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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

MAY, 1880.

ART. I.—CONVOCATION.

AMID the stir of contested elections and the resounding clamour of party cries, it falls to my lot to write a closing Article on the general subject of Church Councils. With the first assembling of Her Majesty's New Parliament, the Archbishops, in virtue of the Queen's Writ, will summon, for the consideration of important business, the Houses of Convocation. Proctors will have to be duly elected thereto, and already the newspapers contain letters advocating such reforms in Convocation as will on the one hand enlarge the constituency by the admission of stipendiary curates to the privilege of the franchise, and will on the other hand provide for a more adequate representation by a larger election of proctors. That Convocation should thus be assembled concurrently with the House of Commons, and that its members should be elected with the machinery of rival committees and systematic canvass after the fashion of their parliamentary brothers will differently affect diverse minds. Be these things as they may, Convocation is a seasonable subject, and in its consideration shall incidentally be said all that remains to be said by me on the subject of Diocesan Synods.

If Convocation possessed the living voice its friends so ardently claim for it, it might justly be raised to protest that never was there a corporate body whose actions were so mercilessly ridiculed and so persistently misrepresented. Worst of all—whose venerable constitution was so mischievously doctored by injudicious friends. In vain is pleaded the Canon which affirms it to be "The true Church of England by representation." In vain the Prolocutor in the Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation affirms that "as at present constituted it is a good and

sufficient representation of the clergy of the Province," and earnestly "deprecates the use of expressions, come from what quarter they may, which imply that Convocation does not adequately represent the clergy—and does not possess the confidence of the Church."[1] In vain the Bishop of Gloucester declares, though apparently with some misgivings, that by the term "the living voice of the Church" we must agree to understand the formal and authoritative utterances of our Church as formulated and expressed by Convocation.[2] All in vain! Societies have been formed for the purpose of effecting a change in the mode of its existence. Robust clerical reformers irreverently treat its utterances with the respect accorded to the claims of the Tooley Street formula—"We, the people of England,"—or at best as the dull proceedings of an ecclesiastical debating society not read by one man in a thousand. The public prints make merry with its venerable forms as a kind of playing at parliamentary debate which supplies congenial pastime for episcopal and clerical leisure. The *Pall Mall Gazette* compares the Lower House of "that singular body" to the French Chamber of Deputies in its worst fits of excitement. The *Daily News* writes: "This motley assemblage doubtless contains some men of ability, and many men of theological and ecclesiastical learning. But in the affairs of ordinary life, in politics, in morals, in social economy, the most marked characteristic of Convocation is its complete and absolute divergence from the opinions of the average layman. Such persons may well be consulted as experts. If they were permitted to legislate, we should soon be forcibly reminded of Frederick Robertson's saying 'that it is one thing to make rules for a religious clique, it is another to frame laws for a great nation.'" As a popular commentary on the complacency and self-satisfaction with which some clerics regard Convocation as at present constituted, and who would even extend its powers as an instrument of legislation in sublime ignorance that Convocation is the portion of our church system from which an Ecclesiastical Insurance Society would exact the heaviest premiums, these opinions are worthy of attention.

The review of Convocation, nevertheless, would convince any unprejudiced mind that its history and proceedings have been unduly depreciated. The disputes which wasted the time and energies of Convocation in the early part of the eighteenth century, and which led in 1717 to its indefinite prorogation, are

[1] "The Reform of Convocation." By Edward Bickersteth, D.D., Dean of Lichfield, pp. 4, 5.

[2] "The Present Dangers of the Church of England." By Bishop Ellicott, pp. 102-105.

not its only records. The regulating of marriage licenses with a view to the prevention of clandestine marriages—the encouragement of charity schools—rules for the better instruction of youth for confirmation—the settling of qualifications of candidates for holy orders—Christian missions to the heathen and to our own plantations—protests against duelling and the licentiousness of the stage—the provision of a form of consecration of churches, to which attention was drawn by the building and endowment of fifty new churches in London never accomplished had not Convocation stirred in the matter;[1] such were the subjects with which this deliberative body was engaged when the torch of discord kindled a conflagration, whose flames could only be extinguished by scattering the embers and dispersing Convocation itself. Since Convocation has been aroused from its long slumber of 120 years it has too incessantly engaged its energies, it must be confessed, in the rattling of the dry leaves of tradition and ceremony. Remembering the critical times through which we have passed, too often there has been reason to inquire "Is this a time for divines to occupy men's minds with interminable discussions on such unreal subjects as a misplaced comma in the Catechism, the proper colour of a vestment, or an explanatory rubric which means one thing to one man, another to another, and nothing at all to a third?" The remembrance, however, of the New Lectionary, the shortened Form, the Reports on Intemperance, and the forthcoming Revised Version, may remind us that its labours have not in our own day been wholly inoperative and absolutely inglorious.

II. The causes which have combined to discredit Convocation are not far to seek. Having slumbered for 120 years it has upon its awakening donned the antiquated garb of former days. To all intents and purposes its constitution is what it was in the days of the First Edward, whilst its powers have known substantially no change since the Act of Submission of Henry VIII. Convoked only by royal will, discussing only by royal permission, passing resolutions only by royal license, publishing them only by royal consent, and executing them only by royal authority; Convocation as it thus exists can never popularly express the voice and sentiments of the English Church. An entirely inadequate representation of the clergy, it has no place whatever for the expression of the opinions of the lay mind. More than all, however, is its evil reputation as the former scene of obstruction and stormy strife—a reputation which in many minds it shares with all councils wholly clerical. "Synodal elections, synodal debates, synodal decrees, I know not which (said Archdeacon Sinclair) to regard with

[1] See Lathbury's "History of the Convocation."

most apprehension."[1] In the sense of relief with which Queen Anne dismissed the Convocation of 1705, there is much to amuse.

"Seeing the Convocation stands prorogued to the first day of March next, we direct you when that day comes to prorogue it to such further time as shall appear to be convenient, —and so we heartily bid you farewell." This language but civilly anticipates the contemptuous terms in which Hallam sums up the History of Convocation in reference to the Bangorian controversy: "In the ferment of that age (says the historian) it was expedient for the state to scatter a little dust over the angry insects; the Convocation was accordingly prorogued in 1717."[2] However profitable in some respects the proceedings of the revived Convocation may have been, they have not entirely retrieved its character, and some would be ready to find in its discussions proof of Clarendon's dictum that "Clergymen understand the least and take the worst measures of human affairs of all mankind that can write or read."

III. Such as Convocation was—inadequately representative and torn by strife—yet it would not be difficult to prove that its enforced state of inaction was fraught with evil results to the Church of England. To the want of synodal action, more than to any other causes, may be ascribed that episcopal isolation and "dignified prelacy" which was so great a reproach to our Church in the last century. In the absence of sympathetic and conciliar contact with their clergy, the bishops quickly forgot the hole of the pit whence they themselves were digged. They occupied their palaces and exalted positions as peers of the realm, like useless castles on the Rhine cliff, while far below flowed the current of church life. The slightest expression of the bishop's will was law. "*Nil sine episcopo*" was written on every feature. "*Nil sine populo*" was nowhere to be seen. Living in stately seclusion, they only appeared from time to time with circumstances of pomp to impress the beholder. Of Bishop Hurd it is said, that "living at Hartlebury Castle, not a quarter of a mile from Hartlebury Church, he always travelled that quarter of a mile in his episcopal coach, with his servants in full dress liveries."[3] No marvel the Church was assumed to be dying of dignity—to be comatose and incapacitated by spiritual apathy. It was only when somewhat later the bishops were enjoined to set their houses in order, that the lesson seemed to be learned that episcopacy was for the Church, not the Church for episcopacy.

---

[1] "The Charges of Archdeacon Sinclair," p. 205.

[2] Hallam's "History of England," vol. iii., c. 16.

[3] Abbey and Overton, "History of the English Church in the 18th Century," vol. ii. p. 30.

Amid all the pretensions of prelacy, this period was the period of greatest practical weakness. When great movements did arise, the bishops, having no opportunity for common counsel, and living for the most part in ignorance of the great wants and spiritual yearnings of the mass of the people, were unable to deal with them. Most thoroughly do I endorse the statement of the Rev. John Overton, "On that most perplexing question, 'How should the Church deal with the irregular but most valuable efforts of the Wesleys and Whitefield, and their fellow-labourers?" it would have been most desirable for the clergy to have taken counsel together in their own proper assembly. As it was, the bishops had to deal with this new phase of spiritual life entirely on their own responsibility. They had no opportunity of consulting their brethren on the bench, or even with the clergy in their dioceses; for not only was the voice of Convocation hushed, but diocesan synods and ruridecanal chapters had also fallen into abeyance. The want of such consultation is conspicuous in the doubt and perplexity which evidently distracted the minds both of the clergy and many of the bishops, when they had to face the earlier phenomena of the Methodist movement."[1]

IV. The revival of Convocation in its present weak and inadequately representative form has, on the other hand, been equally mischievous during the recent crisis of Church conflict. The bishops as a bench, it cannot be denied, have been in practical harmony with the mass of Churchmen, but no body of men has been better abused. They have lacked the power, perhaps the courage, to repress the evils they have abundantly deplored in their Charges. The Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation, arrogating a position not its own, has professed to give utterance to the living voice of the Church. That voice was far more adequately expressed in the Houses of Parliament during the passing of the Public Worship Bill. Had there been a Convocation adequately representing the clergy, or had there been at that time in operation a complete system of diocesan conferences of clergy and laity, such an expression of opinion would have gone forth as would have supported the bishops in the more vigorous exercise of their functions, and would of itself, without crushing out legitimate individual freedom of thought and action, have swept away the irritating excesses which alienated congregations and rendered the Church powerless for good in many cases by the absorption of all its energies in controversial strife. The necessity of strengthening the moral power of the bishops by concentrating in them the expression of the common sense of the diocese is rendered the more imperative by the final decision in

[1] Abbey and Overton, vol. ii. p. 7.

the Clewer case. Once more the direction in the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer is vitalized which enjoins "the parties that so doubt, or diversly take anything, shall alway resort to the Bishop of the Diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same; so that the same order be not contrary to anything contained in this Book." The exercise of such discretion will entail a heavy sense of responsibility, and there are few bishops who would not rejoice to have some ready means whereby they might feel the pulse of their dioceses and at the same time have the advice of their shrewdest and most worthy councillors. Public opinion will not long endure the scandal that those who in theory exalt the office of a bishop to the highest point should in practice persistently set at naught his authority.

Frequently one has been reminded of Archbishop Whately's remark that "those who profess excessive veneration for bishops and yet disregard all bishops who do not agree with them, are like Addison's Tory freeholder who declared "I am for passive obedience and non-resistance, and I will oppose to the utmost any ministry and any king who will not maintain that doctrine."[1]

V. If the present condition of Convocation be thus unsatisfactory, the question arises, "Is reform possible, and if so in what directions must it be attempted?" Broadly speaking, all the reforms discussed may practically be classed under two heads—1st, those which seek to increase the legislative powers of Convocation; and 2ndly, those which aim at making it more perfect as a consultative assembly. The first I cannot but regard as impracticable, the latter as most possible. Underlying the former is the idea of a spiritual parliament responsible in matters spiritual for the safety of religion as Parliament in matters secular for the safety of the commonwealth. In the pursuance of the analogy, its advocates not only set up Convocation as an assembly collateral to Parliament and in the main independent of it, but maintain the equality in synodical dignity of the Lower House of Convocation with the Upper after the fashion of the House of Commons with the House of Lords. Since May, 1532, when Convocation signed its own death warrant in the act of submission of the clergy, whereby all claim to legislate for the Church even in its more purely spiritual details was surrendered, no such power can be established. The very subsidies which were granted when its members were assembled in Convocation had to be confirmed by an Act of Parliament, the legislature not even acquiescing in the power of Convocation to bind the clergy in a

[1] Quoted in "Bishop Blomfield's Life." Edited by his son, p. 291.

matter of taxation. Since 1664, when by verbal agreement between the Archbishop and the Lord Chancellor it was agreed that the clergy should silently waive the privilege of taxing their own body but should be included in the ordinary money bills prepared by the House of Commons, Convocation has been legislatively but a venerable shadow, unnecessary to the Crown and inconsiderable in itself. The interests of the Church are regarded as being sufficiently secured by the presence of certain bishops in the House of Lords, and by the right which the beneficed clergy possess of voting for the knights of the shire in virtue of their ecclesiastical freeholds. That the country will ever permit Convocation to assume and exercise the legislative functions its ambitious advocates fondly desire, is a matter not worth consideration. On one condition only could this be allowed, viz., that Convocation should represent the Church as a whole, and therefore include lay as well as clerical members.

VI. As this subject—viz. the admission of the laity to Convocation—is being urged by many members of the Evangelical party, I proceed next to consider the insuperable difficulties in the way of such proposed reform. Such a change, if effected, would constitute revolution, not reform. The body now known as Convocation would have ceased to exist, and another assembly would have been created in its stead. It may be a grievance that the Church has not a distinct body fairly representing her lay as well as clerical members. If so, let such a remedy be found. That Convocation has not reformed itself into such a body affords, however, no ground of grievance against that ancient assembly when it is remembered that its very constitution is purely clerical. Its title is "Convocations of the *clergy*;" and the Order of Her Majesty in Council for the assembly of that body just made public, reads thus: "That the Lord High Chancellor do upon notice of this, Her Majesty's Order, forthwith cause writs to be issued in due form of law for electing new Members of the Convocation of the clergy, which writs are to be returnable on Friday, the 30th day of April, 1880." Further, let the theory as well as the title of Convocation be borne in mind. If regarded as summoned by Her Majesty's writ, then most assuredly it is as "the spiritualty," distinct from the temporalty, that its members are called together. If regarded as summoned by the Archbishops as heads of the respective Provinces of Canterbury and York, then it is '*totus clerus*,' 'the whole clergy,' who, in theory are called together. A change which, thus ignoring title and theory, would incorporate the laity with the clergy, must be considered revolutionary. I confess, says one of our bishops:—

I do not see where the Constitutional power exists to change the Convocations of the clergy into bodies partly clerical and partly lay.

The metr politans could not do it; the Crown could not do it, and if Parliamen ary sanction were required, I know not whether Church or State wou d be more alarmed at the project. In fact the scheme appears to m to be absolutely impossible without such a revolution in the Church of England as few of us would like to see.[1]

If, laying aside all ambition to discharge the legislative functions of any estate of the realm, Convocations of the clergy would consent to act as a body purely consultative, they would gain in influence and would complete that system of synodical councils which the thoughtful laity would cease to regard with jealousy, when it was frankly avowed that no binding decrees were contemplated, but simply that common counsel which is denied to men of no profession who have at heart the promotion of the best interests of the community in which they dwell. Such a system, if perfected symmetrically in all its ecclesiastical degrees, would recognize the ruri-decanal synod or chapter, the archidiaconal synod, the diocesan synod, the provincial synod or Convocation, and the national synod, or, as it has been called, the Pan-Anglican Conference—all bodies purely clerical, simply deliberative and in no sense legislative. The practical value of the ruri-decanal gathering is now generally admitted. The diocesan has been discredited, unfortunately, by the sacerdotal party, for it cannot be forgotten that the first diocesan synod in our own days was that of Exeter in 1851, occasioned by the attempt of Bishop Phillpott "to safeguard the faith endangered by the Gorham case." In the early history of the Church two purposes seem to have been answered by such diocesan gatherings. In them the bishops promulgated the decrees of provincial synods and met their own co-presbyters for consultation. In days when dioceses were territorially small and the clergy numerically few, such gatherings would be practicable.[2] The mutual right of the bishop and clergy for common counsel, rendered impossible in consequence of numbers, can now only be met by representation. The privilege of the dean and chapter to fulfil this function, as '*senatus episcopi*,' cannot be conceded. (3) They have their place in this respect, but, elected by the Crown or by the bishop, they can, in no sense, adequately represent the parochial clergy.

---

[1] The Bishop of Carlisle's Pastoral Letter, p. 13.

[2] Our own *Reformatio Legum* directs that Diocesan Synods should be held once a year.

[3] "There is not in any single answer from all the deans and chapters of England, in 1854, any indication that they regarded themselves as in origin, foundation, design, attributes, rights or powers having even a theoretical connection with episcopal government or ecclesiastical counsel." *Vide* questions put, in 1854, to all English Chapters: "What are the relations between the Bishop and the Chapter?" Bishop Benson's Essay in "Essays on Cathedrals," p. 275.

They form no portion of the constitution of the Early Church, and, though "a valuable institution, are but a modern invention." The idea of the bishop having counsel from his clergy through the rural deans would be fully and fairly met if only, as the late Archdeacon Sinclair argued, the rural deans were not appointed by the bishop, but elected in chapter by the clergy themselves. The suggestion of Bishop Wordsworth that from the rural deans the bishop might elect the canons and prebends of his cathedral is one which seems well worthy of consideration, as, in some little degree, giving the body of the clergy an indirect connection and power of co-option into the dignities of the Mother Church. The culminating form of gatherings is represented by the Conference of Bishops recently assembled at Lambeth, which presents to the faithful the results of serious deliberation on questions affecting the condition of the Church in divers parts of the world, but does nothing more than "commend the conclusions" therein adopted. The Report on the Best Mode of Maintaining Union among the various Churches of the Anglican Communion recognises the Conference of Bishops meeting under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury as "offering at least the hope that the problem hitherto unsolved of combining together, for consultation, representatives of Churches so differently situated and administered, may find, in the Providential course of events, its own solution." The letter issued by the Conference speaks, in its closing paragraph, thus :—

> We do not claim to be lords over God's heritage, but we commend the results of this our Conference to the reason and conscience of our brethren as enlightened by the Holy Spirit of God, praying that all, throughout the world, who call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ may be of one mind, may be united in one fellowship, may hold fast the faith once delivered to the saints, and worship their one Lord in the spirit of purity and love.

In the system of purely clerical gathering the Provincial Convocations hold thus an intermediate place between the ascending series of diocesan and national, and any reform contemplating the admission of laymen as an integral part of Convocation, ignoring as it does, the past history and present constitution of Convocation, seems wholly impracticable.

A plausible plan has recently been suggested of forming a consultative body of laymen outside Convocation with whom Convocation shall co-operate and take counsel.

In reference to this suggestion, discussed with more or less approval in the Lichfield and Carlisle Diocesan Conferences, it will be sufficient to observe that the appointment of such Provincial Houses of Laymen in addition to the two Houses of Can-

terbury and two of York Convocation, making six distinct bodies whose consent before Parliament was approached in reference to ecclesiastical matters would be necessary—would present the most cumbrous machinery that could be devised, and would continually afford an illustration of how a thing could not be done. The relations of the Houses, lay and clerical, would be of the most delicate nature. The consent of Parliament would be required for such a co-ordinate authority. If Joseph Hume, in his day, voted for the restoration of Convocation on the ground that Disestablishment would be hastened, the formation of such lay Houses in combination with the Provincial Houses of Convocation would only result in collision with Parliament, and end in dislocating the relation between Church and State, and speedily bringing about the Disestablishment of the Church.[1]

VII. Another reform frequently advocated must be regarded as impracticable, if the provincial and synodical character of the Convocations of the clergy be sustained, viz., the suggestion that the Convocations of Canterbury and York should be fused into one body. Some advantages, without doubt, would arise from such an action, but they would be more than balanced by the security now given against crude and hasty legislation, and by the distinct representation of the two distinct phases of character which, as the Bishop of Carlisle truly points out, still distinguish the populations of the North and South. Such a union, moreover, could not be effected without the loss of the rights and privileges of one of our Archbishops to summon his own suffragan bishops and provincial clergy. The attempts to carry less important questions than this, in which matters of privilege have been involved, have often rent Churches in twain.

In the past history of Convocation, as the Prolocutor of Canterbury has reminded us,[2] the difficulty of joint consultation and co-operation has not been insuperable, and if so in the past why in the present? The Preamble to the Thirty-Nine Articles states that they were agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops of

[1] The Lower House of the Canterbury Convocation, in 1877, passed two resolutions, with this object in view:—"1st. That it is more desirable that this Convocation, without any disturbance of its ancient constitution, should provide for consultation with some recognised representative body of the laity. 2nd. That, in the opinion of this House, it would be for the advantage of the Church that a Provincial House of Laymen should be formed, to be convened from time to time by the Archbishop, and to be in close communication with the Synod, who shall always be consulted before application is made to the Crown or to Parliament, to give legal effect to any Act of the Synod. The laymen to be elected by the lay members of each diocese in Diocesan Conference, and the House of Laymen to bring before the Provincial Synod any matters ecclesiastical in their judgment requiring consideration, by means of petition to his Grace the President."

[2] "The Reform of Convocation," pp. 15, 16.

both Provinces and the whole Clergy in the Convocation holden at London in the year 1562. It is known that the York Convocation was represented by the Archbishop of York and the Bishops of Durham and Chester only, who subscribed them. This arrangement was simply for convenience, and in no way indicated a superiority in the Province of Canterbury over that of York. When, again, on December 20th, 1661, the Book of Common Prayer was ratified in London, duly authorised proxies were sent up to represent the Lower House of Convocation of York. In this way, and by the operations of joint committees, inconveniences may be removed, and the object attained without the risk of a constitutional deadlock.

VIII. Lest, however, the reader should suppose that, in the writer's opinion, all reforms are impossible, I hasten to enumerate such reforms as, without in any degree committing THE CHURCHMAN, it seems to myself are desirable and feasible.

(1). First and foremost of all—in order that Convocations might have free and full exercise of deliberation, they should be summoned by the archbishops, as their own provincial synods, and the Crown-writ mode of assembling should be allowed to fall into abeyance. The principles which should regulate the inter-action of Parliament and Convocation in matters affecting the ritual or discipline of the National Church and the adjustment of the technical rights of the clergy, as represented in Convocation, and the laity as represented in Parliament, would be, as Bishop Ellicott states, matters of supreme difficulty. It is suggested, however, that the Convocations should possess the right of veto, and that nothing, in reference to the discipline of the Church, should receive the Royal assent which had passed the Houses of Parliament which did not also receive the formally expressed consent of both Convocations. When once made adequately representative, such Convocations would, by the methodical consideration of questions through committees of experts, gain a moral weight and influence in the country which Convocation, as at present, cannot be said to possess.

(2). Secondly—let there be one chamber only in the Convocation of Canterbury, as in that of York. The anomalous powers of the Lower House, and their frequent conflicts with the Upper, would never have arisen had not the Convocations been summoned by the Crown-writ, and the members led, involuntarily, to regard their position, as bishops and clergy in Convocation, as analogous to those of Lords and Commons in Parliament. The present constitution of our Convocation, Jeremy Taylor[1] maintained, was a departure from primitive tradition, and in no Catholic institution do the presbyters form a separate

[1] Quoted "Church Quarterly Review," Oct. 1879, p. 180.

house, and possess a power of veto on the propositions of the bishops.

(3). Thirdly—let there be adequate representation. On the unsatisfactory character of Convocation, in this respect, there is all but unanimity of opinion. The Dean of Lichfield, although strongly convinced that the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury is a good and sufficient representation, nevertheless gives his full approval to some moderate increase of the elected proctors. Reports of Committees of Convocation in 1871, 1875, fully concur in the unsatisfactory nature of the present representation. Containing, as the Southern Province does, 23 dioceses, it will be found that the proctors number 154; but of this number 108 are ex-officio members, and 46, therefore, of the whole number, represent, and are elected by, 11,000 clergy! In the Northern Province it is well known matters are not so patently unfair. In that Province each archdeaconry sends two proctors, Archbishop Longley, in 1861, having extended to all the archdeaconries, except that of Man, the rule which previously existed only in the archdeaconries of York and Durham of electing each two proctors. By this exercise of his prerogative he increased the whole number of proctors from 17 to 29. It is not easy to understand what valid reasons forbid the Archbishop of Canterbury to do in his Province that which his brother archbishop has done in York. At present, instead of each archdeaconry, each diocese only has two proctors to represent it. If Convocation were gathered wholly and solely by his own summons, such an increased representation would be essential. Summoned by the Queen's writ, the words name "the whole clergy," and therefore, in principle, cover the widest and fullest representation. That the old custom of sending two proctors for each archdeaconry prevailed in the Southern as well as in the Northern Convocation seems manifest from the fact that in the diocese of Lichfield the three archdeaconries still elect respectively two proctors, the six thus elected then selecting from among their own number two to represent the whole diocese.[1]

The subject of giving votes to licensed curates in full orders is one which has enlisted much support, but it is not easy to understand with what consistency it can be argued if Convocation be a consultative assembly of those upon whom rests the burden of responsibility. It is only those bishops and deans who have dioceses and cathedrals who are now in Convocation, and no un-beneficed clergy, therefore, by parity of custom, can claim a place.

It may be permitted to indulge the hope that, in God's good providence, the efforts of our reformers will issue in making

[1] "Reform of Convocation." By Dean Bickersteth, p. 10.

the Convocations of the clergy provincial consultative gatherings of the clergy, possessing the full confidence of the clergy, and entitled, by their deliberative wisdom, to the respectful regard of the nation. Then, and only then, it may further be permitted to hope that from the various diocesan conferences, when fully established, there will arise one Central representative Conference of such a character in some respects as shadowed forth by the second resolution of Convocation already quoted, a body authorized to deal with all legislative questions, and whose recommendations, as being the matured wisdom of all Churchmen, lay and cleric, and being safeguarded by the veto of Convocation, would commend themselves to the Legislature of the country. The elements of this solution of our difficulties are now gathered together, and the process of crystallization is already in operation. The work will be one of years, but it is to this work, and not to the undue exaltation of Convocation by increasing its legislative powers as a clerical body, or of practical destruction of our ancient provincial synods by the infusion of the lay element, that the Evangelical section of our Church should heartily devote itself, whilst, at the same time, arousing itself to secure that which, through its own apathy, it does not possess, viz., a fair share of representation in that body which claims to be "the true Church of England by representation."

JOHN W. BARDSLEY.

ART. II.—HOSPITALS.

PART II.

WHETHER the out-patients should pay is a much disputed point. It is said that the giving of advice and medicine gratis has a pauperizing effect, and that a charge of from *4d.* to *6d.* a visit would be easily forthcoming, while the expenses of the department would be reduced. It is an almost unanswerable argument that our hospitals are, as a rule, poor, with a few notable exceptions, and that those who are benefited should provide a small sum towards its funds is but just. At the same time, it must be acknowledged that the objections to this alteration are grave, and that our great hospitals are right in proceeding very slowly along a course which has so many disadvantages as well as advantages to be considered. For, in the first place, it is an undoubted fact that our hospitals were firmly established on the foundation of being charities, and the requiring of payment from the recipients of the bounty involves to some extent an overthrow of that foundation; and a still

stronger point is, that a payment being required from out-patients, a competition would by that means arise between each hospital and the general practitioners in its neighbourhood, the unwelcome and very evil result being that the local doctors would be no longer on friendly terms with the hospital. I think it is very possible that the adoption of payment in this department would, in many cases, increase the numbers attending. There is a class just above the working class who have pride enough to prevent their accepting charity, but who would feel, when once they may tender a payment, that they have a right to come and to receive the advice of the consulting physician or surgeon instead of their own local doctor. A check would still be placed upon this, in those cases where admission is by governors' letters, which are usually given carefully, and to persons who are sociably suitable. A plan is in force at some country hospitals, by which the patient receives his treatment gratis, but has to pay for the medicine. This is so likely to end in the medicine being procured at inferior drug shops, or perhaps not being procured at all, in order to save a few pence, that its success would be very doubtful. The department is as important as ever, but not so indispensable as it was formerly, because legislation has affected it. For the dispensaries under the Poor Law are now located all over London, at which both advice and drugs may be had, and the use of which is unconnected with the stigma of pauperism.

It is just now the fashion to sing the praises of provident dispensaries, as though their universal adoption would be the commencement of every conceivable good reform and the destruction of all that is wrong in hospital management. No one can doubt but that the essence of the plan is good. It must be right that men should subscribe monthly to a provident dispensary, and in return have a right to the physician's services at the dispensary, or, if need be, at their own homes. Any plan which helps to promote provident habits and independence in the labouring classes is of course good, and worthy of encouragement. But will it prove the universal heal-all which its advocates claim for it? The report drawn up by the representatives of the principal Hospitals of London—to which I alluded in the last number—refers to the fact that there are many who are wholly unable to pay the fee of a consultant whose advice they obtain at a hospital, although they could afford to pay 1*s.* or 2*s.* 6*d.* for a visit from their local practitioner, or to obtain his services by subscribing to a provident dispensary. And it must be remembered that the moving habits of the population of some districts would be a bar to out-patient departments being turned into provident dispensaries, a step which many would like to see accomplished. It would

certainly bring great hardship upon a very large number who are now greatly benefited, and would involve the hospitals in a great deal of office work. I think, however, that great good would be done by making the provident dispensaries in the neighbourhood of a general hospital subordinate to it, although this will not be possible until a central control is placed over all medical charities in London and in each town. This would give the dispensaries a means of sending those patients who should be warded, into the hospital, and might perhaps be used by the school of the hospital for their advanced students to commence practice. But there are provident dispensaries and provident dispensaries: many are genuine and good, but many are in reality merely chemists' shops, where advice and medicine may be had for a trivial sum, and which find it pay to be known under the title, owing to the present popular feeling in their favour.

But although I wish to see our hospitals charging a small fee to the out-patients, I am convinced that the change must begin with that department only. The case is wholly different as regards the in-patient department; this must be dealt with in another manner. I believe that the ground upon which we must work must be that of making out-patients pay something (save in exceptional cases), and, if the in-patients are no longer to be admitted gratis, confining the use of the wards (except those reserved for accidents) to those who are members of provident dispensaries in relationship to the hospital. For out-patients are usually earning their living and can spare their sixpence, but in-patients, in multitudes of cases, do not come into hospital until all their savings have been spent on the heavy costs of illness, and have left their wives and children unprovided for. If, therefore, their money is to be taken it must be by some system of insurance, paid regularly to what might be called the provident fund of the hospital, or to one of the provident dispensaries in alliance with it. For if the hospitals are to require payment for each case, a different class will fill the wards. We shall find the labouring people to whom we now do such great charity elbowed out by people rather superior in the social scale. Here will be a calamity for the poor, and an almost equally important consequence will be, that as the poor patients are reduced, so the prosperity of the school will diminish, for it is very doubtful whether those who claim medical treatment as a right will consent to a group of students being instructed by an elaborate discourse on the obstinate sluggishness of one's liver, or the increasing danger from a cancer. It may, indeed, be counted as a part payment which is now made by in-patients that they allow themselves to be used as vehicles of instruction. Still, they do actually provide,

I believe, in most hospitals, an expensive part of their diet; tea, sugar and butter, are usually required to be brought in by friends on visiting days, and the hospital is thus saved this cost. Yet it is often found that they cannot pay even this expense, and the other patients in the ward (or sometimes outside generosity) have to make up the deficiency. The difficulty of providing payment is shown by the fact of funds being raised to support patients' relatives, who are suffering from the absence of the bread-winner, whose wages are too often stopped while unable to work.

The scheme of admitting paying patients was determined upon by the committee of St. Thomas's Hospital in the autumn of 1878, but upon the "respectful but decided protest" of the staff was annulled. In their letter of protest against its being carried out without previous conference between the governors and themselves, they state certain reasons against the plan. They maintain that in a hospital for the reception of paying patients, the medical attendants ought to be paid, and paid adequately, but that the objections to the medical staff receiving payment are insuperable, for if they took 2*s.* 6*d.* or 5*s.* per visit they would be unfairly competing with the general practitioners, and if they claimed consulting fees, it would appear, and with good reason, that the department was established for their special benefit. Amongst other reasons they also state their conviction that the patients would be very unsuitable for hospital treatment, for, instead of being acutely ill, "they will certainly comprise an excessive number of old cases of dyspepsia, and other chronic or incurable cases, and if the physicians or surgeons have much to do with their selection, the department may be worked more or less in connection with their private practice."

Another scheme was only three months ago submitted by the same hospital for the approval of the Charity Commissioners. The first part of this scheme included the establishment of paying wards set aside for the purpose, having a medical officer in charge, with a salary out of the patients' payments. The second part contemplates admission at lower rates to the ordinary wards, on a scale calculated to pay only the cost of maintenance.

A very valuable report was lately drawn up of the social condition, and ability to pay, of all the patients who entered the London Hospital for a selected twenty-four days last summer. It was done by an unbiassed officer and with extreme care. During this period 402 patients were taken in, and the general result of the inquiry was in his opinion that of that number ten ought to make donations in return for their maintenance, and that only four were in his opinion able to pay, and that of these,

two were accidents, and were therefore brought in, whatever their social status might be. He ascribes the inability of very many patients to pay to such causes as "that the greater proportion of the patients are males who are the only support of their families," and "that before seeking the aid of the hospital, patients have tried (in spite of their disease) to support their families, whilst only working at a great disadvantage, and impoverishing themselves by pawning clothes and selling furniture;" and he adds that "in cases where savings had been laid by, they had been expended on doctors and nursing at home," and "in very many cases patients and their relations found it a very heavy tax to provide the tea, sugar and butter." But he adds that "a general sentiment of gratitude was expressed for the benefits derived, and the kindness experienced by the patients during their residence." The fact is that the subject is enveloped in difficulties. If those of our patients who can afford it are to pay, how are we to decide which they should be? If, when we discharge a patient, he cannot pay all his debt, are we to complete his cure by putting him in the County Court? At some hospitals a third of the beds are occupied by accident cases: can we, when a man is brought severely injured to the gate, wait to inquire whether he consents to pay a certain sum per week? And are we to refuse a man who brings his wife as a last alternative to our wards, because he has spent all his savings on a local practitioner? Probably if an alteration in the system is to be made, it must be by a system of voluntary selection. There will have to be two sets of hospitals—the one requiring payment, and affording superior advantages, and the other free as now. The movement in favour of home hospitals will probably help in this direction. It is better to establish pay hospitals than to change, and so probably spoil, the old ones. The idea of the supporters of the home hospitals movement is to raise sufficient money to start the homes, with the expectation of their being afterwards self-supporting. Having many strong supporters, it will probably meet with the success it deserves.

Many who are ignorant of the subject blame hospital managers for not charging the patients a small sum. They hardly know whether it is in-patients or out-patients whose money they want, or any of the *pros* and *cons* in each case. I have endeavoured to point out a few of the difficulties in the way of making our wards into pay wards, and to show also that there are not the same arguments against requiring a few pence for each out-patient's visit, but I feel sure that of all our many charities none are less liable to abuse than those which afford treatment during sickness.

The financial condition of hospitals is one of the points

requiring most vigilance on the part of managers. Two of the London hospitals are in the happy position of having such large endowments that they never ask for aid from the public, while St. Thomas's, which used to be in fully the same position, has spent its money so freely that it is unable to use several of its wards. But most hospitals are poor—some very poor. It is curious to notice how they have a tendency to establish themselves in rich, as opposed to working neighbourhoods, so that those which have most real need of funds from being amongst the labouring classes, are often least helped by the wealthy, owing to their being out of their sight, and consequently, to a great extent, out of mind. There are sixty-six hospitals in London, and if a line be drawn north and south through Blackfriars Bridge, fifteen will be found to the east of it, and fifty-one to the west. The rich traders and merchants used to live in great numbers within reach of the hospitals of East London, but now that they live either in the country or in the West-end, these hospitals suffer severely. Thus difficulties in the way of collecting money are constantly increasing, and all the more that it is found so easy for little special hospitals, which I have already described, to draw the money of the charitable to the detriment of the more valuable ones. Those who give too often know nothing of the merits of the various charities, and will often refuse a donation on account of no charge being required of patients, when the difficulties in the way of the adoption of payment are almost insuperable, or perhaps on account of the death-rate being high, whereas this may in reality show the usefulness of that hospital where it exists. For if the pressure on its space be heavy, and the managers use it with an honest view of being as useful as possible, it follows that the beds are reserved for only the "very urgent" cases, and upon these there necessarily follows a high death-rate. If a central authority existed, it would stop all such attempts to look well at the expense of straightforward usefulness.

The Hospital Sunday Funds, first established in some provincial towns, and afterwards in London, are an admirable institution. The whole of wealthy London subscribes only £25,000 a year towards this fund, but it is to be hoped that it will largely increase. The Hospital Saturday Fund is to collect the subcriptions of working men, and to divide them in a similar manner. Our labouring classes are generally very ready to give their sixpences and shillings to hospitals. No less a sum than £1,908 was subscribed last year (1879) to the London Hospital in Whitechapel, by working men, it being paid to the fund called the People's Subscription Fund, some of which consisted of collections of even £30 or £40 (sent annually) by the workmen of certain East-end firms. But the difficulty of raising the

funds necessary for carrying on the hospitals is becoming very serious. Some have been obliged to part with a portion of their investments, but an end must sooner or later come to this method of keeping their heads above water. It is to be hoped that the subject of hospital finance will be thoroughly organized on a good, well planned scheme, before the collapse of one important institution brings it, when perhaps too late, prominently before the public. It is true that recent legislation has put more of the cost of treatment of the sick poor on to the rates. There are now Poor Law dispensaries distributed about each district of London. And there are the enormous sick asylums. These are an outcome of the workhouse infirmaries, but take the sick poor from more than one union. Those which have been already built are cleverly contrived, and admirably suited to the needs of a hospital. One was opened at Holloway last July, which was built at a cost of £80,000 for 620 patients. One at Bromley was erected a few years ago for £100 a bed, while a large hospital built at about the same time cost ten times as much. The sick asylums are, of course, for a class different from that taken in by the hospitals. They only take persons sent by the relieving officer, and the patients rarely suffer from acute diseases like those in a hospital, and therefore need but little medical or surgical treatment. In the wards will be found numbers of cases of such disease as rheumatism and bronchitis, and the sad spectacle of whole wards full of young men suffering from consumption. Under the head of disease, senectus is often put down as that from which many are suffering. The general organization in these pauper hospitals is very perfect, and only properly trained nurses are found in the wards. The one improvement which seems needed is that these hospitals should undertake the treatment of accidents and of casualties, by which I mean those minor accidents which are treated by the surgeon and dismissed. Everything that may be needed, including the services of a resident surgeon, are ready, and when it is remembered how important to the saving of life it is to have the hospital within reach, it seems not unreasonable to have this small additional cost put on to the rates, in order to effect such great charity. The Metropolitan Asylums Board now undertake at the cost of the ratepayers those of the very poor who are suffering from small-pox or scarlet fever, and have erected hospitals in the suburbs of London for these cases. They also undertake the charge of imbeciles, and the great care and kindness with which they are treated is well known.

Thus local taxation provides much of the cost of the medical treatment of the very poor, though not of the class treated by the hospitals. How are our hospitals to be kept up in future is a most difficult question, but the answer to it may possibly be

that by a great expansion of the sick asylum system, we shall give our poor the chance of going to them, with no alternative but that of attending a hospital where payment is required. A change such as this would involve great questions, such as the result to the medical schools, &c.

But I cannot leave the subject of finance without stating how great a loss to the hospitals is their lack of co-operation. It is impossible to estimate the harm as well as the waste which is brought about by the lack of any unity among them. Instead of a common interest in the work of treating the sick poor, each of our 66 hospitals in London thinks only for itself, and does its work in the way which is right in its own eyes. The many expensive advertisements of hospitals which appear daily in the *Times* show how each one thinks, or pretends to think, itself the only one really deserving of support. Each one looks upon the others as rivals. And besides the unity of action which a central control would bring about, the saving of expense would, I am convinced, be enormous.

Last year an influential committee was formed of the treasurers and chairmen of the various London hospitals, together with some members of Parliament and others, the Right Hon. J. Stansfeld, M.P., being the chairman. After many meetings and much discussion, the following conclusions were arrived at :—

1. That the hospital accommodation of London is imperfectly distributed, and, in many districts, altogether inadequate.

2. That the want of organisation and co-operation among the medical institutions of the metropolis materially lessens their usefulness.

3. That the present system of indiscriminate relief injuriously affects the independence and self-reliance of those who are able to meet, in some degree at least, the cost of medical and surgical treatment.

4. That the funds at present available, either for proper maintenance of nearly all the existing institutions, or for the extension of relief to districts hitherto unprovided for, are very insufficient.

With these four resolutions, and a Paper clearly explaining each one of them, a deputation, headed by the Right Hon. W. E. Forster, M.P., had an interview with the Home Secretary, on June 20th, 1879. With regard to the first, it was found that of the 15 general hospitals, 10 are within a radius of a mile and a half from Charing Cross, and contain no less than 3,486 beds out of a total of 4,579 for the whole metropolis. Of the other five, the Great Northern Hospital, with only 33 beds, has to meet the requirements of a population estimated at 908,000; two, the London, with 790 beds, and the Metropolitan Free, with 20 beds, are alone available for the riverside

and manufacturing population of the East-end, numbering about 1,041,000, while the extreme west and south are scarcely better supplied. There is also no machinery for meeting the requirements caused by the annual growth of London.

The second resolution may be easily shown. We hospital managers need controlling. Under present arrangements, our hospitals are under the charge of irresponsible committees, from whose action there is no appeal. If they choose to be extravagant, there is no inspection which they have to fear. If they build, a site may be bought not so much with a view to the wants of the poor, as to its being not out of sight of the wealthy, or at a spot chosen to suit the special views or the convenience of the founders. On St. Thomas's being moved to the West-end, and a large sum of money spent on its site, and on the building, the *British Medical Journal* said:—

> When we consider these contrasts and all they imply (the lack of hospitals in the poor parts of London, and their abundance in richer neighbourhoods), have we no right to complain of the emigration of one of the oldest and richest of our endowed hospitals to an ostentatious and costly site on the Albert Embankment? When we find that, of the medical charities congregated in the over-supplied districts we have named, so large a proportion have sprung up within the last twenty years, can we be expected to do honour to the discrimination which has been employed in the selection of their sites?

The advantages of central control, and therefore unity of action, are so obvious, that it is not worth while pursuing the subject, it being noted also that by this means the right system would be brought about of each large general hospital having its satellites of fever hospitals, special hospitals, convalescent homes, and dispensaries.

The third and fourth heads have already been discussed. If the present indiscriminate relief is to be altered for the better, an authority compelling all hospitals to act in concert would be indispensable to a successful result.

The establishment of any central controlling body or board would probably be followed by systematic Government inspection. Except the dislike which Englishmen seem to have of interference, there is no valid reason against the same kind of inspection as is carried out in our schools. Hospitals are, as public institutions, equally essential with schools. With hospitals it should be as with schools, that a Government grant should be made according to efficiency and economy as an addition to its usual means of support. It is to be hoped that this aid will be offered while they are possessed of more capital than they will be a few years hence. Government has already dealt with the question of medical relief, both in the establishment of the sick asylums and the Poor Law dispensaries, and

also in the Poor Law Act of 1879, by which guardians are authorized to subscribe to hospitals, or institutions for blind, for deaf and dumb, and for providing nurses for the benefit of those who need the treatment to be had at these hospitals or institutions.

No field for religious work is so favourable to ministers as that in hospital wards. They find there people in that state of ill-health, or with the prospect of approaching death, which makes them glad to receive advice and consolation, while the quiet which reigns in the wards, and the absence of occupation, all conduce to a readiness to give attention, and a thankfulness for the kindness shown. Committees almost always supply funds necessary for the maintenance of a chaplain, or a scripture-reader, or both, while the Roman Catholics and Jews are cared for by priests of their own faith. Christianity is sympathy in its highest development, and sympathy is the *raison d'être* of such magnificent charities as our hospitals are, while their supporters and managers believe it to be a work which "is twice blest. It blesseth him that gives, and him that takes."

J. H. BUXTON.

ART. III.—BURTON'S REIGN OF QUEEN ANNE.

The Reign of Queen Anne. By JOHN HILL BURTON, D.C.L. 3 vols. Wm. Blackwood and Sons.

SLOWLY but gradually the history of our country is being rewritten. The labours of the historian are no longer limited to a reference of second-hand authorities or to a bird's-eye view of an extensive period. With the throwing open to the public of the State papers of the country, and the disclosures made by the Historical Manuscripts Commission, a curiosity has been excited to trace the stream of history to its fountain-head. And since it was impossible for men, busy amid ancient documents and volumes of important MSS., to take a wide survey of the past, each writer began to occupy himself with a special period and to deal with it in a thorough and exhaustive fashion. Before the distinctive labours of these modern historians, the works of the old-fashioned school—the school of Kemble, Rapin, Hume, and of our old friend Mrs. Markham—were found to be grossly inaccurate and compiled from sources not to be relied upon. Gradually books which had been recognised as authorities in the days of our youth became thrown aside as feeble and unsound, and their places

occupied by new studies by new men. Between English history in its present garb and English history as it appeared to the past generation there is all the difference between a picture which is to be looked upon at a distance and a picture which will bear the closest and most minute examination. The old school of historical artists crowded their canvas with scenes and characters, and were content if the general effect was satisfactory; the modern school limit their efforts, but aim at the most exquisite completeness as to harmony and detail as they lay on their colours. The one is the work of a scene painter, the other of a Meissonier. Century after century of the history of England has now been depicted according to this new standard of criticism, until little more remains to be filled in. Mr. Freeman, raking amid chronicles and charters, has given us the period preceding Domesday. Professor Stubbs has shed a new light by aid of the public records upon our earlier constitutional history. Mr. Longman has retold the life of our third Edward. Mr. Gairdner, from his familiarity with ancient documents, has written the reign of Richard the Third and the imposture of Perkin Warbeck. With the history of the Reformation and the glories of Elizabeth as narrated by Mr. Froude we are all acquainted. Mr. Rawson Gardiner takes up the cue and gives us the latest State Paper interpretation of the reign of James the First and of personal government under his son Charles. The brilliant pages of Macaulay bring our history down to the death of William the Deliverer. Earl Stanhope, from his own family memorials, is the historian of the House of Hanover, whilst Mr. Justin McCarthy is busy occupying himself with recording the events of the present reign.

One important period has too long been allowed to remain inadequately treated. The reign of Queen Anne has hitherto been a stumbling-block in the path of the historical writer. Lord Stanhope has tried his hand at it; Mr. Wyon has made it a special study; and now Dr. Burton, the sober historian of Scotland, has published three volumes on the subject. Yet, if the truth be told, they all have to a certain extent failed. Dr. Burton is undoubtedly the best of the three; he has carefully studied original authorities; he has kept his mind free from party prejudices; he knows how to weigh evidence; he is familiar with the foreign and domestic policy of the period he describes. But he has failed to imbue himself with the spirit of the age of which he writes; he lacks humour and sympathy; he is too much the mere historian of deeds and events as interpreted by the senator and the soldier; and thus he does not reveal to us the reign of Queen Anne as it really existed—the Anne of Pope and Addison, Swift and Steele, the Anne of political feuds and political

pamphlets, the Anne of the chocolate houses, of Wills's, Jonathan's, and Garraway's, the Anne of the October Club and the Kit-Kat Club, the Anne of the High Churchman who believed in the divine right of kings, of the non-juror who looked to Versailles and Marli for inspiration, and of the Dissenter who moaned the loss of his friend the Dutchman—in short, the Anne of the *Spectator*, of Daniel Defoe, of Ned Ward and Tom Brown.

And yet it would seem as if the history of the reign of Queen Anne were one of the easiest to write. Few periods are richer in material to work upon. Essays, diaries, tracts, a vast mass of manuscripts, innumerable pamphlets and the like, present us with a picture of the manners and customs of the day which ought to render life in the time of Anne as clear and familiar to us as life in the time of Victoria. In the rooms of St. James' and the galleries of Windsor we see Mrs. Morley, alias the Queen, writing to her "dear friend," Mrs. Freeman, alias Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough, asking her for advice, mourning over the hours of separation, vowing that she is ready to die for her, and then, woman-like, getting tired of the intimacy, squabbling with "her dear friend," and at last throwing her over for one who was not fit to sew the rosettes upon the high-heeled shoes of the great Sarah. In the House of Commons, we see Bolingbroke rising rapidly to office, whilst Walpole at first miserably breaks down in his maiden speech, and then becomes so great a power that the Tories conspire to imprison him in the Tower. Swaggering down St. James' Street is the dandy of the period, powdered, patched, and periwigged, clad in velvet and ruffles, and a perfect master "in the nice conduct of a clouded cane," which he does not scruple to lay across any vulgar person who comes between the wind and his nobility. Shy, retiring, but ever studying human nature, we see Addison, taking his daily walks abroad. "There is no place," writes the genial satirist, "of general resort wherein I do not often make my appearance; sometimes I am seen thrusting my head into a round of politicians at Wills's, and listening with great attention to the narratives that are made in the little circular audiences. Sometimes I smoke a pipe at Child's, and whilst I seem attentive to nothing but the *Postman*, overhear the conversation of every table in the room. I appear on Tuesday night at St. James' coffee-house, and sometimes face the little committee of politicians in the inner room, as one who comes to hear and improve. My face is likewise very well known at the 'Grecian,' the 'Cocoa Tree,' and in the theatres both of Drury Lane and the Haymarket. I have been taken for a merchant upon the Exchange for above these two years; and sometimes pass for a Jew in the assembly of stockjobbers at Jonathan's. In short, wherever I

see a cluster of people I mix with them, though I never open my lips but in my own club." He had, however, opened his lips to some advantage a little before this. The battle of Blenheim had been fought and the Government were anxious for the victory to be commemorated in immortal verse. Poetasters and the scribblers of Grub Street had been busy invoking the Muses, but Halifax and Godolphin declined to notice their efforts, and were rude enough to consider that no poem had as yet appeared to do honour to Marlborough's triumph. Addison, who was then living in an attic in the Haymarket, was asked to undertake the task. He gladly consented. Who does not know his famous lines in the "Campaign"?—

> 'Twas then that great Marlborough's mighty soul was proved,
> That in the shock of charging hosts unmoved,
> Amidst confusion, horror and despair
> Examined all the dreadful scenes of war;
> In peaceful thought the field of death surveyed,
> To fainting squadrons sent the timely aid,
> Inspired repulsed battalions to engage,
> And taught the doubtful battle where to rage.
> So when an angel, by divine command,
> With rising tempests shakes a guilty land
> (Such as of late o'er pale Britannia passed),
> Calm and serene he drives the furious blast;
> And pleased the Almighty's orders to perform
> Rides in the whirlwind and directs the storm.

From Addison to Swift is in the natural order of things. There, courted at levées and *fêted* at dinners, we see the savage dark-visaged Dean of St. Patrick's, bitter and cynical since the publication of that terrible "Tale of a Tub" has debarred him from a bishopric, whilst feebler men have been rewarded with the mitre. All acknowledge his genius, and bow down before him. With what a mixture of intense vanity and assumed contempt he receives the homage of the great! Read a few of the entries in his "Journal to Stella":—

"I was at Court and church to-day. I generally am acquainted with about thirty in the drawing-room, and am so proud I make all the lords come up to me. One passes half an hour pleasant enough. We had a dunce to preach before the Queen to-day."

"I dined with the Secretary; we were a dozen in all; three Scotch lords and Lord Peterborough. Duke Hamilton must needs be witty, and held up my train as I walked upstairs. The Secretary showed me his bill of fare to encourage me to dine with him. 'Pooh,' said I, 'show me a bill of company, for I value not your dinner!'"

And the company that the Dean then lived amongst—dukes, earls, and ministers of State, were only too glad to receive him, to

silence his bitter tongue; and like the beggar on horseback, their guest insulted them to their face with his airs of superiority and aggressive independence. "I make bargains," writes this polished divine, "with all people that I dine to let me scrub my back against a chair, and the Duchess of Ormond was forced to bear it the other day," says the quondam hack to Sir William Temple, in his loftiest manner:—

> The Earl of Abingdon, has been teasing me these three months to dine with him: and this day was appointed about a week ago, and I named my company—Lord Stawell, Colonel Disney, and Dr. Arbuthnot, but the two last slipped their necks and left Stawell and me there. We did not dine till seven, because it is Ash-Wednesday. We had nothing but fish, which Stawell could not eat, and got a broiled leg of turkey. Our wine was poison; yet the puppy has twelve thousand a year. His carps were raw, and his candles tallow. He shall not catch *me* in haste again.

These insufferable airs on the part of a man with Swift's antecedents, however, plainly prove a fact to which Dr. Burton fails to give due prominence. At no period of our history were men of letters more courted and more handsomely rewarded than during the reign of Anne. Addison was a Secretary of State; Steele was a Commissioner of Stamps; Swift was a Dean, and, if he had not outraged decency, would have been raised to the bench of bishops; Prior was a Secretary of Embassy, and subsequently blossomed forth into the glories of an Ambassador; Tickell became an Under-Secretary; Congreve was a Commissioner of Licenses; whilst Rowe, Gay, Stepney, Hughes, and Ambrose Phillips all held valuable public appointments. No wonder that Voltaire exclaimed, "*En Angleterre les lettres sont plus en honneur qu'ici!*" The cause of this advancement is not difficult to discover. Parliament in those days appealed to its own special audience, and not to the nation; it could only appeal to the nation through the medium of the man of letters and the pamphleteer. The earlier part of the eighteenth century is essentially the age of pamphlets. At the present day, what with speeches fully reported, newspapers of every phase of opinion, circulating libraries and magazine literature, the publication of party *brochures* is gradually falling into desuetude. A speech in Parliament which can be read throughout the country within a few hours of its delivery, a leading article in a newspaper, or a few pages in a periodical review, answer now the same purpose for which pamphlets were formerly intended. But during the reigns of Anne and the earlier Georges, a member of Parliament spoke only to his brother members; his words, however weighty, were confined to his audience, and their exact reproduction to the world outside was forbidden by the rules of the House. Hence, matters most vital to the interests of the nation might

be brought before Parliament, and yet the public, so far as the deliberation of the Legislature was concerned, be not a whit the wiser. The pamphleteer stepped in as the middle man between the Parliament and the public. Without encroaching upon the prerogatives of Parliament, he discussed in his few brief pages all matters agitated at Westminster, and, according to his opinions or hopes of reward, abused or applauded the action of the Government. A powerful pamphlet which could be read by all was therefore a far more able ally or dangerous foe than a powerful speech which could be heard only by a few. Hence it was that Whigs and Tories kept in their pay and rewarded with office men of acknowledged eminence in literature to advocate their policy. The pen of Addison, of Swift, of Steele, of Locke, or of Defoe, was to the country at large what the speeches of Godolphin, St. John, and Harley were to the House of Commons.

In the rarely to be met with works of Thomas Brown, there is a curious diary of his, which reveals to us somewhat of the habits and fashions of our forefathers in the days of "decent, chaste, and formal" Queen Anne. Let us run through the brief entries of one week:—

Sunday.—Great jangling of bells all over the city from eight to nine. Psalms murdered in most parishes at ten. Abundance of doctrines and uses in the meetings, but no application. Vast consumption of roast beef and pudding at one. Afternoon, sleeping in most churches. Scores of handkerchiefs stolen at St. Paul's at three. Informers busy all day long. Night not so sober as might be wished.

Monday.—Journeymen tailors', shoemakers', and prentices' heads ache with what they had been doing the day before. Tradesmen begin the week with cheating as soon as they open shop. If fair, the Park full of women at noon. Great shaking of the elbow (*i.e.*, gambling with dice) at Wills's, &c., about ten.

Tuesday.—Muslins and pepper rise at the East India House at twelve. Calicoes fall before two. Coached masques calling at the chocolate houses between eight and nine.

Wednesday.—Crowds of people gather at the Exchange by one, disperse by three. Afternoon noisy and bloody at Her Majesty's bear garden in Hockley in the Hole. Night sober with broken captains and others who have neither credit nor money.

Thursday.—A constable and a watchman killed or near being so in Westminster, whether by a lord or a lord's footman the planets don't determine.

Friday.—Much swearing at three among the horse-coursers at Smithfield; if the oaths were registered as well as the horses, what a volume 'twould make. Several tails turned up at St. Paul's School, &c., for their repetitions.

Saturday.—People's houses cleansed in the afternoon, but their consciences we don't know when.

The history of politics during the reign of Anne is a curious study of action and reaction. On the accession of the Queen wild were the hopes of the Tories. It was known that the new sovereign's sympathies were hostile to the Whigs, that she was easily led, and that, by her education, sentiments, and religious convictions, she was no admirer of the principles of the revolution. Therefore it was expected that the reign of the Tories would be long and supreme, and a new political creed be circulated amongst the nation. It was fondly anticipated that the Dutch intimacies forced upon the country by the late king would be set aside, that in the war then being waged against France, on account of Lewis supporting the claims of the Pretender, England would be indebted more to her fleet than to the aid of foreign mercenaries, that the funded debt would be relieved of its burdens, that the Dissenters would return to the position they had occupied under the Stewart kings, and that the agricultural interest would enjoy peculiar advantages. This was the high Tory programme, but it was soon apparent that its propositions were impracticable. It was found that the war with France could only be carried on by maintaining the alliances formed by William in all their integrity. The country still continued to be heavily taxed to support the Treasury; the Dissenters, an active and prosperous class, were left very much to their own devices; whilst the farmers, in spite of their selfish objections, still saw themselves pressed by the burdens of the past. This condition of things cut both ways. The extreme Tories, finding that they had only changed a Whig Ministry for a Tory Ministry with a Whig policy, held themselves aloof from the Government. The moderate Whigs, seeing that, though a Tory Cabinet was in power, Whig measures were adopted, had no objection, in return for certain favours accorded them, to give their votes to Godolphin, who then held the seals as Lord Treasurer. The current of politics thus setting towards a compromise, a coalition Ministry, partly composed of Whigs and of Tories, came into office. And since it is in the nature of such fusions for the rival elements to struggle for supremacy, intrigues were speedily set on foot by which each party might dominate over the other. At first the Tories, aided by the subtlety of Harley and the influence of the Court, were in the ascendant, but the Whigs soon showed themselves conscious of their strength and of the sympathies by which they were backed. The country was in favour of the Whigs. The Tories were divided, and personal animosities were rife among their leaders; in spite of their maintenance of the Grand Alliance, they were wearied of the war and anxious for peace. Nor was implicit trust placed in their friends. The country party and the High Church party were the great supporters of Tory measures, but the nation

at large was inclined to be suspicious. At the bottom of the country party was the Pretender, at the bottom of the High Church party were an un-English bigotry and sacerdotal arrogance. On the other hand, the Whigs enjoyed that union which, when rightly directed, is force. They possessed a large majority in the Commons; they were sincere in their efforts for the humiliation of the House of Bourbon, they had no sympathy with the exile at St. Germains, and they were loyal in the maintenance of their Protestantism. Gradually the posts in the Cabinet became conferred upon those who swore fealty to the views of Somers and Halifax instead of to those of Harley and Bolingbroke; with the exception of Godolphin, who possessed the confidence of the commercial classes, and Marlborough, whose brilliant victories had justly won the applause of the nation, the Ministry was now composed wholly of the Whigs. Such was the situation of affairs at the close of the year 1708.

For a time it seemed as if the Whig tenure of power would be unlimited. Thanks to Marlborough, the throne of Anne was safe from all the plots of the Jacobites; England had risen to a supreme position in the councils of Europe, whilst everywhere the policy of the House of Bourbon had suffered defeat; the union between England and Scotland was, in spite of doubts and fears, a success; the country was prosperous, and the prospect of a permanent peace seemed now more than probable. But in politics there is no gratitude; and a measure or a sudden course of action may shake the strongest Government. Though the Tories were in the cold shade of exclusion, they did not lose heart. The Queen, now that she had nothing to fear from the Pretender, her brother, was more Tory than ever. Harley was busy with his schemes and intrigues to oust Godolphin. Marlborough had done his work, and his enemies now thought they could dispense with his aid. His wife, no longer the cherished Mrs. Freeman, had been dismissed the Court. Swift with his bitter pen was lashing the country squires and Anglican clergy into action, complaining of the heavy taxation, the toleration granted to Dissenters, and the short-sighted foreign policy that had been adopted. Here were elements which, if deftly put in motion and favoured by fortune, might bear the Tory party back to office. All that was wanted was for the Whigs to commit some grievous mistake, and the opportunity would not be lost upon their rivals. The moment was offered them. Various causes—an unpopular bill, a mistaken foreign policy, a deficit in the finances, a war misconducted, and the like—have helped to turn out a Government, but the Cabinet of Godolphin is the only instance in political history of a Ministry being overthrown by a sermon. It happened after this fashion.

Henry Sacheverell, the rector of St. Saviour's, Southwark, a

vain and mischievous clergyman, who had become famous, or rather notorious, by incessant invectives against the Dissenters, had published a sermon on the "Perils of False Brethren" which he had preached in St. Paul's Cathedral before the Lord Mayor and a large congregation. In this now historical discourse Sacheverell had inveighed, in the style of the coarsest declamation, against the doctrine of resisting the divine authority delegated to kings, against the toleration accorded to Nonconformists, and the dangers with which the Church was beset from her political and religious enemies. At this distance of time it is difficult to account for the sensation that followed the publication of this party address. Dr. Burton does his best to transform the feeble preacher into one of the pillars of the pulpit, and his sermon into a masterly discourse, but the evidence we possess fails to support such capricious statements.

Sacheverell had obtained a position for himself by employing very much the same arts as do his disciples of the present day. He objected to the control of the Church by the State, to the interference of the secular law in matters ecclesiastical, and, whilst doing all in his power to create schism, to the liberty enjoyed by those outside the Anglican fold. Acrid, spiteful, and turbulent, he had none of the charms of intellect to soften or illumine his splenetic bigotry. His sermon is before us: it exhibits no learning, no eloquence, no satire; it is simply a dull diatribe against a constitutional and Protestant Government, picked out here and there with vulgar personalities and tawdry rhetoric. Yet the sensation it created was immense. It took the town by storm and was the one topic of gossip throughout the country. Its sale was enormous, and edition after edition issued from the shops of the booksellers, in Little Britain. The greatest preachers of the reign of Lewis XIV., the greatest preachers of the reign of Charles II., never caused a tithe of the excitement which was excited by this sorry composition from a man one of whose similes had been "like parallel lines meeting in a common centre." But coarse invective and bitter personalities always succeed in commanding a large and attentive audience.

Unfortunately for the cause of the Whigs, Godolphin, who had been lampooned under the name of Volpone in the sermon, determined to prosecute the preacher. He vowed that Sacheverell should be impeached at the bar of the House of Lords in the name of all the Commons of England. In vain the leaders of his party endeavoured to turn him from his purpose. The Lord Treasurer, like many cool, calm men when goaded out of their natural prudence, completely lost his judgment, and declared that nothing would satisfy him but the gratification of revenge. His resolve was complied with. A committee was appointed to draw up articles

and Sacheverell was imprisoned. The trial took place in Westminster. Four distinct charges were brought against the malevolent preacher. He was accused of declaiming against the Revolution, of disapproving of the law of toleration, of suggesting that the Church of England was in danger from the conduct of the Ministry, and of declaring that the Government was bent upon the destruction of the Constitution. The end of this miserable episode is well known. The sympathies of the nation were on the side of the persecuted preacher. The Tories regarded him as the martyr of a latitudinarian Government, and extolled the virtues he had never displayed, and the learning he never possessed. The Anglican clergy rallied round their brother, and proclaimed all who differed from them as enemies to the Church. The crowd thronged about the coach of the prisoner, as he drove to Westminster Hall, and eagerly implored his blessing. Had Sacheverell been a patriot, withstanding the tyranny of a despot, or a soldier whose gallantry had retrieved the fallen fortunes of his country, he could not have been more the idol of the hour. By the slenderest majority he was found guilty, but a sentence so light was passed upon him, that it was regarded as a victory by the Tories and celebrated with bonfires and illuminations. "I intend to disappoint him," said the late Lord Palmerston, in reference to the obstinacy of a certain Ritualist. "I shall certainly not make a martyr of him." Had Godolphin been imbued with a little of this worldly wisdom, he would have taken no notice of the vituperations of Sacheverell, and have thus spared the overthrow of his party. The trial had sounded the knell of dissolution in the ears of the Whigs. The Queen openly espoused the cause of the Tories. Marlborough was humiliated. The stout and loyal Whigs were dismissed from office, whilst the servile and ambitious were bribed with promises. Parliament was dissolved, and the elections went in favour of the Tories. Godolphin was commanded to break the white staff, and the Tories under Harley once more reigned supreme.

Those who wish to study the history of the political fluctuations of the reign of Queen Anne, may safely be referred to these volumes. The intrigues of the Tories and the counterplots of the Whigs, the literary warfare between Swift and Steele, and the feud between Harley and Bolingbroke, are duly set forth and enlarged upon. But soon graver matters than party conflicts were to occupy public attention. The health of Anne was failing fast, and the one topic that engrossed the public mind was the question of the succession. Three parties divided the State: the Jacobites, whose cry was "God save James the Third!" the Tories, who were willing to welcome the Pretender back provided he agreed to turn Protestant; and the Whigs, who pledged themselves to stand by the clauses of the Act of Settlement and the principles of the

Revolution. Into the political intrigues that now took place we cannot enter. Bolingbroke was scheming to supplant Harley and paving the way for the accession of the Pretender; Harley, now Earl of Oxford, was removed; but the white staff was delivered, not to Bolingbroke, but to Shrewsbury. Then came the demise of the Queen. The Whigs, feeling assured that the country would support their measures, at once stood at the helm of Government. It was one of those occasions where the firm and the resolute win the day. No Pretender, with his priests and images and subservience to an Italian prelate, was to ascend the throne, and lower the pride and independence of England. The Whigs sternly gave their voice in favour of the House of Hanover. Troops were ordered to protect London. The fleet stood out at sea. All the ports were closed. The Tories were nonplussed, and heralds proclaimed the new King without disturbance. What a comment upon the vanity of human wishes and the insecurity of ambition is contained in the few lines written by Bolingbroke to Swift: "The Earl of Oxford was removed on Tuesday; the Queen died on Sunday. What a world is this! And how does fortune banter us!"

The "History of the Reign of Queen Anne" is undoubtedly an important contribution to the literature of the day. Compared with the works on the same period of Tindal, Swift, Bolingbroke, Smollett, Stanhope, Wyon and Lecky, the volumes of Dr. Burton at once display their superiority. It is evident that their author has taken great pains in the compilation of his political history. He has collected his facts with judgment, his opinions are the result of much reflection, and he has declined to be fettered by the conclusions arrived at by his predecessors. He vindicates the character of Marlborough from many of the unjust charges heaped upon the head of the great general by both Whig and Tory detractors. He has made a special study of the wars of the period, and his descriptions of the battles that took place, if they are wanting in the verve and brilliancy of Mr. Kinglake, are at least clear and accurate. The best part of the work is, however, as was to be expected, the chapters relating to Scottish matters. His criticism on the state of art, science, and literature at that time is meagre and unsatisfactory. Dr. Burton, however, it must be admitted, is not a master of English. His style is heavy and often involved; he lacks the power of narrative, and that grasp of facts which makes the story he relates clear and continuous; his rhetoric is as laboured and overladen as that of Canon Farrar. Still, his history is the outpouring of a mind rich with stored knowledge, conscientious and tolerant; it is a work of great value.

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

THE dividing line between the doctrine of the Lord's Supper held by the Protestant Churches, and that held by the Church of Rome and by her sympathisers, is to be found in two positive principles which are thrown by the course of controversy into crucial importance. The second of them especially touches the most modern development of Anglo-Catholic theology, and consequently cannot be attested by the same positive concurrence of authority as the other. On either side of these lines there may be found considerable variety in the estimate formed of the Sacraments and in the position, dignity, and importance comparatively assigned to them. But any man, however high may be his estimate of the Lord's Supper, who maintains these principles, belongs essentially to the Protestant school. Every one who maintains the converse propositions, however Evangelical his language may sometimes be, belongs essentially to the Anglo-Catholic school.

I. The first is that the grace, virtue and efficacy of the Sacrament, whatever it be, is not to be found in the elements, but in the heart of the faithful recipient. That this expresses the true mind of the greatest Divines of the Church of England can be proved by most abundant evidence. Enunciated in its most distinct form by the judicious Hooker (Eccl. Pol. b. v. c. 67), it has been emphatically repeated by another great authority on this subject, Dean Waterland. "What Mr. Hooker very judiciously says of the *real presence* of Christ in the Sacrament, appears to be equally applicable to the *presence* of the *Holy Spirit* in the same. It is not to be sought for in the *Sacrament*, but in the worthy receival of the *Sacrament*. As for the Sacraments they really exhibit; but for aught we can gather out of that which is written of them, they are not really, nor do really contain in themselves, that grace, which with them or by them it pleaseth God to bestow." (Waterland's "Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist," c. v. p. 94, Oxford, 1823.) Bishop Moberly, in his "Bampton Lecture," recognises the fact that "Hooker and Waterland limit authoritatively that presence *to the heart of the receiver*." ("Bampton Lectures for 1868," Lect. 6.)

II. The second principle is that the Body and Blood of Christ, of which we are made spiritually partakers in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, is not the glorified Body of Christ now existing in heaven with flesh and blood united in the one living

organism, but it is the Body as it was crucified, and the Blood as it was poured out from the flesh and separated from it. This vital distinction has been thrown more and more into prominence in the course of controversy. The Church of England in her Communion Office teaches her children to pray that—

"We receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine, according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood: who, in the same night that He was betrayed, took bread and, when He had given thanks, He brake it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, 'Take, eat, this is My Body which is given for you: Do this in remembrance of Me.' Likewise after supper He took the Cup; and, when He had given thanks, He gave it to them, saying, 'Drink ye all of this; for this is My Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you.'"

Our great Divines repeat the same keynote, as may be seen from the following quotations:—

How are His Body and Blood to be considered? Surely not as Christ is glorified, but as He was crucified; for it is that Body that was given, and the Blood is that Blood which was shed.—Bishop Lake, "Sermon on Matt. xxvi."

If a host could be turned into Him now, glorified as He is, it would not serve; Christ offered is it, hither we must look.—Bishop Andrewes' "Sermon on the Resurrection."

Christ's Flesh, not indeed simply as it is Flesh, without any other respect (for so it is not given, neither would it profit us), but as it is crucified and given for the Redemption of the World.—Bishop Cosin, "Hist. of Transubstantiation," lvi.

If the consecrated elements be the Flesh and Blood of Christ, then are they the Sacrifice of Christ Crucified upon the Cross. For they are not the Flesh and Blood of Christ as in His Body, while it was whole, but as separated by the passion of His Cross.—Thorndike, "Just Weights and Measures," xiv. s. 7.

The Body we receive in this Holy Sacrament is His Crucified Body."—Archbishop Wake's "Principles of the Christian Religion," p. 364, London, 1827.

In the learned work of Dean Goode on the Eucharist, he maintains with abundant proof the following proposition:—

The Fathers tell us that in the Eucharist the Body of Christ is present as *dead*, and His Blood as *shed*, upon the Cross, and that we eat and drink them *as such*; and they cannot be really and substantially present in this form, as they do not now exist in it.

In the work of Dr. Vogan on the Eucharist, this aspect of the question is yet more thoroughly worked out, and supplies the basis of his elaborate argument. To his volume the reader is referred for fuller information, and for the authorities by whom the distinction between the dead and living body of the Lord

Jesus Christ is supported alike by the Early Fathers and the Divines of the Church of England.

From these two principles the following rules are readily deduced :—

1. Any writer who refers the Presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to the heart, and lays stress on the faith and moral condition of the communicant.—

2. Any writer who speaks of God the Father as the giver of the grace of the Sacrament, and the Holy Spirit and his operations in the human soul as the agent.—

3. Any writer who describes the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper as being still bread and wine after consecration.—

4. Any writer who speaks slightingly of material sacrifices, and emphatically of those which are moral and spiritual.—

5. Any writer who identifies the Body and Blood of Christ received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper with the crucified Body and shed Blood of the Lord.—

6. Any writer who gives prominence to the Lord's Supper as commemorative of the sacrifice and death of Christ once for all accomplished on the Cross—

Must be understood *not* to maintain the Real Presence of the true Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated elements of the Lord's Supper. The *converse* propositions would of course be equally certain.

Before applying these rules to the passages from the Early Fathers, asserted to teach the doctrine of the Real Presence, some preliminary remarks must be made on the general attitude maintained by them towards the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The following quotation is taken from a Letter published in the *Guardian* newspaper of February 10, 1869 :—

> But there is a practical mode of judging between sound and unsound views on the Eucharist better than from the subtleties of logic. If the doctrine on which Eucharistic adoration is based be true, it is a truth of cardinal importance. This is not only acknowledged but urged by those who hold it to be true, and experience shows that wherever this or a similar doctrine is held, it becomes the centre of the system of Christian teaching. Observing this fact, let us compare it with the general tone of the New Testament. Is the doctrine prominent there? Are the Epistles of St. Peter and St. Paul full of it? Was it the great theme of the Apostolic teaching? On the contrary, it is hard to find so much as a clause or a sentence which may be thought to give it an implied sanction. Had St. Paul known such a doctrine, its omission from his Treatise to the Romans is surely unaccountable. But his language to the Corinthians is even more decisive. In chapter xi. of his first epistle, he enjoins reverence for the Lord's Supper. It would have been to the purpose of his argument to leave nothing unsaid as to the mystery of Christ's presence. Yet his

words in every respect accord with the solemness of our English Liturgy.

The same principle is at least applicable to the writings of the Early Fathers as it is to the Apostolic epistles. Yet what are the facts? The Early Fathers quoted in the Article in the *Church Quarterly*, of October, 1879, are Ignatius, Justin Martyr, and Irenæus. In the larger work of Dr. Pusey, whose statement that to his knowledge he had omitted nothing bearing on the subject should be kept in mind—within the same limits of time the same writers, and the same only, are quoted. Irenæus was born somewhere between A.D. 120-140, and his great work against heresies was written between A.D. 182 and 188. Tatian, who comes next in Dr. Pusey's catena, flourished about the middle of the second century, and was contemporary with Justin; but the exact date is uncertain. Clement of Alexandria, who follows, died A.D. 220. It is therefore admitted that till towards the close of the second century the only writers in whose works any clear references to the Lord's Supper are to be found are Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, and Tatian. It is true that Dr. Hebert, in his history of uninspired teaching on the Lord's Supper, adds Clement of Rome, and the author of the letter to Diognetus. But the only ground for this afforded by the language of the former is the use of the word "offerings," and of the latter the use of the words "passover" and "mysteries." How slight and untrustworthy such indications of doctrine are, to say the least for them, and how little is their controversial value, is shown by the fact, that Dr. Pusey has passed them over altogether. It remains therefore that, on the admission of Anglo-Catholics themselves, there are only four writers to be found in the first one hundred and eighty years after Christ who make any reference whatever to the Lord's Supper. Polycarp, Barnabas, Clement of Rome, the author of the Epistle to Diognetus, Hermas, Papias, and Athenagoras are all silent. It is scarcely possible that the significance of this fact should be overrated. This silence becomes more remarkable, the more closely the remains of these Fathers are studied. Topics are discussed and passages occur over and over again, in which the subject of the Lord's Supper would almost necessarily have been introduced, had the ordinance possessed to their mind the primary importance with which the doctrine of the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated elements necessarily invests it. Thus Barnabas has a chapter entitled "The Jewish Sacrifices are to be abolished;" Clement speaks of offerings presented by priests; the Pastor of Hermas enjoyed a popularity in the early ages, which has been compared to that of the Pilgrim's Progress among ourselves, and speaks largely of religious duties. The Epistle to Diognetus was written

to give an account of the Christian religion; Athenagoras heads chapter xvii. of his work with the words, "Why the Christians do not offer sacrifices." Yet in none of them is a single clear and indisputable reference to the Lord's Supper to be found. The argument has been stated with great force by Dr. H. Burgess, and he quotes in illustration the two passages from Clement of Rome, in which Dr. Hebert erroneously considers a reference to be made to the Lord's Supper. In order to avoid misapprehension it would be as well to state at once, and most positively, that if the passages quoted by Dr. Hebert from Clement and the Epistle to Diognetus do refer to the Lord's Supper, there is not a syllable in the reference that can be twisted by any possible ingenuity into an affirmation of the Anglo-Catholic doctrine of the "Real Presence."

Thus out of ten writers three only make any reference to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper at all, much less affirm the Presence of the true Body and Blood of Christ in or under the forms of the consecrated bread and wine. That doctrine gives an awful importance to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and forces it into prominence as the great vivifying principle of every theology of which it constitutes a part. Had it been held, we must have found it everywhere, just as we do find it everywhere in the writings of modern Anglo-Catholics; yet with the exception of the three writers whose works remain to be examined, and of Tatian, we find it nowhere. The whole subject is even strangely absent. It is impossible that these Fathers can have known anything of the doctrine, which Anglo-Catholics assert to have been the universal doctrine of the Church from the beginning. If Ignatius, Justin Martyr, and Irenæus teach it, they are not only in this respect out of harmony with all the other writers of their day, but in absolute opposition to them. Men who do not refer to the Lord's Supper even when the natural course of their argument would have suggested the reference, cannot have belonged to the same school of belief with those who hold that the consecrating words of a human priest can attach the very Body and Blood of Christ to every atom of the bread and every drop of the wine used in the Sacrament.

But if it is demonstrable that this doctrine was not the general doctrine of the Fathers of the first two centuries, another question arises. Can it possibly have been the doctrine of Ignatius, Justin, and Irenæus? The affirmative is incredible. To establish such a fact would need language the most precise and exact; assertions the most clear and indisputable in the writers under review. Is such language, are such assertions, to be found? They are not. There is not a sentence in either of these writers which is not in entire consistency with that doctrine of the

Spiritual Presence of Christ in the Ordinance, which has been shown to be the doctrine of the Church of England.

What is it then that Ignatius teaches on this subject? The first passage we have to deal with is from the Epistle to the Smyrnæans:—

> They [the Docetæ, who denied that our Lord had a True Body] abstain from the Eucharist and from prayer, because they confess not the Eucharist to be the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ which suffered for our sins, and which the Father of His goodness raised up again. They, then, who speak against this gift of God, incur death in the midst of their disputes, but it were better for them to treat it with respect that they also might rise again. Cap. vii.

It is argued that "the Eucharist" is used for the elements in the Lord's Supper. Let the assumption be for a moment granted. Even so, the passage affirms no more than do our Lord's words of institution: "This is My Body." No more stress or higher meaning can be laid on the word "is" in the language of Ignatius, than in the language of our Lord himself. The affirmation therefore proves nothing whatever. But is it certain that the word "Eucharist" is used for the elements? It appears certain that it is not.

In the first place the apposition between the Eucharist and "prayer" is destroyed by the supposition. Prayer must be the ordinance of prayer and not any special part of it; neither the words separately, nor the bodily attitude separately, nor the intention of the heart separately, but prayer as including all these in one ordained act of communion with God. By parity of reasoning, "the Eucharist" must mean the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper, and not any part of it. The word is only used by Ignatius on two other occasions. It occurs in his Epistle to the Philadelphians: "Take ye heed, then, to have but one Eucharist; for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup to (show forth) the unity of His blood" (cap. iv.). Here it seems indisputable that the ordinance is intended, not the elements, for the unity of the ordinance is based upon the unity of the flesh and of the cup. It also occurs in the Epistle to the Smyrnæans: "Let that be deemed a proper Eucharist which is administered either by the Bishop or by all to whom he has entrusted it." Here again the word is co-extensive with the act of the Bishop who administers, and that act reaches to the entire ordinance. If in two of these passages the word is certainly used of the ordinance, in all human probability it must be used of the ordinance in the third instance also. The word is not employed for the "action," as has been most inaccurately stated; but it is employed for the ordinance, of which the action is only a part. If the language

appears harsh, the object of the argument should be remembered. Ignatius is writing, not of the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, but of the reality of the Body and Blood of Christ altogether. "He, Christ, suffered truly, even as also He truly raised up Himself, not, as certain unbelievers maintain, that He only seemed to suffer" (cap. ii.). He proceeds to argue that after His resurrection Christ was still possessed of flesh (cap. iii.), and indignantly exclaims, "What does any one profit me if he commend me, but blasphemes my Lord, not expressing that He was (truly) possessed of a body" (cap. v.). He asserts that even angels, "if they believe not in the Blood of Christ, shall, in consequence, merit condemnation" (cap. vi.). Then, in the next chapter, he contrasts the error of the Docetæ, who, not believing in the reality of our Lord's body, and therefore not in the reality of His sufferings, neither kept the memorial of His death, nor approached God in prayer, through His mediation, with the duty of the true Christian to "give heed to the Gospel in which the passion (of Christ) has been revealed to us and the resurrection has been fully proved." The longer form of the Epistle, the value of which is still disputed among critics, renders the passage quoted thus: "They are ashamed of the Cross; they mock at the passion; they make a jest of the resurrection." None, who take the Epistle as a whole, will doubt that this is the true interpretation.

The next passage is as follows: "Breaking one and the same bread, which is the medicine of immortality and the antidote to prevent us from dying" (Ep. xx.).

It should be noticed that the word "Eucharist" does not occur in this sentence, but only the word "bread;" and that the phrase "medicine of immortality" is associated with the "bread"—indications sufficient of themselves to prove that Ignatius says nothing in these words of what is commonly known as the "Real Presence." His language implies a high conception of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, but not a whit higher than is expressed by the Church of England herself, by Jewell, Hooker, and the other writers quoted in a previous Article. To affirm that "according to S. Ignatius the Eucharist (that is, the elements) is the bearer, not of magical powers, but of the Body and Blood of Christ," is to put into the language of Ignatius ideas of which he was wholly ignorant. In what sense the Father attaches the idea of immortality to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper may be illustrated by a parallel passage in his Epistle to the Philadelphians:—

> The Gospel possesses something transcendent above the former dispensation, in the appearance of our Lord Jesus Christ, His passion and resurrection. For the beloved prophets announced Him, but the Gospel is the perfection of immortality. (Philad. ix.)

In another passage the language is yet more striking: "I flee to the Gospel as to the flesh of Jesus" (Philad. v.).

As the Gospel is the perfection of immortality because it conveys the full revelation of Him who is "the Resurrection and the Life," so the bread is the medicine of immortality, because it represents that meritorious sacrifice and death which have purchased eternal life for all that believe.

The third passage on which reliance has been placed as an evidence of the doctrine of the Real Presence, has been already quoted in another relation. In order to avoid all disputes about translation, all the passages are given in this Paper from Messrs. Clark's "Ante-Nicene Christian Library."

Take ye heed then to have but one Eucharist. For there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup to (show forth) the unity (literally, into the unity) of His blood; one altar, as there is one bishop, along with the presbytery and deacons my fellow servants; that so, whatsoever ye do, ye may do it according to (the will) of God (Philad. iv.).

"Here again," asserts the Anglo-Catholic writer, "the Eucharist is spoken of objectively, and effects are attributed to it which could only be attributed to the Body and Blood of Christ. The partaking of the cup has for its effect the ἕνωσις τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ." But Ignatius says no such thing. He says that the oneness of the flesh of Christ and of the cup proves the oneness of the "Eucharist." The Eucharist, therefore, is neither the flesh of Christ nor the cup; although the ordinance includes both as parts of one whole. The word is not used for the elements. He further affirms that the object of the ordinance is to make all believers one in the "Blood" of Christ. Thus, he concludes his epistle to the Smyrnæans as follows:—

I salute your most worthy bishop, and your very venerable presbytery, and your deacons, my fellow servants, and all of you individually as well as generally, in the name of Jesus Christ, and in His flesh and blood, in His passion and resurrection, both corporeal and spiritual, in union both with God and man (chap. xii.).

In this case, as in the former, light may be thrown on the meaning of Ignatius from the language of the longer Greek recension. If it be spurious, it suffices at all events to show how his words were understood in other and earlier times:—

I exhort you to have but one faith, and one (kind of) preaching, and one Eucharist. For there is one flesh of the Lord Jesus Christ, and His Blood which was shed for us is one; one loaf also is broken to all (the communicants), and the cup is distributed among them all. There is but one altar for the whole Church, and one bishop, with the presbytery and deacons, my fellow servants; since

also there is but one true begotten Being, God, even the Father, and one only begotten Son of God, the Word and man; and one Comforter, the Spirit of truth; and also one preaching, and one faith, and one baptism; and one Church which the Holy Apostles established from one end of the earth to another by the Blood of Christ and of their own sweat and toil; it behoves of us also, therefore, as a "peculiar people and a holy nation" to perform all things with harmony in Christ (Philad. iv.).

Such are the three passages on which Anglo-Catholic writers rely, in proof that Ignatius held the doctrine of the Real Presence. There are two other passages which are admitted to afford *primâ facie* evidence on the other side. We give them together, as they serve to throw light on each other:—

My love has been crucified; and there is no fire in me desiring to be fed. But there is within me a water that thinketh and speaketh, saying to me inwardly, "Come to the Father. I take no delight in corruptible food, nor in the pleasures of this life. I desire the Bread of God, the Heavenly Bread, the Bread of Life which is the flesh of Jesus Christ the Son of God, who was born in the last line of the seed of David and of Abraham; and I desire the drink of God, namely His Blood, which is incorruptible love and eternal life." (Rom. vii.)

Wherefore, clothing yourselves with meekness, be ye renewed in faith, that is the flesh of the Lord, and in love, that is the Blood of Jesus Christ. (Trall: c. viii.)

Of both these passages it is equally true that if they refer to the Lord's Supper at all, they do not contain a syllable affirmative of the modern doctrine of the Real Presence. It has been shown that such language only implies the Reality of the Presence of Christ in the ordinance, and the blessings procured for us by His sacrifice, and implies nothing more. It is simply equivalent to the words of administration appointed by our Church: "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee—the Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ that was shed for thee—preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." But do they refer to the Lord's Supper at all? The question is best answered by parallel passages from the same writer, for the language of Ignatius, in common with that of other Early Fathers, is too loose and inexact to make a minute verbal criticism of much value. When it is seen that similar phrases are used where no reference whatever to the Sacrament could be intended, it becomes evident that the reference is not even to the ordinance, but it is only to the spiritual communion of the soul with God. Thus he tells the Ephesians, that "faith and love towards Christ Jesus are the beginning and the end of life" (c. xiv.). To the Magnesians he writes: "I pray for a union both of the flesh and spirit of Jesus Christ, the constant source of our life, and of faith and love, to which nothing is to be preferred" (c. i.). Again: "That they

may prosper both in the flesh and spirit, in faith and love, in the Son and in the Father, and in the Spirit, in the beginning, and in the end" (c. xiii.). To the Smyrnæans he says: "That which is worth all is faith and love, to which nothing is to be preferred." If any doubt can remain that it is a spiritual communion with Christ of which Ignatius speaks, the doubt must vanish when we turn to the Syriac version of the three Epistles, which the late Dr. Cureton maintained to be the only authentic remains of Ignatius: "I seek the Bread of God, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, and I seek His Blood, drink, which is love incorruptible."

The next Father to be examined is Justin Martyr. There are eight passages in his writings considered to refer to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, but the writer in the *Church Quarterly* has appealed to the following only:—

This food is amongst us called the Eucharist, whereof no one may partake but the man who believeth that which is taught him by us to be true, and who has been washed with the water which is for the remission of sins, and unto regeneration, and who is so living as Christ has enjoined. For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these, but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour, having been made flesh by the word of God, hath both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of His word, and for which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh. For the Apostles, in the memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels, have thus delivered unto us what was enjoined upon them; that Jesus took bread, and when He had given thanks, said, "This do ye in remembrance of me, this is my body," and that after the same manner, having taken the cup and given thanks, He said, "This is my blood," and gave it to them alone, which the wicked devils have imitated in the mysteries of Mithras commanding the same thing to be done. For, that bread and a cup of water are placed with certain incantations in the mystic rites of one who is being initiated, you either know or can learn. (Apol. I. c. 66.)

The word "food" at the beginning of the sentence is τροφή, to the meaning of which attention has already been called. It may be added, that Irenæus used it in the precise sense which has been assigned to it; εἰς τροφὴν ἡμετέραν (Fragments). The words "the food which is blessed by the prayer of His word" become in Anglo-Catholic translation, "the food that has been made Eucharist." The words are ἡ εὐχαριστηθεῖσα τροφή, and the reader can judge of the two translations for himself. It is also asserted to be the meaning of Justin that by the Eucharist, that is, in the writer's meaning, "by the consecrated elements, our flesh and blood are nourished by transmutation." What Justin really says is only, that "by the food our flesh and blood are nourished by transmutation," or, to use the modern word, by "assimilation," a plain proof to ordinary minds that the bread

and wine after consecration remain simple bread and wine, and nothing more, so far as they themselves are concerned. When he says "not as common bread and common drink do we receive them," Justin only affirms what we cordially accept, that the bread and the wine which have been consecrated, have become different from other common bread and wine, in that they have been set apart by the express commandment of Christ himself as efficient symbols of the body and blood of the Lord. When he says, that by virtue of prayer, carrying with it the promises contained in the Word, the consecrated elements become (spiritually and sacramentally) "the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh," he only affirms what has been already shown to be in the doctrine of the Church of England, and which is expressed in the words of administration, "The Body of Christ—the Blood of Christ." Yet out of these simple and apparently inoffensive words of Justin, Anglo-Catholic ingenuity has drawn four formal propositions, bristling with the highest sacerdotal ism. In lieu of any elaborate refutation of their fallacy, it will suffice to quote the note appended to this passage, by the editors of Messrs. Clark's Ante-Nicene Library :—

This passage is claimed alike by the Calvinists, Lutherans, and Romanists; and, indeed, the language is so inexact, that each party may plausibly maintain that their own opinion is advocated by it. The expression "the prayer of His Word," or of the Word we have from Him, seems to signify the prayer pronounced over the elements, in imitation of our Lord's thanksgiving before breaking the bread.—"Justin Martyr," p. 64.

Irenæus must now claim attention. Six pages of elaborate argument in addition to very lengthy quotations are devoted to the exposition of the views of this Father. It has been already said that, in face of the general silence maintained by the great body of the Early Fathers on the subject of the Lord's Supper, nothing but the most precise statements on the other side can render it credible that any of them can possibly have held the modern doctrine of the Real Presence. If any such precise statements were to be found in the writings of Irenæus, all this elaborate argumentation would not be necessary. The strict limits of space imposed on this Article renders it impossible either to quote Irenæus at length, or to follow out in detail the fallacies of his mis-interpeter. It must suffice to warn any reader of the *Church Quarterly*, that he must not accept the sketch of the argument of Irenæus given in its pages without carefully testing it for himself by a reference to the original.

The seventeenth chapter of the work against heresies is headed "Proof that God did not appoint the Levitical dispensation for His own sake, or as requiring such service ; for He does, in fact, need nothing from man." The chapter contains six

sections, and occupies nearly six octavo pages of letter-press in Messrs. Clark's edition. The general argument is directed to prove the abrogation of sacrifices under the New Covenant. The key to the whole is given in the following sentences:—

When He perceived them neglecting righteousness and abstaining from the love of God, and imagining that God was to be propitiated by sacrifices and other typical observances, Samuel did even thus speak unto them: "God does not desire whole burnt offerings and sacrifices, but He will have His voice to be hearkened to. Behold a ready obedience is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." David also says: "Sacrifice and oblation Thou didst not desire, but mine ears hast Thou perfected; burnt offerings also for sin Thou hast not required." He thus teaches them that God desires obedience, which renders them secure, rather than sacrifices and holocausts, which avail them nothing towards righteousness; and (by this declaration) he prophesies the New Covenant at the same time. (Irenæus c. Hær. b. iv. c. 2).

Having thus declared the services of the New Covenant to be spiritual, he enlarges upon this idea. It is not till the fifth section that he refers to the Lord's Supper:—

Giving directions to His disciples to offer to God the first fruits of His own created things—not as if He stood in need of them, but that they might be themselves neither unfruitful nor ungrateful—He took that created thing bread, and gave thanks, and said, "This is My Body." And the cup likewise, which is part of that creation to which we belong, He confessed to be His Blood, and taught the New Oblation of the New Covenant; which the Church, receiving from the Apostles, offer to God throughout all the world, to Him who gives us the means of subsistence, the first fruits of His own gifts in the New Testament. (*Ibid.* iv.)

Let it be observed that the oblation is not the oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ, but of "the first fruits of His own created things;" viz., the bread and the wine. This bread and wine are sacramentally and spiritually the Body and Blood of Christ. He proceeds in the next section to declare that they are this by representation:—

Just as a King, if he himself paints a likeness of his son, is right in calling this likeness his own, for both these reasons, because it is the likeness of his son, and because it is his own production; so also does the Father confess the name of Jesus Christ, which is throughout all the world glorified in the Church, to be His own, both because it is that of His Son, and because He who thus describes it gave Him for the salvation of man.

The one reason states the representative character of the consecrated elements; the other, the divine authority which invests them with this character. He points out also that the symbolic use of the bread and wine is in accordance with God's mode of

working. After quoting the words of Malachi, "And in every place incense is offered to my name as a pure sacrifice," he adds, "and John, in the Apocalypse, declares that the incense is the prayer of the saints."

Irenæus pursues the subject in chapter eighteen. Since God does not need anything from his creatures, it follows that our services are rendered acceptable, not by the value of the service itself, which would be the case on the Anglo-Catholic hypothesis, but by the moral disposition of the offerers. Accordingly he enlarges upon this :—

It behoves us to make an oblation to God, and in all things to be found grateful to God our Father, in a pure mind, and in faith without hypocrisy, in well grounded hope, in fervent love, offering the first fruits of His own created things. And the Church alone offers this pure oblation to the Creator, offering to Him with giving of thanks (the things taken) from His own Creation.

Let it be observed that over and over again the oblation is described as consisting of "created things." Then, pleading against those who deny a resurrection, he proceeds :—

But our opinion is in accordance with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist in turn establishes our opinion. For we offer to Him His own, announcing consistently the fellowship and union of the flesh and spirit. For us the bread which is produced from the earth, when it receives the invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two realities, earthly and heavenly (by the material substance and the spiritual reality represented by it); so also our bodies, when they receive the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, having the hope of the resurrection to eternity. (*Ibid.* s. 5).

There is nothing here which is not strictly consistent with the Church of England doctrine of a Real Spiritual Presence. The bread at consecration ceases to be common bread, and becomes bread separated to a sacred use ; it is, as Irenæus states in s. 4, "The body of the Lord and the cup His blood." The use of the word Eucharist is ambiguous. In the first instance it appears to be used in its proper sense of the ordinance, and subsequently in its derivative sense of the elements. It is much more probable that this ambiguous use of the word arose from habitual inexactness, than from conscious use of a figurative sense. It has been often noted that the early germs of Sacramental error are to be found first in Irenæus.

In his fifth book, Irenæus recurs to the subject, and further vindicates "the salvation" of the body and its regeneration, that is, its resurrection. Otherwise, "neither did the Lord redeem us with His blood, nor is the cup of the Eucharist the communion of His blood, nor the bread which we break the communion of His body. For blood can only come from veins and flesh, and whatsoever makes up the substance of man, such as the Word of God was actually made." Here "Eucharist" is used in its

proper sense; the language is strictly scriptural, and the reference to the Sacrifice upon the Cross clear and specific.

"He had acknowledged the cup (which is a part of the creation) as His own blood, from which He draws our blood; and the bread (also a part of the creation) He has established as His own body, from which He gives increase to our bodies. When, therefore, the mingled cup and the manufactured bread receive the Word of God, and the Eucharist of the Blood and Body of Christ is made, from which things the substance of our flesh is increased and supported, how can they affirm that the flesh is incapable of receiving the gift of God which is life eternal, which flesh is nourished from the body and blood of our Lord, and is a member of Him?"

The reality of Christ's presence is everywhere affirmed, but nothing is said of the mode of it. The Church of England appears to have used the language of Irenæus in her Communion Office: "Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink His blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body, and our souls washed by His most precious blood." In these words it is evident that a spiritual feeding by faith is contemplated, and not a natural feeding by the mouth—a feeding which may take place in the Ordinance of the Lord's Supper, but is not exclusively attached to it. If, according to the Anglo-Catholic hypothesis, all who receive the consecrated bread and wine eat the body and blood of Christ, the petition is evidently unnecessary. It is remarkable that the doctrine of Irenæus, that the "Lord gave his soul for our souls, and his flesh for our flesh" (Bk. v., c. i., s. 1). is not consistently carried out by the Church of England, for it is the soul which is to be "washed in His precious blood." The evident explanation is, that by the body and blood of Christ our Church means the whole redeeming efficacy of His sacrifice and death, applied indifferently to either the human body or the human soul, and equally effectual to the salvation of them both.

The same explanation is equally applicable to the one remaining passage on which reliance has been placed:—

Just as a cutting from the vine planted in the ground fructifies in its season, or as a corn of wheat falling into the earth and having decomposed, rises with manifold increase by the Spirit of God, who contains all things, and then through the wisdom of God serves for the use of man, and having received the Word of God becomes the Eucharist, which is the body and blood of Christ; so also our bodies, being nourished by it (that is, by the produce of the vine and of the corn) and deposited in the earth, and, suffering decomposition there, shall rise at their appointed time also.

The illustration is simply that of 1 Cor. xv. 37, 38. We are tempted, however, to add another short passage, which Anglo-

Catholics are not accustomed to quote, from the surviving fragments of the lost writings of Irenæus:—

Though these oblations (those of the New Covenant) are not according to the law, the handwriting of which the Lord took away from the midst by cancelling it; but they are according to the spirit, for we must worship God "in spirit and in truth." And therefore the oblation of the Eucharist is not a carnal one, but a spiritual; and in this respect it is pure. For we make an oblation to God of the bread and cup of blessing, giving Him thanks in that He has commanded the earth to bring forth these fruits for our nourishment. And then, when we have perfected the oblations, we invoke the Holy Spirit that He may *exhibit* (ἀποφήνῃ) this sacrifice, both the bread the body of Christ, and the cup the blood of Christ, in order that the receiver of these anti-types, may obtain remission of sins and life eternal. Those persons, then, who perform these oblations in remembrance of the Lord, do not fall in with Jewish views (ἐν τοῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων δόγμασι προσέρχονται), but, performing the service after a spiritual manner, they shall be called the sons of wisdom.—"Ante-Nicene Library, Works of Irenæus," p. 176.

If doubt should still remain on the mind of any reader, let him take the trouble to test the language of these Fathers by the Canons suggested in the beginning of this Paper. The assertion that Ignatius has taught the Real Presence is contradicted by Canon 1, inasmuch as he places great stress on faith (Eph. ix., xx., Philad. v., Smyr. iv.): by Canon 2, inasmuch as he emphatically refers the enjoyment of the presence of Christ to the "Word of God" (Phil. iv.), and, in singular accordance with the language of the Homily of the Sacraments, describes the Holy Spirit as "a rope" by which the soul ascends up to God (Eph. ix.): by Canon 3, inasmuch as he speaks of the elements as "bread and wine" after consecration (Eph. xx.): by Canon 5, inasmuch as he declares the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins (Smyr. vii.), and by Canon 6, inasmuch as he connects it with "the passion of Christ." (*Ibid.*)

Similarly, the ascription of such views to Justin Martyr is forbidden by Canon 1, in that he lays emphatic stress on the faith of the communicant, stating that no one was allowed to partake but "the man who believes that the things which we teach are true, and who has been washed with the washing that is for the remission of sins, and who is living as Christ has enjoined (*Apol.* I., c. 66): by Canon 2, inasmuch as the Father and the Holy Ghost are made prominent in the Sacrament, "Praise and glory to the Father of the Universe through the Name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and offer thanks for our being counted worthy to receive these things at His hands" (*Ibid.* c. 66.): by Canon 3, inasmuch as he calls the

elements after consecration "bread and wine" (*Apol.* I., 65: *Dial. with Trypho*, c. 41): by Canon 4, inasmuch as he teaches with Irenæus that the ancient sacrifices and temple were not needed by God, but were ordained for the good of men, and therefore depended for their value on the moral disposition of the offerers (*Dial. with Trypho*, c. 22).

Similarly, even Irenæus, the least satisfactory of these Early Fathers in his views of the Lord's Supper, is vindicated from the suspicion of teaching any Real Presence of the Body of Christ in the elements by Canon 1, inasmuch as he declares the value of the Christian sacrifice to consist altogether in the moral disposition of the offerer (Irenæus c. Hær. b. iv. c. 22, ss. 2, 3, c. 18, ss. 3, 4): by Canon 2, inasmuch as he asserts "the incapacity of flesh to receive the life granted by God" (*Ibid.* b. v. c. 3, s. 3), and teaches that the Lord "hath poured out the Spirit of the Father for the union and communion of God and man, imparting indeed God to man by means of the Spirit" (*Ibid.* b. v. c. 1, s. 1): by Canon 3, inasmuch as he describes the elements as bread and wine (cup) after consecration (*Ibid.* c. 2, s. 9): by Canon 4, inasmuch as, with emphatic reiteration and at great length, he denies all spiritual value to external and material sacrifices (*Ibid.* b. iv. cc. 17, 18): by Canons 5 and 6, inasmuch as in immediate connection with the Lord's Supper stress is laid on Christ having "redeemed us by His blood, and blood can only come from veins and flesh, and whatsoever makes up the substance of men, such as the Word of God was actually made" (*Ibid.* b. v. cc. 1 and 2); again, "as He suffered, so also is He alive and suffering" (*Fragments*, 52).

These facts prove that the Early Fathers, of the first two centuries at all events, did not hold or teach the doctrine of the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated elements of the Lord's Supper. All the alleged proofs of it fail, and turn out on examination to be no better than a groundless mass of misapprehensions. It is not the object of this Article to continue the inquiry beyond the first two hundred years after Christ; and whether the same purity of doctrine continued for the first three hundred years, or, as Bishop Jewell affirmed, for the first five hundred, is a comparatively unimportant matter of opinion. For two hundred years at all events, a period covering the lifetime of all those who conversed with the Apostles, or with the immediate successors of the Apostles, the broad line separating the pure Protestant doctrine of the Lord's Supper from the later corruptions which culminated in the Trent Decrees was never passed. The doctrine during this period was distinctly Evangelical; and the fact proves beyond reasonable doubt that the interpretation which the Evangelical churches have placed on the words of Institution is the true interpreta-

tion. Here stands the gulf, broad and deep and clear, between the apostolic doctrine and the doctrine of later times. And it is to be observed, that the absence of all theological accuracy and technical language during the struggles of the first centuries serve to render the interpretation of our Lord's personal teaching, thus afforded to us, the more certain and trustworthy. When Christianity was fighting for its life there was no time for subtle refinements, and in the very simplicity of the theology of those ages we find the assurance, that the teaching of the Great Master and the impression made by it on the mind and heart of the Church has been faithfully handed down to successive generations. To conceive that our Lord could have intended to teach the modern doctrine of the Real Presence, and yet that the Christians of the first two centuries should have known nothing of it, would be to conceive the most impossible of moral impossibilities. Yet it is evident that if the great Fathers of the period held such a belief, they certainly did not teach it. Not only is not one single precise statement of the doctrine to be found, but the whole tenor of their language, and therefore the whole current of their thoughts, stand in irreconcileable opposition to it.

The conclusion, therefore, is inevitable, that the Anglo-Catholic catenas, which have been used as the commonplaces of sacerdotal belief, are not to be trusted. It does not become any one who is conscious of the weakness of the highest human judgment, and of the force with which strong moral tendencies pervert the strictest exercise of the understanding, to use hard epithets of any one. But neither must the truth be blinked, or facts allowed to be misrepresented in a false charity. The assertion, that the doctrine of the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated elements was the faith of all Christians from the beginning, is simply and absolutely untrue.

What then becomes of the asserted Catholicity of the doctrine of the Real Presence; what of its historical continuity; what of the loudly paraded doctrine of Vincentius, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus?* The broken reed pierces the hand that leans upon it. The imposing superstructure fades into nothing with the shaking foundation on which it rested. To discuss the true character of the doctrine of the Real Presence and its perverting influence on the whole system of sacerdotal theology, lies outside the object of this Paper. It is enough to say that, while it is not to be confounded with transubstantiation, and may, perhaps, be distinguishable from consubstantiation, it contains the vitiating poison of them both. All that makes them dangerous to men's souls and dishonourable to God, survives in the Real Presence. Metaphysicians may argue about

the modes of the Lord's presence in the consecrated elements, but it is in the belief of the Presence itself that the danger lies, and in the materialising of the invisible into creatures visible and tangible. Those who are well acquainted with the articles of accusation charged against the martyrs of the Marian period, will be perfectly well aware that disbelief in Transubstantiation was generally the subject of one article, and disbelief in the Real Presence the subject of another. May I say that the Real Presence is the heart and life both of Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation? It is a doctrine so vital, so fatally operative, that the Church of Rome thought herself justified in burning men for rejecting it, and that saints of all ages and ranks considered it to be dishonouring to their Master, and preferred to die rather than give their tacit consent to it. But whatever estimate may be formed of the doctrine, one thing is certain, it is neither primitive nor apostolic. It was not the doctrine of the Primitive ages; it was not the doctrine of the Apostles; it was not the doctrine of the Incarnate God, in whom dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

EDWARD GARBETT.

ART. V.—THE PRINCE CONSORT.

The Life of His Royal Highness the Prince Consort. By THEODORE MARTIN. With Portraits. Volume V. London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1880.

THE world is justly impatient of the panegyric of a biographer. If a man's deeds and thoughts do not of themselves sufficiently proclaim his worth, the fault is either his biographer's or his own. In the case of the Prince Consort, all that could be told of him went to make the narrative a "chronicle of actions bright and just;" and if at times Sir Theodore Martin unwittingly added superfluous words of praise, he may plead in excuse the difficulty of silence where the chronicler has had occasion to scrutinise a character under many and very varied aspects, so narrowly as it has been his duty to scrutinise that of the Prince, and "has at every step found fresh occasion to admire its purity, its unselfishness, its consistency, and its noble self-control." Sir Theodore's biography, of which the last volume is before us, will convey to the minds of those who read it "no feeble reflex of the profound impression which these qualities produced upon" his own mind during years of close and conscientious study. Much has necessarily become known to himself, of course, "which it would

have been either premature or unfitting to record" in this work; but that which the biographer learned, and left unrecorded, he tells us, "has only tended to deepen his admiration of the Prince." The sincerity of the admiration, indeed, strikes us everywhere all through the work; the sympathy is no less obvious than the literary ability; and the narrative of a noble life has been worthily closed.

The concluding volume tells the story of two years, namely, the years 1860 and 1861. Foreign affairs occupy the greater portion of the volume, and the narrative is full of interest; but we can only touch upon two or three points.

At the opening of the year 1860, the restless ambition of the Emperor Napoleon was threatening the peace of Europe. The Queen and the Prince Consort, remembering his language at Osborne about the *frontières naturelles de la France*, regarded his intentions with distrust. His position, indeed, was full of embarrassment. The Italian problem was not easy of solution. The duty of England, however, was simple and obvious, to stand aside, as she had hitherto done, avowing her sympathy with the Italians in their struggle for constitutional liberty, but leaving them to work out for themselves what they had already so well begun. "It is most dangerous for us," said the Queen, "to offer to bind ourselves to a common action with the Emperor with regard to Italy, whilst he has entered into a variety of engagements with the different parties engaged in the dispute, of which we know nothing, and has objects in view which we can only guess at." On the 24th of January, Lord Palmerston, after an effective speech of Mr. Disraeli, assured the House of Commons that "Her Majesty's Government was totally free from any engagement whatever with any Foreign Power upon the affairs of Italy."* The Cabinet had refused to be persuaded by Lord Palmerston's Memorandum of January 5th, "and when the demand of France for the cession of Savoy, of which he had been for some days aware, came to be known, as in a few days it was sure to be, he could not but feel that, if it had found his Government under any pledge to France, not even his popularity could have withstood the storm of indignation which the intelligence would have provoked." On January 25th, the Prince Consort, in a letter to the Prince Regent of Prussia, remarking that "the principle not to impose any fixed form of

* A twelvemonth later, January, 1861, Mr. Disraeli, one of the visitors at Windsor Castle, mentioned to the Prince that the Conservatives "were anxious to strengthen the Government in a bold national policy." Mr. Disraeli added that they were ready to help Lord Palmerston "out of scrapes, if he got into any." This time-honoured rule of an honourable Opposition was strictly observed.

Government upon the Italians by force of arms is unquestionably the right one," continues:—

The Emperor Napoleon is in a cleft stick between his promises to the Italian Revolution, and those he has made to the Pope. The self-deceptive form of resolution which he has tried to effect by the Treaty of Villafranca, has but added to his difficulties by fettering him with new relations towards Austria. He would fain burst these meshes, and make use of us for the purpose. . . . . People are frightened at the irresponsibility which, betwixt night and morning, may break with everything which they thought, when they went to bed, was too sacred to be touched.

On February 5th Lord John Russell wrote to the Queen that "French appetite for change is insatiable. It seems we are to have no rest in Europe." In reply Her Majesty wrote:—

We have been made regular dupes (which the Queen apprehended and warned against all along). The return to an English alliance, universal peace, respect for treaties, commercial fraternity, &c., &c., were the blinds to cover before Europe a policy of spoliation.

The Commercial Treaty * negotiated by Mr. Cobden between England and France was ratified on the 4th day of February, and Mr. Gladstone's remarkable effort of eloquence, the splendid speech which explained his Budget, carried the Treaty through a storm of opposition. Some severe remarks, however, were made in the House of Commons, with regard to the Emperor's conduct, and the Emperor in making the round of the diplomatic circle at the Tuileries the following night, addressed some hasty words, after the manner of Napoleon I., to the English Ambassador:—

"It was," said the Emperor, "really too bad. He had done all in his power to maintain a good understanding with England, but her conduct rendered this impossible. What had England to do with Savoy? And why was she not satisfied with the declaration he had made to me that he had no intention to annex Savoy to France without having previously obtained the consent of the Great Powers?"

Lord Cowley rejoined that the Emperor had never said that his action would depend on the consent of the Powers; and that had he been authorized to convey that assurance to his Government, England would have calmly awaited the decision at which the Great Powers might arrive. The Emperor then turned to the Russian Ambassador, who had been standing by, and

* Two days after the Treaty was signed, the Prince tells the Prince Regent of Prussia that it "will not give satisfaction here, because it gives France our coal and iron—the elements of our superiority hitherto—and in return, by loss of duties on wine and articles of luxury, causes us an immediate deficit in income of two millions sterling."

remarked that the conduct of England was inexplicable. Shortly afterwards the Emperor again came to Lord Cowley. This time, happily, no one was by, and the Ambassador had had time to think how to deal with the difficulty. He checked the "further progress of remarks in a direction already sufficiently dangerous, by saying that he considered himself justified in calling the Emperor's attention to the unusual course he had adopted in indulging in presence of the Russian Ambassador in animadversions on the conduct of England."

Leaving then the official tone, Lord Cowley appealed to the Emperor to consider whether he had been properly dealt with, remembering the personal regard and the anxiety to smooth over difficulties between the two Governments which in his official capacity he had always shown, even at the risk of exposing himself to being suspected of being more French than he ought to be.

The Emperor felt at once the mistake he had made, and begged Lord Cowley to think no more of what had occurred. His lordship, however, took the opportunity of putting the true state of the case before him, and thus in the end the Napoleonic address did good. The Queen wrote to her Foreign Minister that Lord Cowley deserved praise. Her Majesty continued:—

The circumstance is useful, as proving that the Emperor, if met with firmness, is more likely to retreat than if cajoled, and that the statesmen of Europe have much to answer for for having spoilt him in the last ten years by submission and cajolery. The expressions of the House of Commons have evidently much annoyed the Emperor, ... but they have also had their effect in making him reflect. If Europe were to stand together and make a united declaration against the annexation of Savoy, the evil might still be arrested; but less than that will not suffice.

No such declaration, however, was made. The other Powers contented themselves with letting the French Emperor know that his theory of natural frontiers was one they could not admit, and that any attempt to apply it elsewhere would meet with general resistance. The arrangement between the Courts of the Tuileries and of Turin was accordingly carried out. Northern and Central Italy were erected into one kingdom with Sardinia; and the Emperor received the price of his consent.

Concerning Prussia, "as usual, timorous and undecided," the Prince wrote to Baron Stockmar:—

Prussia's position is a weak one, and will continue to be so as long as she does not morally dominate Germany; and to be herself German is the secret to bring this about. Nobody will be inclined to go to war about Savoy, but "*le concert Européen*" would be a powerful check to similar tricks in the future.

Shortly afterwards Russia began to speak openly the same lan-

guage as to the Treaty of Paris of 1856 which had been used by the French Court as to the Treaties of 1815. The Russian Minister at Vienna declared that no dynasty in France could hold its ground if unable to restore to France the territory taken from her in 1815; and unless the House of Romanoff succeeded in recovering the portion of Bessarabia of which Russia had been deprived by the Treaty of 1856, and in cancelling the Black Sea provisions of that treaty, it could not hold its ground. Russia, accordingly, began to renew her complaints against the Ottoman Government, and declared that in the event of a revolt she could not remain a tranquil spectator of the massacres which were certain to ensue. Prince Gortschakoff, however, was not able to carry out an "atrocity" agitation policy at that time. The French Emperor was not prepared to place himself in hostility to the Western Powers, nor did he agree, indeed, with Russia on the Eastern Question. But the time seemed to him opportune for pushing his designs on the Rhenish frontier. In a letter from Lord John Russell to Lord Cowley, we read:—

> All my accounts show that Prussia is undermined by very active French agents, who distribute petitions for annexation to France. Prussia is told, as Austria has been told, that if she is robbed by a stronger neighbour she can rob a weaker neighbour in her turn.

Later on, the Queen wrote to King Leopold:—

> The restlessness of our neighbour, and the rumours one hears, must destroy all confidence. Really, it is too bad! No country, no human being would ever dream of disturbing France; every one would be glad to see her prosperous. But she must needs disturb every quarter of the globe and try to make mischief and set every one by the ears.

By the beginning of June these feelings had gained strength; for the time the *entente cordiale* was at an end. The Queen wrote to Lord Palmerston:—

> What is required, and is now attainable for the general security, is a mutual agreement between the three Powers—England, Austria, and Prussia—that each should make known to the other two any overture or proposition, direct or indirect, which either of the three may receive from France tending to any change of the existing state of territorial possession in Europe.

Steps were taken in this direction, and Lord John Russell's proposals were cordially responded to, especially by Prussia. The record of transactions in regard to external affairs we are unable from lack of space to follow.

In the month of May, while the French Emperor was increasing both his army and his fleet, it further seemed necessary to increase the national defences. Mr. Gladstone, however, was

strongly opposed to expenditure upon loans.[1] Writing to the Queen on the 24th May, the Premier says:—

Viscount Palmerston hopes to be able to overcome his objection; but if it should prove impossible, however great the loss to the Government by the retirement of Mr. Gladstone, it would be better to lose Mr. Gladstone than to run the risk of losing Portsmouth or Plymouth.

On the 17th March the Prince writes to Stockmar:—

Gladstone is now the real leader of the House of Commons, and works with an energy and vigour altogether incredible. . . . The Reform Bill is very democratic, but scarcely excites as much attention as a Turnpike Trust Bill.

The speech against lowering the franchise[2] made by Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton, the Prince warmly praised: "It is a real masterpiece." Lord Palmerston, writing to the Queen the same night, said "it was eloquent without being wordy, and was closely argued throughout." Nobody cared for the Bill, and it was withdrawn.

On June 23rd the first of the great Volunteer reviews was held in Hyde Park. It was a great success. At Edinburgh, in August, was held the first great review of Scottish Volunteers, which, according to the Prince, put "the French as much out of humour as Messrs. Cobden and Bright." The Duchess of Kent joined the party from her charming residence at Cramond, near Edinburgh, where Her Royal Highness was staying for the summer.

"Mamma arrived," says Her Majesty's diary, "about a quarter to three, and waited with us, looking at the splendid scene,—Arthur's Seat covered with human beings, and the Volunteers with bands marching in from every direction on to the ground close in front of the

[1] Writing to Stockmar in May, the Prince says that Mr. Gladstone's finance had in view "forcing us into disarmament." "The Volunteers have already run up to 124,000 men." In June the Prince wrote: "Mr. Gladstone, in common with Bright and Cobden, looks to the recent Commercial Treaty for England's real and only defence."

[2] A prediction to which Sir Theodore Martin has given emphasis has been fulfilled to the letter in the present day:—"No doubt we shall have members just as anxious for what is called the honour of the country who will make high-sounding speeches against truckling to absolute sovereigns, and insist on the right of the House of Commons *to become the garrulous confidant of every secret which Cabinets would keep to themselves.* But will the new representatives of the new constituency be as provident of practical defences as they may be lavish of verbal provocatives? Will they as readily submit to the taxation which is necessary to self-defence, so long as the world shall see wars commenced for the propagation of ideas, and peace concluded by the acquisition of dominions?" We may insert here a remark of Lord Aberdeen's, late in life. "Wisdom? Why this country is not governed by wisdom, but by talk. Who can talk will govern."

Palace. We waited long, watching everything from the window." . . . . "It was magnificent," again wrote the Queen—"finer decidedly than in London. There were more men, and the scenery here is so splendid. That fine mountain, Arthur's Seat, was crowded with people to the very top; and the Scotch are very demonstrative in their loyalty. Lord Breadalbane, at the head of his Highlanders, was the very picture of a Highland chieftain."

In November, 1860, Prince Louis of Hesse arrived at Windsor Castle "on a visit." Shortly afterwards he was betrothed to Princess Alice; and the Queen's diary presents an interesting picture of how the engagement came about:—

After dinner, while talking to the gentlemen, I perceived Alice and Louis talking before the fire-place more earnestly than usual, and when I passed to go to the other room both came up to me, and Alice, in much agitation, said he had proposed to her, and he begged for my blessing. I could only squeeze his hand and say "Certainly," and that we would see him in our room later. Got through the evening, working as well as we could. Alice came to our room—agitated, but quiet. . . . . Albert sent for Louis to his room, went first to him, and then called Alice and me in. . . . . Louis has a warm, noble heart. We embraced our dear Alice and praised her much to him. He pressed and kissed my hand, and I embraced him. After talking a little we parted—a most touching, and, to me, most sacred moment.

We must pass over many of the deeply interesting events recorded in this portion of the volume, and proceed to quote a few passages from the closing pages. The English passenger steamer "Trent" was boarded on November 8, 1861, and Mr. Mason and his friends were forcibly removed by Captain Wilkes, in an American ship of war. On November 30, after the Cabinet meeting, Lord John Russell forwarded to the Queen the drafts of the despatches to be sent to our Ambassador. "They reached Windsor Castle in the evening, and doubtless occupied much of the Prince's thoughts, in the long hours of the winter morning, when he found sleep impossible." Ill as he was, he rose at seven, and before eight he brought to the Queen the draft of a memorandum in correction of Lord John Russell's principal despatch. "He could eat no breakfast," is the entry in her Majesty's diary, "and looked very wretched." He told the Queen he could hardly hold the pen in writing; and the *fac-simile* of the memorandum given in the present volume bears traces of his weakness.[1]

[1] The document has a peculiar interest:—

"WINDSOR CASTLE, December, 1, 1861.

"The Queen returns these important drafts, which upon the whole she approves; but she cannot help feeling that the main draft—that for communication to the American Government—is somewhat meagre. She should have liked to have seen the expression of a hope that the American captain did not act under instructions, or, if he did, that he misapprehended them,—that the United States Government must be

Yet never had the Prince's suggestions been more statesmanlike or more successful. His amendments were cordially adopted by Lord John, and Lord Palmerston thought them "excellent." Probably, under God, his action spared England and the United States the horrors of a war.[1] When the amended despatch reached America, and before it was placed in Mr. Seward's hands, he told our Ambassador that "everything depended upon the wording of it," and begged, as a personal favour, to be permitted to read it before receiving it officially. Lord Lyons wrote :—

Almost immediately afterwards he came here. He told me he was pleased to find that the despatch was courteous and friendly—not dictatorial or menacing. His task of reconciling his Government to a pacific course—no easy one—was thus greatly simplified.

On November 28th, the Prince felt himself rather better, though aching and chilly—*noch immer recht miserable.* He had been unwell some time. The 1st of December was a Sunday. Her Majesty writes in her diary :—

He went with us to chapel, but looked very wretched and ill. Still he insisted on going through all the kneeling. . . . Albert came to our family dinner, but could eat nothing—yet he was able to talk and even to tell stories. After dinner he sat quietly listening to Alice and Marie (Leiningen) playing, and went to bed at half-past 10, in hopes to get to sleep. I joined him at half-past 11, and he said he was shivering with cold and could not sleep at all.

On the 3rd there was greater uneasiness :—

Another night of wakeful restlessness followed. A little sleep which the Prince had from six to eight in the morning filled the Queen with hope and thankfulness. But the distaste for food continued. He would take nothing—hardly any broth, no rusk or bread—nothing. My anxiety is great, and I feel utterly lost, when he, to whom I confide all, is in such a listless state, and hardly smiles! . . . Sir James (Clark) arrived, and was grieved to see no more improvement, but not discouraged.

---

fully aware that the British Government could not allow its flag to be insulted and the security of her mail communications to be placed in jeopardy; and her Majesty's Government are unwilling to believe that the United States Government intended wantonly to put an insult upon this country, and to add to their many distressing complications by forcing a question of dispute upon us; and that we are therefore glad to believe that, upon a full consideration of the circumstances of the undoubted breach of international law committed, they would spontaneously offer such redress as alone could satisfy this country—viz., the restoration of the unfortunate passengers and a suitable apology."

[1] Congress had passed a vote of thanks to Captain Wilkes. In this crisis the Emperor of the French proved his loyalty to England by a prompt and plain declaration; Austria, Prussia, and Russia, took a similar course.

On the 6th, Dr. Jenner broke the intelligence to the Queen that the illness was gastric or low fever; it must have its course, viz., a month, dating from the beginning, which he thought was November 22nd, the day the Prince went to Sandhurst, a day of incessant rain. Her Majesty notes that "his manner all along was so unlike himself, and he had sometimes such a strange, wild look." We read:—

The listlessness and the irritability, so foreign to the Prince's nature, but so characteristic of his disease, continued; and at times his mind would wander. . . . . When her Majesty returned to him after dinner, on the 8th December, she records with a touching simplicity, "He was so pleased to see me—stroked my face, and smiled and called me 'Liebes Frauchen' ('dear little wife'). . . . Precious love! His tenderness this evening, when he held my hands, and stroked my face, touched me so much—made me so grateful."

On the 10th there seemed to be some improvement; and on the 11th the Queen records "Another good night, for which I thank and bless God." But on the 12th the fever increased. On the 14th the end was near:—

"About half-past five," her Majesty writes, "I went in and sat down beside his bed, which had been wheeled towards the middle of the room. 'Gutes Frauchen,' he said, and kissed me, and then gave a sort of piteous moan, or rather sigh, not of pain, but as if he felt that he was leaving me, and laid his head upon my shoulder, and I put my arm under his. But the feeling passed away again, and he seemed to wander and to doze, and yet know all. Sometimes I could not catch what he said. Occasionally he spoke French. Alice came in and kissed him, and he took her hand. Bertie, Helena, Louise, and Arthur came in, one after the other, and took his hand, and Arthur kissed it. But he was dozing, and did not perceive them. Then he opened his dear eyes, and asked for Sir Charles Phipps, who came in and kissed his hand, but then again his dear eyes were closed. General Grey and Sir Thomas Biddulph each came in and kissed his hand, and were dreadfully overcome. It was a terrible moment, but, thank God! I was able to command myself, and to be perfectly calm, and remained sitting by his side."

* * * * *

The Queen had retired for a little to the adjoining room, but, hearing the Prince's breathing become worse, she returned to the sick-chamber. She found the Prince bathed in perspiration, which the doctors said might be an effort of nature to throw off the fever. Bending over him she whispered, "*Es ist kleines Frauchen!*" ("'Tis your own little wife!") and he bowed his head and kissed her. At this time he seemed half dozing, quite calm, and only wishing to be left quiet and undisturbed, "as he used to be when tired and not well."

Again, as the evening advanced, her Majesty retired to give way to her grief in the adjoining room. She had not long been gone, when a rapid change set in, and the Princess Alice was requested by Sir

James Clark to ask her Majesty to return. The import of the summons was too plain. When the Queen entered, she took the Prince's left hand, "which was already cold, though the breathing was quite gentle," and knelt down by his side. On the other side of the bed was the Princess Alice, while at its feet knelt the Prince of Wales and the Princess Helena. Not far from the foot of the bed were Prince Ernest Leiningen, the physicians, and the Prince's valet Löhlein. General the Hon. Robert Bruce knelt opposite to the Queen, and the Dean of Windsor, Sir Charles Phipps, and General Grey were also in the room.

In the solemn hush of that mournful chamber there was such grief as has rarely hallowed any deathbed. A great light, which had blessed the world, and which the mourners had but yesterday hoped might long bless it, was waning fast away. A husband, a father, a friend, a master, endeared by every quality by which man in such relations can win the love of his fellow-man, was passing into the Silent Land, and his loving glance, his wise counsels, his firm manly thought should be known among them no more. The Castle clock chimed the third quarter after ten. Calm and peaceful grew the beloved form; the features settled into the beauty of a perfectly serene repose; two or three long but gentle breaths were drawn; and the great soul had fled, to seek a nobler scope for its aspirations in the world within the veil, for which it had often yearned, where there is rest for the weary, and where "the spirits of the just are made perfect."

Art. VI.—THE CHURCH IN WALES.

IN the year 1811, the Calvinistic Methodists of Wales, as I explained in the February Number of The Churchman, seceded from the communion of the Church of England. They then formed themselves into an independent body of dissenters; they became numerous and powerful; they exercised great influence in forming the character and fashioning the habits of the Welsh people in their social and religious tendencies during the first quarter, and for some years beyond the first quarter, of the present century. Methodism as taught by John Elias, Ebenezer Morris, and their contemporaries, left its mark, and stamped its image on a large and respectable portion of my countrymen; that mark and image have not yet been effaced, but they are wearing away; their outlines are gradually diminishing and disappearing; the Welsh Methodists of the present day are losing the spirit and deviating from the ways of their forefathers.

The other two leading sections of Dissent in the Principality, —the Congregationalist and the Baptist—existed before the year 1811, when the Calvinistic Methodists severed their connexion with the Church. Their history can be traced back to the time

of the Commonwealth if not beyond it. But at the beginning of the eighteenth century their condition in Wales was bare existence; their chapels were few and far between; their congregations small and insignificant; they exercised little or no influence on public opinion. When the Methodist revival broke out in the second quarter of the eighteenth century, the Congregationalists and the Baptists felt the effect; they grew and waxed strong, side by side with the Calvinistic Methodists; men of great and popular talents, and of great force of character, rose among them; these produced an impression on the localities in which they lived and where they laboured, and it is found that the denomination to which they severally belonged predominates in the places connected with their names. Thus the Congregationalists and the Baptists, like the Calvinistic Methodists, became powerful factors in the formation of the religious character of the Welsh people, during the first part of the present century. They are not singly, if the whole of Wales is taken into the reckoning, as numerous as the Calvinistic Methodists, but in particular districts they respectively exceed them in number and influence. The three denominations as a rule are found in all localities, their chapels are often built within a stone's throw of one another, and they create a spirit of rivalry among the people which dishonours the name of religion, and is detrimental to its highest interest. And here and there Welsh Wesleyan chapels are seen up and down the country; but Wesleyanism is not popular among the Welsh people. The founders of Welsh Methodism joined Whitfield and the Countess of Huntingdon when the split occurred between them and John Wesley, and in order to distinguish their doctrinal views called themselves "Calvinistic Methodists." The people when they speak in Welsh never apply the term Methodists to the adherents of Wesley, but call them simply Wesleyans.

These sections of Dissent are firmly established in the country; they have acquired and they retain a strong hold on the minds of the people. In doctrine they differ little from one another, and in their mode of conducting their public worship the difference is still less, and yet there is little communion or spiritual intercourse between them. They have no mutual fellowship with one another in the observance of Divine ordinances and in the enjoyment of religious privileges; they are seldom seen except on special occasions in each other's chapels; they have their respective organizations, and those organizations are not formed and adapted to be worked together in harmony, but they are separate machineries independent of and often in collision with one another. Each sect has its own chapels and ministers, its Sunday schools, its prayer meetings and its private gatherings—its colleges and its theological students—its magazines and publications;

and these varied machineries are worked with zeal and activity, but I fear—and I say it in no uncharitable spirit—that the zeal which sets the machinery in motion is rarely that holy affection of a spiritual mind which the Scripture calls "the zeal of God's house."

This is a remark that requires an explanation, and I shall endeavour to make plain my meaning. "Zeal" is an affection or passion of the mind; it may be good or bad; it takes its colour from the root whence it springs; the motive that produces it gives to it its character. If it arises from "love out of a pure heart," it is good—it is then a virtue; but if it proceeds from the "lust of an evil heart," it is bad—it is then a vice. And so in Scriptures the Hebrew word—קנא—and the Greek word—Ζηλος—commonly translated in the English version "zeal" or "jealousy," bear a double meaning; in some places they are used in a good sense, but in others in a bad sense. The Hebrew word, for instance, is used in the former sense in Num. xxv. 13, where it is said of Phinehas that he was "zealous for his God;" and in the latter sense in Genesis xxxvii. 11—translated "envied" in the English version—where it is said of Joseph's brethren that "they envied him." And the Greek word also is sometimes used in a good sense, as by St. Paul when he uses it in 2 Cor. vii. 11, among words expressive of virtues for which he commends the Corinthians; and sometimes in a bad sense, as also by St. Paul, when in Gal. v. 20, he enters it in the list of words by which he designates "the works of the flesh," the English word "emulation" being its translation in that list. And I have further to add that the Greek word bears in the New Testament this double meaning even when it is applied to religious affections or emotions. When thus applied, it is used in a good sense in the words quoted in John ii. 17, and applied to our Lord—"the zeal of Thine house hath eaten me up"—and in a bad sense when it is applied to the Corinthians in 1 Cor. iii. 3, where St. Paul tells them, "whereas there is among you envying (in Greek, zeal) and strife and divisions, are ye not carnal and walk as men?"

The case of the Church of Corinth is remarkable; it demands from me more than a passing word; it supplies in my opinion an illustration of the state of religion in the Principality at the present day.

The Church of Corinth was rich in spiritual gifts, and sound in the faith; it was not cold or lukewarm, but hot and fervent in religion; enthusiasm tinged with fanaticism worked like leaven in the meal in its public assemblies; when its members came together to one place for prayer and praise, for mutual instruction and edification, and for the public celebration of the ordinances of religion, there was much life and

fervour among them, but little wisdom and discretion; tumult and confusion often prevailed, and things were not done decently and in order; party spirit ran high among them and gave a strong colour to their religious fervency; the spirit of jealousy and faction under the garb of religious zeal leavened the whole lump; they "gloried in men" and they were "puffed up for one against another;" they said "every one of them, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ." Thus religious zeal degenerating into a party spirit—although it lifts up for banners the names of honoured servants of God—becomes a carnal affection; it blights the graces and stunts the spiritual growth of the Christian.

Clemens Romanus in his epistle to the Corinthians refers to the spirit of jealousy and envy which was at work among them, and for which St. Paul so severely rebuked them. Among the Corinthians it took the form of religious zeal, but Clemens quotes from the Old Testament as parallels to it and illustrations of it instances in which it showed itself not only in the concerns of religion, but also in matters of State and in family feuds; he shows that the disposition was the same, and equally "carnal" whether the occasion that called it forth was secular or religious. The passage is so very striking that I am induced to quote it *in extenso*. Clemens uses in it the Greek word Ζηλος—for jealousy or envy, but I translate it "zeal"—although the English word does not bear the double meaning of the original—that the English reader may see that the instances which Clemens quotes have an affinity to the case of the Corinthians, who, under the influence of party zeal, were torn and divided into religious factions. The passage is found in chapter iv., where, after referring to the case of Cain and Abel, and quoting Gen. iv. 3-8, he proceeds to speak thus:—

> You see, brethren, how zeal and envy led to the murder of a brother. Through zeal also our father Jacob fled from the face of Esau, his brother; zeal made Joseph to be persecuted unto death and to come into bondage. Zeal compelled Moses to flee from the face of Pharaoh, King of Egypt, when he heard these words from his fellow-countryman: Who made thee a judge and ruler over us? Wilt thou kill me as thou didst kill the Egyptian yesterday? On account of zeal Aaron and Miriam had to make their abode without the camp; zeal brought Dathan and Abiram alive to Hades through the sedition which they excited against God's servant Moses; through zeal David underwent the hatred not only of foreigners, but was also persecuted by Saul, King of Israel.

This "zeal," this spirit of jealousy and envy, which Clemens here describes, lies deep in the nature of man; it is one of the most powerful forces that set his nature in motion; it is a root of bitterness which has produced direful results in

the world, and the results it has produced in the name of religion within the Church of Christ are hardly less direful.

This spirit is rife in Wales; it finds kindly soil among the contending sects which distract religion in the Principality; it assumes the form of religious zeal, but it is not zeal for the truth as it is in Jesus, for all the leading sections of Dissent and the Church are one on the fundamental articles of the Christian faith; it is a party spirit fostered by jealousy and envy, and breaking out into strifes and contentions in things which in religion may be called indifferent. As at Corinth, so to-day in Wales, it "glories in man;" it puffs up among the people a spirit of rivalry for one sect against another. One saith, I am a Methodist; another, I am a Congregationalist; another, I am a Baptist; and another, I am a Churchman; and it may be well said of them, as St. Paul said of the Corinthians, that they are "carnal and walk as men;" and they may be well asked the question, Is Christ divided that they are split up into separate parties and opposing factions? The difference between them is small, and yet the line of separation is broad and the breach is wide.

The state of religion among the leading sections of Dissent is a question that deeply affects the interest of the Welsh Church, and on this account I have dwelt at considerable length upon it. From my remarks it will be seen that in my opinion jealousy and envy under the garb of religious zeal is powerfully at work among them; and this spirit of rivalry is as clearly seen in their mutual animosities among themselves as in their hostility to the Church; they are as jealous of one another as they are of the Church. I do not write indiscriminately. I believe there are holy and spiritually-minded men among Welsh Nonconformists of whom it may be said, as it was said of Noah, that they are "just and perfect in their generation, and that they walk with God." They are cast, indeed, in the mould of their own sect, and they may possibly have its impress, but when they are brought to the test they show that they are "Israelites indeed in whom there is no guile;" they sink their sectarian differences in the cause of their common Christianity. And, again, in these remarks I am not referring to the spirit of animosity and strife which politics breed and foster among different sections of Dissent in Wales. Among political Dissenters that spirit is active and strong and mighty in operation; it leavens and colours all their doings in matters of religion; it has possession of their pulpits; its utterances there are as distinctly heard and as clearly distinguished as on platforms and in the Press; under its influences Dissenters belonging to their various denominations sink their sectarian differences in their common hostility to the Church, and join hand

in hand in their efforts to overthrow her. The spirit which this unholy alliance creates passes like the blasting of an east wind over the country, and blights the growth of spiritual religion among the people; and it does what is worse than this —it digs up religion by the roots and denies it a place in the Legislature and the Government of the country; under its influence Calvinistic Methodists and other orthodox Dissenters cross the borders and hold forth the right hand of fellowship to Unitarians and infidels in a common effort to sever religion from education, and to exclude the Bible from the schools. This remark supplies an answer to the question which has doubtless been puzzling to our friends in England—How is it that Wales —I blush while I pen the sentence—that Wales of all countries, where the Bible Society is so popular and so liberally supported, and where Bibles are scattered broadcast through the length and breadth of the land, and extensively read by the people, appears in the Government returns as having Board Schools out of all proportion with England in which no instruction in the Bible is given? The political bias—that Governments have no concern with religion—has produced this result, and the spirit which this bias evokes immolates with profane hands on the altars of orthodoxy revealed religion with its life to the demon of false Liberalism. This "enemy is come in like a flood," and the Church in Wales, if she is faithful to her mission, will "lift up a standard against him."

The spirit of faction, however, with which I am dealing, and to which I am anxious more particularly to call attention, is not that which arises from political bias, but that which proceeds from religious bigotry; religion, and not politics, is the atmosphere in which it breathes and thrives; it is religious zeal which forgets "the weightier matters of the law" and "strains at gnats" which may be called the incidents and accidents of religion. It is developed in various ways among the people; it is seen in the attachment which they have to their own sect, and the interest they take in extending its influence; they are passionately and jealously fond of their own chapels, their own preachers, their own Sunday schools, and their own periodicals; this fondness, which if kept within the limits of moderation would be legitimate, is excessive and creates prejudice and ill-feeling in one sect against another. It interrupts and destroys Christian intercourse between them. In the same villages among sparse population there are chapels close to each other, representing the various sections of Dissent, and the congregations which belong to them, instead of joining together as brethren in Christian work on the common platform of revealed truths in which they agree, have their separate organizations and conflicting interests in defence and furtherance of the Shibboleths

which distinguish their parties; the zeal which they show in winning converts to their sects reminds one of the words which our Lord addressed to the Pharisees when he said to them that "they compassed sea and land to make one proselyte." Liberty and conscience are indeed alleged in defence of the party zeal that is at work among us. I advocate liberty, but I see before my eyes proofs among the people that Christian liberty can degenerate into wanton licentiousness, and I maintain the rights of conscience, but I cannot forget that St. Paul, in reproving the Christians at Corinth for their "strife and envying and divisions," made no mention of conscience as if it was an element in the question, but ascribed their proclivities and prejudices on the matters in which they differed to their "carnal" affections; his silence shows that conscience had little to do with their differences, and it may be said with equal truth that conscience has as little to do with the differences which divide at the present day orthodox Dissenters in the Principality into separate sects and rival factions. But, as I have already said, I am not here speaking indiscriminately. I rejoice to say—and thanksgiving to God thrills my heart with emotions while I say it—that God has "reserved" in the midst of us seven thousand men—and more than seven times seven thousand—who have not bowed the knee to the Baal of religious bigotry; they are rooted and built up in Christ, and are established in faith and love; they realize and enjoy "the communion of saints." They are not as numerous now as they were in the days of our fathers and fore-fathers. I remember many in my early youth the savour of whose piety retains its freshness in my mind to this hour; but I now seldom or ever come across their like. The time of revival in the days of our fathers was a "feast of ingathering," it was time of spiritual harvest, when souls in great abundance were gathered to the Saviour. The harvest for the present seems past, but yet there is a residue whom the Lord has called, and they are found among us as "the gleaning grapes when the vintage is done;" they are a "posterity preserved in the earth" unto the Church; they are seed plots which promise abundant harvest.

I have observed that the party spirit of which I speak shows itself as much in mutual rivalry among the different sections of Dissent themselves, as in their hostility to the Church; each sect is zealous for its own party, and its antagonism is provoked whether the rivalry arises from another section of Dissent or from the Church of England; whenever the collision occurs—and where the organizations are so numerous, the collisions of necessity frequently occur—there the spirit of rivalry turns up and produces its mischievous results. Independent of this spirit of rivalry which the separate interests of each sect create, I do not

believe that there is a deep-rooted hostility in the minds of the great bulk of the Welsh people against the Church of their fathers. This is my deliberate opinion—incidents which here and there crop up showing how the pulse of the people beats lead me to this opinion. When, for instance, a Dissenter becomes dissatisfied with his own sect, which is not an unfrequent occurrence, it often happens that he shows his preference for the Church; he does not join another Dissenting body, where he would be readily admitted to communion, but returns to the Church of his fathers; this is particularly the case if the clergyman of the parish is a good man, preaching the truth of the Gospel earnestly and faithfully, leading a holy and pious life, attending diligently to his duties, discreet and considerate in his religious practices, showing an interest in the temporal and spiritual welfare of his people, and living in charity and at peace with all his neighbours. Then, again, I have a personal testimony to bear on this point. I have to apologize for this personal reference, but it is a question of experience, and I simply state the fact and leave it to speak for itself. In the discharge of my duties I visit, as far as I am able, Churchmen and Dissenters alike indiscriminately in their sicknesses and afflictions. I read to them the Word of God, and pray with them—always extempore—and I speak to them to the best of my ability words of counsel and comfort, and for the thirty-four years within a few months I have had the privilege of labouring in the ministry, I cannot call to mind one instance in which I appeared as an unwelcomed visitor at any house, or by the side of any sick bed, in my official capacity as a clergyman of the parish; and I believe that my testimony on this point is in harmony with the experience of my brethren generally throughout the Principality. And I rejoice here to add that I have often left the dying beds of Dissenters with a heart deeply moved with thanksgiving to God that they had been taught the truth of the Bible, and the knowledge of the Saviour, and had been led so firmly to build their hope on the Rock of Ages as to triumph over death, and to rejoice in hope of the glory of God under the ministry which they had been in the habit of attending.

Again. The success of the National Schools in Wales, under the spiritual superintendence of the parochial clergy, is another incident which shows the pulse of the people. This success has been so great that in my opinion, if the Elementary Education Act of 1870 had not been passed the Church would have monopolized elementary education throughout the rural districts of Wales. A cry of grievance was raised that Dissenters should send their children to Church schools, and political capital was made out of it but beneath this cry the fact remained—which indicated an undercurrent of feeling

so strong that no political agitation could disturb or arrest it in its progress—that the people continued to send their children to Church Schools, and—where circumstances gave them an opportunity to show their choice—often to prefer them to British schools; this fact is incompatible with the supposition that there exists in the Welsh people a feeling of antipathy or hostility to the Church and her ministers. And also another incident, which, as it seems to me, indicates still more clearly the direction in which the spontaneous pulse of the people beats, is the fact that many, if not most, of the Welsh clergy, especially in South Wales, are sons of Nonconformist parents. The parents, although communicants or attendants in the chapel where from their earliest youth they had been accustomed to assemble for public worship, yet dedicated their sons, in many instances even from their birth, to the ministry of the Church of England. The Calvinistic Methodists some years ago at an association in Cardiganshire called the attention of their adherents to this fact, and condemned it; they passed a resolution to discourage the practice, but notwithstanding the obstructions thus and otherwise thrown in its way it still prevails; the obstructions are artificial—they are sectarian cobwebs woven out of religious bigotry, but the practice of the parents is the natural outcome of the sentiment and the feelings of the people—it shows catholicity of spirit in sympathy with the Church of England, and indicates that there is still lurking in the bosom of many a Welshman, although by the accident of birth and habit a Nonconformist, a reverence of a type that cannot be mistaken for the Church of his fathers. And I have another fact to mention which leads to the same conclusion. Harvest thanksgiving services are very popular in Wales. On these occasions the clergyman of the parish invites his parishioners to meet him in God's house to render unto Him sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for the increase of the fields and ingathering of the harvest; a ready and willing response is always given to the invitation. At these services the churches are crowded, and the congregations are composed of Nonconformists and Churchmen; all this bespeaks a friendly and not a hostile feeling. And there is one other fact bearing on the question which I am unwilling to omit; I mean the solemnization of marriages in churches. It was referred to by Canon Bevan in the paper he read at Swansea Congress on "The past and present condition of the Church of Wales." I shall give it as he puts it; his words are these:—

> Though it is difficult to adduce statistical evidence on a point of this sort (*i.e.* whether the Nonconformists are thoroughly alienated from the Church), I think I may without impropriety refer to the marriage returns as having some bearing on the point. From the last report we find that in thirty-three out of the fifty-one districts into

which the Welsh counties are divided, marriages at churches exceed those at Nonconformist chapels; and the total marriages at church throughout Wales exceed those in chapel in the ratio of four to three.

A feather shows which way the wind blows, and the incidents which I have enumerated, though trivial in themselves, sufficiently indicate that the Church still maintains a strong hold on the minds of the Welsh people. I believe that a great future lies before her. I believe she is a power among the people, and that her power is on the increase; she has capabilities for doing good which the various sects of Nonconformity do not possess, and I am much mistaken if those capabilities will not be hereafter developed in furtherance of true religion and virtue, to an extent beyond anything we have yet witnessed. The late Bishop of St. David's—Dr. Thirlwall—once said, in a sermon I heard from him many years ago, of the Church in Wales—that "there was no wrinkle on her brow, or faltering in her step"—a sentiment I fully endorse.

In my next Paper I hope to take a review of her position and prospects in the fulfilment—amidst conflicting sects—of her mission among the people.

J. POWELL JONES.

Reviews.

Word, Work, and Will. Collected Papers. By WILLIAM THOMSON, D.D., F.R.S., F.R.G.S., Lord Archbishop of York. Pp. 332. London: John Murray, 1879.

The Papers here collected have appeared, two of them at least, as portions of larger works, and others separately and in a minor form. The Most Rev. Prelate has conferred a boon upon many in thus republishing them. The contents of the volume are, "The Synoptic Gospels," originally published in the Speaker's Commentary—"The Death of Christ," one of the treatises in "Aids of Faith," an important and useful publication in answer to the notorious *Essays and Reviews*—"God Exists"—"The Work of Life"—"Design in Nature"—"Sports and Pastimes"—"On the Emotions in Preaching"—"Defects in Missionary Work"—and lastly, "Limits of Philosophical Enquiry," an address to the Edinburgh Philosophical Institute.

A glance at this series of titles will make it sufficiently clear that in every one of his Papers the Archbishop is dealing with no effete or buried controversies of the past. The questions of which they treat are every whit as rife and momentous now as when the Addresses and Papers were first made public. The Gospels are still the centre of a conflict of which the issue is not doubtful, though, such is the vitality of scepticism, and such the prolific character of modern criticism, the end of it may yet be distant. The student of God's Word will find here a thoroughly reliable and original *résumé* of the grounds on which we confidently accept the Synoptic Gospels as genuine, authentic, and inspired histories of Jesus Christ, and with it a condensed and masterly criticism of the

subtle and mischievous theories of Tubingen and similar schools of thought, whether German or English.

With equal acumen and learning, and with something, too, of the fervour and force of his natural style, the Archbishop in the "Death of Christ," deals with the modern attempts to upset our faith in the crucified Christ, as the vicarious and expiatory sacrifice for human sin. Since this Essay first appeared, several works have been published bearing on the subject, some of them in great part an expansion of the Archbishop's line of argument, but it will still be referred to as a calm, candid, and careful defence of the orthodox doctrine.

From the paper on the existence of God we extract the following striking passage—but one indeed among many with which the volume teems—as an illustration at once of the clear and incisive logic with which the Archbishop vindicates the position he has taken up, and of the charm and grace of style with which he is able to invest one of the profoundest of subjects :—

Perhaps, after all, not use but beauty and harmony are the chief ends of created things. We may one day understand that already one great end of creation was answered, when "God saw that it was good." All created things are ends as well as means. The fragrant rose, the leaping brook, the spotted leopard, *are*, because it is good that they should be. And though no man shall ever inhale the perfume of the flower, or drink of the brook in the way, or possess the flecked and glossy skin—they shall not have been made in vain.

How then does it stand with the arguments from design at present? Science tells us that the earth was once a globe of white fire, without life upon it of plant or beast. Long ages passed over; it became a dwelling for Homer and Aristotle, for Dante and Shakespeare. As no one alleges a change of purpose in the world's upbuilding, we must assume that in that liquid ball of scathing fire all the beauty of nature, all noble deeds and great thoughts of mankind, and mankind itself, were potentially contained. That was the fiery bud, this is the expanded flower. There was in that no life of plant nor animal, no wise discourse, no moral order, and yet the germs of them all must have been there, undiscernible. Geology writes, as well as she can, the first chapter of the account of that growth. Then history takes up the wondrous tale—history, which Augustine calls a beautiful poem decked out by God's own hand for man. The most wonderful epic of creation, full of grand surprises, of patient waiting, of skilful construction, of glorious adornment. Each stage of growth was wonderful, until the next surpassed it. Each had in itself some completeness, yet each laid the foundation for higher forms of beauty and for fresh traces of living beings. Of the cause of this growth there are but two opinions, to speak broadly and roughly: one of which is that a Being of infinite wisdom contrived and effected it; and the other is, that it evolved itself with no thought or contrivance at all, and that the thought that can understand and appreciate its marvels came first into being when man appeared—that, in a word, there is no conscious thought or wisdom but in man.

Now I will ask you to give your attention, and to decide between these two. Thought, and all that it includes, place man at the head of creation, and constitute his true nobility. A thinking man, as Pascal truly says, amid the brute and senseless forces of nature, feels superiority to those forces even whilst they crush him, for he can understand them, and think them. Is he, then, the only thinking being that exists? Did something or other—call it fate, call it nature, call it energy—make thought, having itself no thought? Did the blind make eyes, and the deaf ears? Were conscience and duty evolved by themselves without assistance, out of seething slime? I am challenged to demonstrate the contrary. From this one argument of the wisdom of creation I confess I cannot demonstrate. There was Kant's success. He proved that the arguments from design could not amount to a demonstration. But there, too, his success ended. We are free to decide what is probable—what is practical. Well, it is not probable that the world was prepared for life by a

power that knew not life; for thought by a power that could not think; for law and duty, and love of God, by a force to which those ideas are as alien as they are to the weathered brows of the stony Memnon, whose sightless balls pretend to look over the Egyptian wastes. Pp. 199-201.

Several other passages we had marked for quotation, but we will content ourselves with heartily recommending the Archbishop's volume as an admirable repertory of argumentative weapons for all who are either assailed by the modern scepticism, or called to stand forth in more prominent defence of God's truth.

Sister Dora: a Biography. By MARGARET LONSDALE. Eighth Edition. Pp. 260. C. Kegan Paul and Co., 1880.

Dorothy Wyndlow Pattison was born at the village of Hauxwell, in the North Riding of Yorkshire, January 16th, 1832. Her father, the Rev. Mark J. Pattison, was for many years rector of Hauxwell; and Dorothy was the youngest but one of Mr. and Mrs. Pattison's twelve children. From her mother she inherited beauty of feature, and from her father a well-proportioned figure and fine bearing. Petted as a child on account of her ill-health, not allowed to "do lessons" regularly, she was not spoilt. After recovering from a very severe illness at the age of fourteen, she became fond of riding, and by active exercise in the open air her health greatly improved. By the time she was 20 years old Dora, as she now liked to be called, had lost every sign of delicacy, and had become a tall, strong, healthy woman. Her never-failing spirits made her the life of the house; the "bright, bonnie maiden," as a neighbour termed her, was called by her father "his sunshine." She had a strong power of personal influence, and an indomitable will.

After she had reached the age of 20, there were yet nine years which she passed, to all outward appearance, quietly at home. She had learnt a good deal from her sister, and still more from her elder brother, Mr. Mark Pattison, now Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford. Her mental qualities were remarkable. But she was eager to be out in the world working; and when Miss Nightingale's work during the Crimean war excited such enthusiasm, Dora's spirit of adventure was roused. She implored her father to let her join the band of women who went out as nurses. He reminded her that she was untrained, and she submitted, but apparently the disappointment left her exceedingly restless. After the death of Mrs. Pattison, her main occupation at home—nursing—having been taken away from her, she craved for change; the quiet village life became more and more distasteful to her. Mr. Pattison did not approve of her becoming a "sister of mercy;" but her wilfulness was strong and showed itself in many ways. On her death-bed, twenty years later, she said, referring to her behaviour towards her father, "I was very wilful; I did very wrong." The end of it was, that in October, 1861, Dora left home, not to join the Sisterhood at Redcar, as she had desired, but to become a village schoolmistress. At Little Woolston she remained three years, toiling hard, much respected, but apparently not happy. After an attack of pleurisy, she went to Redcar to recover her health. The associations of that place revived in her "the old longing for regular work and training," and at length she became attached to the Sisterhood of Good Samaritans. "Her father neither gave nor withheld his consent, but Dorothy knew only too well that none of her family approved of what she had done."

Of her almost morbid restlessness, the biographer makes mention, and at the same time of her painful doubts. She had fallen, it appears, under the influence of an intellect more powerful than her own; *whose* intellect we are not told; and "her mind was filled with doubts relating

to the authenticity and inspiration of the Holy Scriptures." A desire to deepen her devotion to Christ, apparently, and thus to gain the victory over Broad Church doubtings, led her to the servile obedience of an extreme High Churchism.

Of this obedience we may quote a few illustrations. We read, p. 23:—

The Sisterhood of the Good Samaritans was one of those communities which are called "secular;" a term meant to express that the members of it are not contemplative, but active, and that they take no vows, either openly or secretly, excepting the vows of obedience to the clergyman who calls himself their "pastor," and to the person whom he may appoint out of their number to the office of "Sister in Charge," commonly called "Mother Superior." "Sister Dora," as Miss Pattison now became, was put through a course of severe training, which was as distasteful to her as anything in the shape of work could possibly be. She made beds, cleaned and scoured floors and grates, swept and dusted, and finally became a cook in the kitchen at Coatham. At first, she literally sat down and cried, when the beds she had just put in order were all pulled to pieces again, by some superior authority, who did not approve of the method in which they were made. Sister Dora, already aching in every limb from the unaccustomed strain upon her muscles, had to pick up the bedclothes from the floor, where they had been thrown, and begin her toil over again.

Again, p. 35:—

Towards the middle of December she was ordered by the Sisterhood to go and nurse a private case in the south of England. The committee at Walsall were told, at the same time, that another Sister would be sent to take charge of the hospital, but they were persuaded that they had got the right woman in the right place, and were not at all disposed to give her up without a struggle. They wrote and remonstrated with those in authority at Coatham, but before a final answer came, Sister Dora received a letter from her own home, telling her that her father was dangerously ill, and desired to see her at once. After the orders she had received, she did not consider herself at liberty to go to Hauxwell without communication with Coatham; she therefore telegraphed to the Home, telling the condition in which her father was, and his earnest longing for her presence, begging them to send another nurse to the private patient, and thus to leave her free to go home without delay. The almost incredible answer came back immediately, "No, you must go at once to Devonshire."

With a strangely mistaken sense of duty, Sister Dora set off to do the bidding of her self-chosen masters. She had scarcely reached her destination when she received the tidings, forwarded from Walsall, of her father's death. Then came from the Sisterhood a tardy permission to attend the funeral, if she pleased. She wrote back, in bitterness of spirit, to the effect that as when he was alive they would not allow her to go to him, now he was dead she no longer cared to go. Even the urgent representations made to her by her family, that she ought to attend her father's funeral, produced no effect, and she returned to Walsall, but almost broken-hearted, and with no spirit to face the work which there awaited her.

Comment is needless. No wonder that resentment sprang up in her mind; the breach between her and the despotic direction of the Sisterhood went on widening for years.

In Walsall, to which she had been sent in 1865, was to be her work to the end of her days. Before coming to Walsall an offer of marriage had been declined. "Her affections were not deeply enough engaged," says the biographer, "to furnish her own mind with a sufficient excuse for leaving the life of active usefulness to which she had pledged herself by entering the Sisterhood." We have quoted the words "*pledged herself*;" but what kind of pledge, or vow, she had thus given, does not appear. At all events, according to the biographer, Miss Pattison seemed to feel herself somehow bound. Towards the close of her life, however, she regretted that she had adhered to celibacy. "A woman ought to live

with a man, and to be in subjection," she said; and further, "her love, almost amounting to a passion, for children," was never satisfied. Another offer of marriage, it may be here mentioned, was declined, during her residence in Walsall; he who sought her having "no faith in revealed religion."

Into the unceasing round of hospital work "Sister Dora" threw herself; not without hopes, we read, "that in this work she might stifle the uneasy voice within her." She desired, indeed, at one time to enter some Ultra-Church Sisterhood, in order that she might bind herself strictly to lead a single life; restless, with a strong will, and not satisfied with her spiritual state, she wished to surrender her will to some Director. During several years indeed, her notions of Christian freedom, it is obvious, were sadly imperfect. But, as time went on, she seems to have grown in the grace and knowledge of the Saviour. The study of Holy Scripture, we read, was a habit of her life. She always carried in her pocket a small Bible. Of the work of the Holy Spirit, we should judge, her views were defective.

Of her labour in the Walsall hospital many deeply interesting incidents are related. Thus, *e. g.*, page 54, we read:—

A fine, healthy young man was one night brought in with his arm torn and twisted by a machine. The doctor pronounced that nothing could save it, and that he must amputate it at once. The sufferer's groan and expression of despair went to the sister's heart. She scanned the torn limb with her quick, scrutinizing glance, as if she would look through the wound to the state of the circulation below, and then measured with her eye the fine healthy form before her. The man looked from one face to the other for a ray of hope, and, seeing the deep pity in her expression, exclaimed, "Oh, Sister! save my arm for me; "it's my right arm." Sister Dora instantly turned round to the surgeon, saying, I believe *I can* save this arm if you will let me have a try?" "Are you mad?" answered he. "I tell you it's an impossibility; mortification will set in in a few hours; nothing but amputation can save his life." She turned quickly to the anxious patient. "Are you willing for me to try and save your arm, my man?" What would he not have been willing to let the woman do, who turned upon him such a winning face, and spoke in tones so strangely sympathetic? He joyfully gave consent. The doctor was as angry as he was ever known to be with Sister Dora, and walked away saying, "Well, remember it's your arm: if you choose to have the young man's death upon your conscience, I shall not interfere; but I wash my hands of him. Don't think I am going to help you." It was indeed a heavy responsibility for a nurse to take upon herself, but Sister Dora never shrank from a burden which seemed to be cast upon her. It was by no means the first time that she had disagreed with the surgical opinion; often and often had she pleaded hard for delay in the removal of a limb which, she ventured to think, might by skill and patience be saved. On this occasion, her patient's entire confidence in her was sufficient encouragement. She watched and tended "her arm" as she called it; almost literally night and day for three weeks. It was a period of terrible suspense and anxiety. "How I prayed over that arm!" she used to say afterwards.

When the doctor at last saw her work, his astonishment was great. He saw the young man's arm, no longer mangled, but straight and healthy. "Why, you have saved it!" he exclaimed. Long afterwards, when she was very ill, this young man used to walk over from his place of work, eleven miles away, when he could, to inquire after her. As he heard the tidings, he would say to the servant, "Tell the Sister that's *her* arm that rang the bell!" She seems to have been exceedingly clever in dressing and tying up wounds. One day came to the hospital a boy, who had just chopped off one of his fingers. "Where's the finger?" she asked. "It's at home," replied the boy. "Go and fetch it this moment, and mind you are quick." On his producing it she set it skilfully, and it healed.

In the year 1874 all connection between Sister Dora and the Good

Samaritan Sisterhood finally ceased. A friend who asked her about this had for answer, "I am a woman, and not a piece of furniture!" For the nursing at Walsall, henceforward nominally, as she had been for some years practically, she was responsible. In 1875, while taking charge of a Small-pox Hospital, during an epidemic, she wrote a letter to the patients at her Cottage Hospital, in which one paragraph runs thus:—

Have you been singing to-day? You must sing particularly, "Safe in the arms of Jesus," and think of me. Living or dying, I am His. Oh, my children, you all love me for the very little I do for you; but oh, if you would only think what Jesus has done, and is doing for you, your hearts would soon be full of love for Him, and you would all choose Him for your master. Now whilst you are on your beds, read and study His life; see the road He went, and follow Him. I know you all want to go to heaven, but wishing will not get you there. You *must* choose *now* in this life, you cannot choose hereafter when you die. That great multitude St. John saw round the throne *had* washed their robes and made them white in the Blood of the Lamb, which was shed for each one of you. God loves you; I know it, by His letting you get hurt and bringing you to the hospital. "As many as I *love* I rebuke and *chasten*." Think over these things, my dear children.

During the winter of 1876-77 she found a difficulty in lifting her patients. From a medical man whom she consulted, she learnt the existence of that dread disease, cancer, and after a short struggle she made up her mind to refuse surgical aid; she would allow the disease to take its natural course; and, further, nobody should know of it. For a long time none of her family or of her friends, not a single soul in Walsall, had the slightest idea that she was not in good health. In August, 1878, she left Walsall for a long holiday. Exceedingly ill, with a distressing cough and continual pain, she returned to Walsall to a hired house, not to the hospital, on October 8th. There was a wilfulness in her determination to keep the disease a secret. People thought she was dying of consumption; and the biographer speaks of her "proud and wilful reticence." The natural self-will remained; even the greater part of her weeks of agony she would endure in loneliness; none should pity her. She passed away on December 21st. The closing scenes were in some respects painful. We gladly note that she "spoke most decidedly against the idea that we need any one to go between the soul and Christ." With "a bright and beautiful smile" she listened to the words, "he that believeth in Me hath everlasting life," and she said, with the deepest earnestness, "That is just what I want."

The report that she was baptized by Monsignor Capel on her death-bed is declared to be untrue. "She received the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper from the hands of a clergyman of the Church of England, more than once, after the date of the visit of a Roman Catholic priest, with whom she had been acquainted in former years, and from whose visit to her on her death-bed the report most probably originated." It is right to add that some of the warmest testimonies to her great work in Walsall, where she was honoured and esteemed by all classes, were contributed by Nonconformists.

Memoir of the Right Rev. Robert Milman, D.D., Lord Bishop of Calcutta and Metropolitan of India, with a Selection from his Correspondence and Journals. By his sister, FRANCES MARIA MILMAN. Pp. 390. London: John Murray, 1879.

WIDELY as we are constrained to differ from Bishop Milman on certain questions, it is impossible to withhold a tribute of admiration to the unresting industry and Christian devotion which

characterised his Indian Episcopate. The evidences of this crowd the pages of this memoir. In truth, the narratives of the Bishop's journeyings to and fro, up and down the country in all directions and in all weathers, of his confirmations and preachings, and of his visits to Mission Stations, large and small, make up the staple of the volume, and impart to it an almost monotonous tone. The impression often left on the mind in reading the later chapters, is one not of freshness but of repetition. To the Bishop and his companions, and to personal friends and relations, many of the details of what he himself described as "perpetual travelling," possessed, no doubt, a special interest, but to the general readers it is a matter of no concern whether horseback, dauk, gharri, elephant, or boat was the mode of conveyance. As to all this, it must suffice to say that the Bishop seems to have been almost ubiquitous. Whether greater results might not have been achieved by a more careful husbanding of strength and less busy-ness about outside minor matters, is a question on which much might be said. But, certainly, while we have here much that would be well in place in the report of a Missionary, we search in vain for the statesmanlike and comprehensive views of mission work in its nature, methods, and prospects, which we should have expected from a man of Bishop Milman's antecedents and general character.

The Bishop had a facility for learning languages which stood him in good stead, and materially assisted him in his intercourse with the educated natives. It was not only that he preached in Hindustani with great power, but that he could lecture in that language with fluency on secular subjects which demanded an accurate knowledge of scientific and historical terms. Resolved to do his work thoroughly, he worked, we are told, at the rudiments of grammar, and put himself in the hands of teachers like the veriest schoolboy. He established at the Palace a series of *conversaziones*, at which the native gentlemen were invited to meet the European society of Calcutta, and which appear to have been very popular. The visitors would see there not only the Viceroy and State officers, natives of rank, rajahs, princes, Hindu and Mahommedan, but also native Christian ladies in white veils, Armenian and Greek priests, Parsees and strangers from many parts of India, or even the far East. And these, in their gorgeous dresses and splendid turbans and jewels, formed a striking and brilliant scene in the beautiful house, with its wide verandahs, which the liberality of Bishop Wilson had given to the See of Calcutta.

A story told by one of the missionaries affords a curious little illustration of the esteem in which these parties were held among the native gentlemen. The missionary had remonstrated with one of the large zemindars, near Calcutta, about the cruel way in which one of his agents treated the ryots. He could not persuade him to dismiss the man till he said, at last, "Well, I shall tell Miss Milman, and I am sure she will never invite you again to any of the parties at the palace." This threat was enough, and the man was dismissed."

Bishop Milman was well known as a High Churchman when he was appointed, and this character he maintained to the end. His opinions as to Evening Communions, his reference to Cuddesdon and its teaching, and to the Purchas judgment, his disappointment when he learnt that Mr. Benson, "the Superior of the Cowley brothers," could not come out to him, his hankering after the establishment of brotherhoods and sisterhoods, his ecclesiastical terminology, his sympathy with priestly confession and recommendation of it, so long as it was not made a *necessity*, and his adherence to the eastward position, are all characteristic. At the same time, the volume before us abounds with illustrations of his readiness to appreciate and honour the labours of those from whom, as to these

and some other things, he was separated *toto cœlo*, and also of his anxiety to discourage anything like what he calls "the overdoing and overvaluing of these externals."

The notices of mission work which pervade this volume are occasionally of a very interesting character, and cannot fail to impress the reader with a deep sense of the extent, the reality, and the success of the work. The increase of the Episcopate in India was an object of much solicitude to him, and naturally so, considering the enormous amount of time which he expended every year in his long journeys, extending at one time to British Burmah, and at another to Bombay and Madras, which he "visited" as Metropolitan. The formation of the dioceses of Lahore and Rangoon, and the consecration of Drs. Caldwell and Sargent, were events which would have cheered him had he been spared to see them, while the subdivision of his own diocese must have materially lightened the labours which eventually, no doubt, cut short his life.

Short Notices.

Recollections of Ober-Ammergau in 1871. By H. N. Oxenham, M.A. Pp. 80. Rivingtons, 1880.

These "Recollections" are reprinted from the *Guardian* of October 4, 1871. They form one of the best of the many accounts of the *Passionspiel* which have appeared since 1850, when the attention of the English public was first directed to this subject. We cannot at all agree with the author about the Ober-Ammergau performance. It may be that Handel's "Messiah," on its first appearance, about a century ago, had a powerful effect in checking the Unitarian tendencies of the age; but the Passion Play in 1880, in our judgment, is much more likely to increase the degrading materialism of semi-Romanist tourists than it is to counteract scepticism. To real religion, according to the New Testament, its spirit and its truth, "dramatizing the Passion"—we quote Mr. Oxenham's words—is, as we judge, flatly opposed. Concerning the effect of this decennial performance on the villagers themselves, Roman Catholics, who get their bread by carving crucifixes and such like, we say nothing. But as to the performance itself, a "Play" representing our Lord's Passion, including "*the Crucifixion scene*," it seems to us inexpressibly shocking. On the last page of Mr. Oxenham's narrative occurs the statement that the "drama" is "a real though minor fulfilment of the apostolic injunction to shew forth the Lord's death till He comes again." We are surprised to see a scholar thus refer to 1 Cor. xi. 26, in which the Greek verb (according to the English version "*shew*") signifies *declare*, announce, or proclaim. The word is commonly perverted as justifying the mystical representation of the Passion in the Mass. Again, on the title-page of this book Mr. Oxenham quotes, οἷς κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη ἐν ὑμῖν ἐσταυρωμένος; and these words are translated in our Version, "before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you." But the verb of Galat. iii. 1, προγράφω, is simply *to write*, either "first," "before," or "openly," *i.e.*, in public; and, whatever shade of meaning be given to the word, this Scripture gives not the slightest sanction to the *Passionspiel*. St. Paul's thought was of prior written or verbal description. To suppose that the great Apostle would have countenanced a man on a platform *playing* Christ upon the Cross is worse than an absurdity.

Εἰκων Βασιλικὴ. The Pourtraicture of His sacred Majestie in his solitudes and sufferings. A reprint of the edition of 1648, and a facsimile of the original frontispiece, with an introduction throwing fresh light upon the authorship of the work. By E. J. L. Scott, M.A. Oxon., Assistant Keeper of MSS., British Museum. Pp. 226. Elliott Stock, 1880.

In a monograph on Milton, just issued, for the series of English Men of Letters, is a brief account in four passages of *Eikon Basilike*, wherein are reproduced all the blunders and mis-statements which it was the laborious task of Dr. Wordsworth fifty years ago to expose. So writes Mr. Scott in his very interesting preface to the edition of the *Eikon* before us. Against Bishop Ganden's claim he brings out several new points, and fresh matter was found a few weeks ago, which has weight of its own. It appears from an additional note, that while the sheets of the present work were passing through the press, Mr. J. B. Marsh made a most interesting discovery in corroboration of the Royal Authorship. He found in the Record Office the original of the second prayer at the end of the *Eikon*, in the handwriting of Charles I., of the date 1631. An article upon this discovery will appear in *The Antiquary* for May. The present edition of *Εἰκοω Βασιλικὴ* is well printed, tastefully got up, with a parchment cover.

The Church Sunday School Hymn Book. For use in Sunday Schools and at Children's Services. New and revised Edition. London: Church of England Sunday School Institute, 34, New Bridge Street, E.C.

With this Hymn Book we are much pleased. No work of the kind will satisfy everybody; but the present selection seems to us, on the whole, an exceedingly good one, and the arrangement admirable. Our dear and esteemed friend, the late Dawson Campbell, if we mistake not, had some share in preparing this book. It is sufficiently comprehensive to meet the wants of all Sunday Schools. It contains 365 Hymns; and a to size, price, and binding, no fault can be found with any of the various specimens. We are old-fashioned enough not to like the Litanies. Otherwise, as we have said, we are greatly pleased with the book, and have no doubt that it will prove a favourite in thousands of our schools this year.

Intermediate Schools in Ireland. By Maurice C. Hime, M.A., LL.D., Head Master of Foyle College, Londonderry. Pp. 270. Simpkin, Marshall & Co., 1879.

Dr. Hime is evidently a scholar and a man of ability, and one who has well thought over Educational questions. He has acquired a reputation as a writer, and his present work will not diminish it. We have read some of its pages with interest; the book is never dry or feeble. As a thoughtful contribution to a controversy of no small importance—in which some, at all events, of our readers are deeply interested—we gladly recommend it. Dr. Hime's Papers were written before Lord Cairns's Intermediate Education Bill was brought forward; but he remarks that the tendency of the Act will be certainly to diminish the injury so long inflicted on their schools. The disendowment of the Church, he says, has injured them much; and he gives his reasons. He also makes a protest against "*Grinding* establishments." The Grinders' occupation, he says, is cramming. We should add that one of the Appendices is "The Intermediate Education (Ireland) Act, 1878."

The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans, with Introduction and Notes. By the Rev. H. C. G. Moule, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Pp. 270. London: Cambridge Warehouse, 17, Paternoster Row.

This is a volume of that very useful series, "The Cambridge Bible for

Schools," edited by Dean Perowne. Mr. Moule's work, we need hardly say, bears marks of close, conscientious study; the exposition is clear, suggestive, and thoroughly sound. There is not the slightest parade of scholarship, and yet this Commentary will bear comparison with any even of the highest rank for ability and erudition. Here and there, as we have opened and read its pages, we have found the notes, both doctrinal and practical, really excellent. Mr. Moule has evidently read much, and pondered carefully; but he gives, in small compass, the conclusion at which he has arrived. We are greatly pleased with this book.

Addresses to District Visitors and Sunday School Teachers. By the Rev. Francis Pigou, D.D., Vicar of Halifax, and Chaplain in Ordinary to her Majesty. With an introduction by the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Rochester. Pp. 148. Nisbet & Co., 1880.

"These addresses of an eminent Clergyman, whose varied experience in large parishes is equalled only by his readiness to impart it to those beyond his borders, I heartily commend to all who would make the Church's work among the poor, by the hands of her devout daughters, solid, vital, and lasting." So writes Bishop Thorold, in a valuable, though all too brief, introduction to this book. Dr. Pigou's Addresses are thoroughly practical, and all earnest Christians will find them interesting.

"*Can Nothing be Done?*" The Story of Robert Raikes. A Plea for the Masses. By the Rev. Charles Bullock, B.D. Pp. 146. *Home Words* Publishing Office.

A timely, vigorous, and very interesting publication. At the age of 72 Robert Raikes saw the destitution of the children. "I asked," said he, "Can nothing be done?" A voice answered, "Try!" "I did try; and see what God hath wrought." This is the key-note of the excellent little book before us, which may be heartily recommended. Its author desires to bring before the Christian public the spiritual and moral destitution of the masses in our large towns. "I believe," he writes, "that great things might be done. I believe that a definite, permanent, New Testament evangelization of the masses is not, as some seem to believe, Utopian. The very thought that it could be so would indicate that we despaired of Christianity itself." We thoroughly agree with Mr. Bullock in regard to Lay workers: and we hope that his earnest appeal or plea may touch many hearts.

Heart-Breathings. Short Comments on a Portion of Psalm cxix. By Agnes M'Neile Malden. Pp. 100. Nisbet, 1880.

In an interesting editorial preface to this useful little book we read that Agnes Malden was named after her godfather, Hugh M'Neile, at the time of her birth Rector of Albury, where her father lived, Lieutenant Malden, R.N.—afterwards for many years a well-known resident in Brighton. Her health was always delicate. During years of sickness, until at the age of thirty-one she sang her *Nunc Dimittis*, there was the consistent testimony of a quiet mind; "cheerfulness and joyfulness even in her hours of greatest weakness and suffering." The secret of this happy equanimity, we read, lay in the habit of constant meditation and prayer. Her comments on Psalm cxix. are suggestive, and deeply spiritual. It was the privilege of the present writer, several years ago, to hear Miss Malden's words of trustful patience; and he gladly recommends the little volume which recalls her sunny saintliness.

A tasteful, tiny book has for title, *Words of the Lord Jesus Christ:* these "words" are arranged as a daily companion epitome of the Gospel, and treasury of private prayer. (Nisbet & Co.)

The Sunday School Centenary: School Libraries, &c. We are pleased to learn that by the liberality of a friend of Sunday Schools, who wishes to promote the circulation of pure literature in the homes of the people,

help will be given towards procuring books for School Libraries, &c., selected from *Hand and Heart* publications. The offer, available during the Centenary year, is to the value of £5 for £3, £3 for £1 16s., or £1 for 12s. The grants will be made up to the value of £1,000. Many applications will be sent, no doubt, without delay, to the Manager, *Hand and Heart* Office, Paternoster Buildings, E.C.

From Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton we have received a copy of Dr. E. de Pressensé's well-known book, *Jesus Christ, His Times, Life and Work*, seventh edition, unabridged.

We heartily recommend Mr. Ballantyne's tale of the Post Office, *Post Haste* (Nisbet & Co.), a notice of which, by inadvertence, has been delayed. All Mr. Ballantyne's stories—and he has written many—are clever, and really good; there is a touch of reality about every one of them; and adventure-loving boys, or, for the matter of that, sedate girls, are sure to read them with zest. *Post Haste* is full of interest, and also of information. It has several illustrations, and is handsomely got up as a gift book.

A pamphlet of 120 pages, "*Phoster*," a sequel to "*Luknon*" (Simpkin, Marshall, and Co.), has for its full title, "Light cast on the Footprints of Israel, from Medea to the British Isles." Its author, Mr. H. P. Keighly, has adduced evidence, direct and indirect, to prove that the ten tribes, erroneously called lost, have at this present day a separate and distinct national existence.

We gladly call attention to *Diocesan Map of England and Wales* (W. and A. K. Johnston, 6, Paternoster Buildings, E.C.) Compiled by the Rev. Donald J. Mackey, B.A., Cantab., Canon and Precentor of St. Ninian's Cathedral, Perth. This Map shows the provisions of the Bishoprics Act, 1878, also the other recommendations of the Cathedral Commissioners, 1854. It is an interesting and useful publication, with a special interest, of course, at the present time. The Bishop of Chichester's residence, we may remark, is by the side of Chichester Cathedral.

Ancient Universities and Modern Requirements, a pamphlet of 20 pages, by the Rev. Preb. Anderson, M.A., is well worth reading. (*Chronicle* Office, Bath.)

In the last number of the *Foreign Church Chronicle* (Rivingtons), an ably edited little Quarterly, Mr. Oxenham replies concerning "The Literary and Theological Fraud." The reference is to a work edited by Mr. Oxenham, with Introduction and Notes, a twelvemonth before, under the title of "An Eirenicon of the Eighteenth Century," the first edition of which appeared in 1704, while three were published subsequently, one in Ireland and two in England, as an "Essay towards a Proposal for Catholic Communion, by a Minister of the Church of England." At the end of Mr. Oxenham's letter, the Editor of the *Foreign Church Chronicle* remarks:—

There is no external evidence whatever for the hypothesis that this Essay was written by a Member of the Church of England. The very year after its publication it was denounced in three separate publications as a Popish fraud, and *this charge was not refuted or denied.* The book sank into oblivion as a *coup manqué*, like the Puritan sermons delivered by Jesuit priests half a century earlier. But the tradition respecting it survived, and every scholar who knew that the book existed at all, knew also that it was composed by a Papist, who employed the equivocal expression of "a Minister of the Church of England" to designate himself by, and that its purpose was "to break that bias which education, study, and interest had given" English Churchmen "in disfavour of the Church of Rome." To this tradition, unbroken so far as scholars are concerned, the author of Kettlewell's Life, Thomas Hearne, Bishop White, Hartwell Horne, Arthur Hadden, and Dr. Richard Gibbings, among others, bear testimony.

As to the internal evidence, the *Chronicle's* remarks are pertinent and forcible. Mr. Oxenham is again requested to withdraw the book from sale.

THE MONTH.

THE net result of the Elections is, that in the new House of Commons the Liberals will number about 350, the Conservatives 240, and the Home Rulers 60. Thus the Liberals will have a clear majority of 50 over Conservatives and Home Rulers combined. If the Home Rulers coalesce with the Liberals, the new Government will have a majority of 170, the largest Liberal majority since the Reform Act of 1832. Such a result has surprised everybody. It was expected that the government would lose a few seats in Scotland and in Ireland, and that several, perhaps many, English boroughs would return to Liberalism. But the defections in the English counties are more remarkable than those in the English boroughs; in the county elections, generally, the Liberal gains are great and significant.

How is such an extraordinary result to be accounted for? The answers to this question are, of course, many and various. It is said that a large proportion of the electors wanted "a change;" trade has been bad; the harvests have been disastrous; in these hard times, farmers as well as artisans have thought a change might do good. That the working men, as a rule, voted on Lord Beaconsfield's foreign policy, except in regard to taxation, is most improbable. Yet the Afghan and Zulu disasters afforded Mr. Gladstone a good handle; and he has used it in his own fashion. From the Bulgarian atrocity agitation, at every fresh development of the history, says the *Times*, "We see Mr. Gladstone drawn back by his responsible friends, and then recovering himself to keep abreast of his irresponsible admirers." The majority is undoubtedly to a great extent his work.

In many contests, no doubt, the energy of Nonconformists has turned the scale. At the election of 1874, they were to some extent neutral. Mr. Forster's independent action in regard to national education had given offence. During the last three or four years, however, Nonconformists have agreed to sink "minor differences" in order to turn out the Conservatives. In some cases their policy has provoked strong but just comment. The *Record*, *e. g.*, made some pertinent observations on a telegram from Mr. Samuel Morley, supporting Mr. Bradlaugh in Northampton. Mr. Morley (April 13th) has written to express his deep regret that in a moment of electioneering excitement he agreed to "join with Mr. Adam in urging upon the Liberal electors the desirableness of union." The result of the Northampton election is a startling fact.

Mr. Gladstone has beaten Lord Dalkeith, in the Mid Lothian

contest; and the Presbyterian Establishment, we fear, is left weaker.*

For ourselves, though THE CHURCHMAN will keep itself free from party politics, we confess we view with apprehension a majority which is largely Radical. Lord Hartington, however, whose statesmanlike speeches have been deservedly praised, will be strong enough, we hope, to hold his own, both in the Cabinet and in Parliament.

The influence of the publicans, it is clear, is not so great as some have supposed; and the cuckoo cry about "Beer and the Bible" will now probably cease. We are thankful to believe that the temperance movement is yearly growing stronger.

It is announced that the Bishop of Durham has determined on convening a Diocesan Conference. It is to meet in September.

By an Order in Council, in pursuance of the Bishoprics Act, 1878, the Bishopric of Liverpool was declared founded (March 24th). On the 16th of this month, appeared the announcement:—

> Her Majesty has been graciously pleased to appoint the Rev. John Charles Ryle, M.A., Dean of Salisbury, to be Bishop of the newly constituted see of Liverpool.

Of the gratification which this appointment will cause among all Evangelical Protestant Churchmen, no remark need here be made. According to the *John Bull*, High Churchmen will unite with such in regarding it as satisfactory. It will prove, we believe, what is termed a "popular" appointment; and so far as concerns the new see decidedly the best which could have been made. The sagacity of the Premier in regard to patronage is well known; it has never been more conspicous than in selecting Mr. Ryle for a Lancashire Bishopric.

Canon Carter has written a letter to the Bishop of Oxford resigning the Rectory of Clewer.

---

* The executive committee of the Liberation Society have passed resolutions in which they express unreserved satisfaction with the results of the general election. Notwithstanding that the main issues to be decided were of a character which made it necessary to hold in abeyance the Society's distinctive objects, its supporters are congratulated on the fact (1) that sixteen members of the Society's committee (including four members of the Scottish executive) have been returned to Parliament; (2) that a decided majority of the Scotch members are either in favour of the disestablishment of the Scotch Church, or are willing to accept the verdict of the country in regard to it, while no Scotch Liberal has declared himself to be opposed to it; (3) that there will be in the new Parliament a much larger number of members in favour of disestablishment, both in England and Scotland, than in any previous Parliament.