment is the "peculiar and distinctive feature" and the "religious conviction" of the "largest of all the sections of the Liberal party"—that is, as he further explains, of all who are at once Nonconformists and Liberals. Mr. Gladstone's thoughts can only be measured by his words, and it is plain that the concession which he makes to disestablishment by these statements is to the last degree perilous.

The Council of the Church Association have issued a circular calling the attention of the electors to the great questions at stake, viewed from an anti-sacerdotal standpoint. The *Rock* which under new management has greatly improved, justly remarks that "the source of England's greatness, and as a necessary consequence her world-wide influence, is based upon Protestant Christianity."

At last an eminent divine, for whom, as the *Times* has remarked, high preferment might have been expected any time during the last twenty years, has been made a dean. It will not be forgotten by Evangelical Churchmen that the Prime

Minister who promoted the veteran M'Neile to the Deanery of Ripon has offered the Deanery of Salisbury to J. C. Ryle. Mr. Ryle's great abilities and distinguished services to the Church are acknowledged on all sides. The circulation of his tracts in this country, and by translation abroad, is without parallel. As a preacher, an author, a speaker at Church Congresses and elsewhere, he has stood in the first rank. The impetus given to Church Reform by his letters and pamphlets, though not always acknowledged, has been great.

Concerning the Article by Canon Garbett, in the CHURCHMAN for March, "The Doctrine of the Fathers on the Lord's Supper," the High Church *John Bull* remarks:—

> Mr. Garbett is not a whit too severe on the discreditable article in *The Church Quarterly Review* on the subject of "The Real Presence." That Review is in danger of the fate that overtook the *Oxford Tracts*, and from the same cause—the admission of a Romanizing leaven.

A valuable document on the controversy between the Church Missionary Society and the Bishop of Colombo, signed by the Archbishops and the Bishops of London, Durham, and Winchester, has been published. The Committee gratefully receive the suggestions therein contained, and express their "conviction that they will be able cheerfully to act upon them." In an admirable letter from Prebendary Wright, Hon. Sec. C.M.S., we read that if the Bishop should see his way to act upon the advice given unanimously by the Prelates, a satisfactory solution of difficulties will no doubt be found. Certain facts given in the document speak for themselves. The Prelates, for instance, remark that—

> This Society, which numbers some seventy Bishops of the Church of England amongst its Vice-Presidents, is acknowledged on all hands to be one of the greatest instruments by which our Church spreads the knowledge of Christ among the heathen; in the Island of Ceylon its agents have been at work for sixty years, beginning at a time long anterior to the establishment of a Bishopric of Colombo; it has already spent upon its work in that island no less than 400,000*l.*, and has become possessed of many valuable Mission buildings; about 10,000*l.* is expended annually by the Society for the support of its work in Ceylon among some 7000 native Christians connected with its Missions.

The state of things at St. Petersburgh continues deplorable. The Czar will see, it may be hoped, the unwisdom of a warlike policy, which sorely presses his subjects with taxation and commercial distress. From suspicion of Russia the army of Germany has been increased. In France the new Ministry appear to be firmly seated in power, but Article 7 of M. Jules Ferry's Education Bill was rejected in the Senate by a majority of eighteen. The Jesuits have been warned.