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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

AUGUST, 1880.

ART. I.—JAMES II. AND THE SEVEN BISHOPS.

I COME now to the closing scene in King James' disgraceful reign, the prosecution and trial of the Seven Bishops. The importance of that event is so great, and the consequences which resulted from it were so immense, that I must enter somewhat fully into its details. I do so the more willingly because attempts are sometimes made now-a-days to misrepresent this trial, to place the motives of the bishops in a wrong light, and to obscure the real issues which were at stake. Some men will do anything in these times to mystify the public mind, to pervert history, and to whitewash the Church of Rome. But I have made it my business to search up every authority I can find about this era. I have no doubt whatever where the truth lies. And I shall try to set before my readers the "thing as it is."

The origin of the trial of the Seven Bishops was a proclamation put forth by James II., on the 27th of April, 1688, called the "Declaration of Indulgence." It was a Declaration which differed little from one put forth on the April of 1687. But it was followed by an "Order of Council" that it was to be read on two successive Sundays, in divine service, by all the officiating ministers in all the churches and chapels of the kingdom. In London the reading was to take place on the 20th and 27th of May, and in other parts of England on the 3rd and 10th of June. The bishops were directed to distribute copies of the Declaration throughout their respective dioceses. The substance of the Declaration was short and simple. It suspended all penal laws against Nonconformists. It authorized both Roman Catholics and Protestant Dissenters to perform their worship publicly. It forbade the King's subjects, on pain of his displeasure, to molest any assembly. It abrogated all those Acts

of Parliament which imposed any religious test as a qualification for any civil or military office. To us who live in the nineteenth century the Declaration may seem very reasonable and harmless. To the England of the seventeenth century it wore a very different aspect! Men knew the hand from which it came, and saw the latent intention. Under the specious plea of toleration and liberty, the object of the Declaration was to advance Popery and give license and free scope to the Church of Rome, and all its schemes for reconquering England.

This famous Declaration, we see at a glance, placed the bishops and clergy in a most awkward position. What were they to do? What was the path of duty? They were thoroughly pinned on the horns of a dilemma. If they refused compliance to the King's wishes they would seem intolerant, illiberal, and unkind to the Nonconformists, as well as disloyal, disrespectful, and disobedient to their sovereign. If they yielded to the King's wishes, and read the Declaration, they would be assisting the propagation of Popery. The liberty James wanted them to proclaim was neither more nor less than indulgence to the Jesuits and the whole Church of Rome. In short, they found themselves between Scylla and Charybdis, and could not possibly avoid giving offence. Refusing to sanction the Declaration, they would certainly displease the King and perhaps irritate the Dissenters. Consenting to it, they would infallibly help the Pope. Never perhaps were English bishops and clergy placed in such a difficult and perplexing position!

God's ways, however, are not as man's ways, and light often arises out of darkness in quarters where it was not expected. At this critical juncture the Nonconformists, to their eternal honour, came forward and cut the knot, and helped the bishops to a right decision. The shrewd sons of the good old Puritans saw clearly what James meant. They saw that under a specious pretence of liberty, he wanted a fulcrum for a lever which would turn England upside down, and destroy the work of the Reformation. Like the noble-minded Roman ambassador before Pyrrhus, they refused to be bribed just as they had formerly refused to be intimidated. They would have none of the Royal indulgence, if it could only be purchased at the expense of the nation's Protestantism. Baxter, and Bates, and Howe, and the great bulk of the London Nonconformists, entreated the clergy to stand firm, and not to yield one inch to the king. Young Defoe said to his Nonconformist brethren, "I had rather the Church of England should pull our clothes off by fines and forfeitures, than the Papists should fall both upon the Church and the Dissenters, and pull our skins off by fire and faggot."*

[1] C. Knight. History, iv. 419.

Oliver Heywood, a famous Nonconformist of the day, says distinctly in his account of the times, "though the Dissenters had liberty, we know it was not out of love to us, but for another purpose. We heard the king had said he was forced to grant liberty at present to those whom his soul abhorred."[1]

The immediate result was that a meeting of the London clergy was held, and after much debate, in which Tillotson, Sherlock, Patrick, and Stillingfleet took part, it was decided that the "Order in Council" should not be obeyed. No one contributed to this result more than Dr. Fowler, Vicar of St. Giles, Cripplegate, a well-known Broad Churchman. While the matter yet hung in the balance and the final vote seemed doubtful, he rose and said:—"I must be plain. The question to my mind is so simple, that argument can throw no new light on it, and can only beget heat. Let every man say Yes or No. But I cannot consent to be bound by the majority. I shall be sorry to cause a breach of unity. But this Declaration I cannot read." This bold speech turned the scale. A resolution by which all present pledged themselves not to read the Declaration was drawn up, and was ultimately signed by eighty-five incumbents in London.

In the meantime the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Sancroft, showed himself not unequal to the emergency. He was naturally a cautious, quiet, and somewhat timid man, and the last person to be combative, and to quarrel with kings. Nevertheless he came out nobly and well, and rose to the occasion. As soon as the Order in Council appeared he summoned to Lambeth Palace those few bishops, divines, and laymen who happened to be in London and took counsel with them. It was resolved to resist the King, and to refuse to read the Declaration. The Primate then wrote to all the bishops on the English bench, on whom he could depend, and urged them to come up to London at once, and join him in a formal protest and petition. But time was short. There were no railways in those days. Journeying was slow work. Eighteen bishops, says Burnet ("Own Times," iii. 266), agreed with Sancroft. But with the utmost exertion only six bishops could get to London in time to help the Primate. These six, with the Archbishop at their head, assembled at Lambeth on the 18th of May, only two days before the fatal Sunday, when the King's Declaration was to be read in London, and before night agreed on a petition or protest to which all affixed their names.

The names of the six bishops who signed this remarkable document, besides Sancroft, deserve to be known and remembered. They were as follows: Lloyd of St. Asaph, Turner of Ely, Lake

[1] Heywood's Works, i. 287.

of Chichester, Ken of Bath and Wells, White of Peterborough, and Sir Jonathan Trelawney of Bristol. It is a curious fact that, with the single exception of Ken, the author of "Morning and Evening Hymns," not one of the seven men who signed the petition could be called a remarkable man in any way. Not one, besides Ken, has made any mark in the theological world, or lives as a writer or preacher. Not one of the whole seven could be named in the same breath with Parker, or Whitgift, or Grindal, or Jewel, or Andrews, or Hall. They were probably respectable worthy quiet old-fashioned High Churchmen; and that was all. But God loves to be glorified by using weak instruments. Whatever they were in other respects, they were of one mind in seeing the danger which threatened Protestantism, and in determination to stand by it to the death. It was not jealousy of Dissenters but dislike to Popery, be it remembered, which actuated their conduct and knit them together. (Ranke, iv. 346.) All honour be to them. They have supplied an unanswerable proof, that the real loyal honest old-fashioned High Churchmen disliked Popery as much as any school in the Church.

The famous petition which the seven bishops drew up and signed on this occasion is a curious document. It is short, and tame, and cautious, and somewhat clumsily composed. But the worthy composers, no doubt, were pressed for time, and had no leisure to polish their sentences. Moreover we know that they acted under the best advice and were careful not to say too much and give needless offence.

In substance (says Macaulay) nothing could be more skilfully framed. All disloyalty, all intolerance, were reverently disclaimed. The King was assured that the Church was still, as ever, faithful to the throne. He was also assured that the bishops, in proper time and place, would, as Lords of Parliament and Members of the Upper House of Convocation, show they were by no means wanting in tenderness for the conscientious scruples of Dissenters. The Parliament, both in the late and present reign, had pronounced that the sovereigns were not constitutionally competent to dispense with statutes in matters ecclesiastical. The Declaration was therefore illegal, and the Petitioners could not in prudence, honour, or conscience, be parties to the solemn publication of an illegal Declaration in the House of God, and during the time of Divine Service.

Pointless and tame as the Petition may seem to us, we must not allow ourselves to make any mistake as to the latent meaning of the document and the real object of the bishops in refusing to obey the King. We must do them justice. They were thoroughly convinced that the Declaration was intended to help Popery, and they were determined to make a stand and resist it. They had no ill-feeling towards Dissenters, and no desire to continue their disabilities. But they saw clearly that

the whole cause of Protestantism was in jeopardy, and that, now or never, they must risk everything to defend it. Every historian of any worth acknowledges this, and it is vain to try to take any other view unless we are prepared to write history anew. A cloud of witnesses agree here. There is an overwhelming mass of evidence to prove that the real reason why the seven bishops resolved to oppose the King, was their determination to maintain the principles of the Reformation and to oppose any further movement towards Rome. In one word, the cause for which they boldly nailed their colours to the mast was the good old cause of Protestantism *versus* Popery. Every one, Churchman or Dissenter, knew *that* in 1688, and it is a grievous shame that anyone now should try to deny it. The denial can only be regarded as a symptom of ignorance or dishonesty.

It was quite late on Friday evening, May 18, when this Petition was finished and signed, and on Sunday morning, the 20th of May, the Royal Declaration had to be read in all the churches in London. There was therefore no time to be lost. Armed with their paper, six of the seven bishops (Sancroft being forbidden to come to Court) proceeded to Whitehall Palace, and had an interview with James II., at 10 o'clock at night. The King took the Petition, and read it with mingled anger and amazement. He was both deeply displeased and astonished, and showed it. He never thought that English bishops would oppose his will. "I did not expect this," he said; "this is a standard of rebellion." In vain Trelawney fell on his knees, saying, "No Trelawney can be a rebel. Remember that my family has fought for the Crown." In vain Turner said, "We rebel! We are ready to die at your Majesty's feet." In vain Ken said, "I hope you will grant us that liberty of conscience which you grant to all mankind." It was all to no purpose. The King was thoroughly angry. "You are trumpeters of sedition," he exclaimed, "go to your dioceses and see that I am obeyed." "We have two duties to perform," said noble Ken, "our duty to God and our duty to your Majesty. We honour you: but we fear God." The interview ended, and the bishops retired from the royal presence, Ken's last words being "God's will be done."

Before the sun rose on Saturday morning, May 19, the Bishops' Petition was printed, as a broadsheet, and hawked through all the streets of London. By whom this was done is not known to this day: but the printer is said to have made a thousand pounds by it in a few hours. The excitement was immense throughout the metropolis, and when Sunday came, next day, the churches were thronged with expecting crowds, wondering what the clergy would do, and whether they would read the King's Declaration. They were

not left long in doubt. Out of one hundred parish churches in the city and liberties of London, there were only four in which the Order in Council was obeyed, and in each case, as soon as the first words of the Declaration were uttered, the congregation rose as one man and left the Church. At Westminster Abbey the scene was long remembered by the boys of Westminster school. As soon as Bishop Spratt, who was then dean, a mean servile prelate, began to read the Declaration, the murmurs and noise of the people crowding out completely drowned his voice. He trembled so that men saw the paper shake in his hand; and long before he had done the Abbey was deserted by all but the choristers and the school. Timothy Hall, an infamous clergyman, who read the Declaration at St. Matthew's, Friday Street, was rewarded by the King with the vacant Bishopric of Oxford. But he bought his mitre very dear. Not one Canon of Christ Church attended his installation, and not one graduate would come to him for ordination.

A fortnight passed away, and on the 3rd of June the example of the London clergy was nobly followed in all parts of England. The Bishops of Norwich, Gloucester, Salisbury, Winchester, and Exeter, who were unable to reach London in time for the Lambeth Conference, had signed copies of the Petition, and, of course, refused to order obedience to the Declaration. The Bishop of Worcester declined to distribute it. In the great diocese of Chester, including all Lancashire, only three clergymen read it. In the huge diocese of Norwich, the stronghold of Protestantism, it was read in only four parishes out of twelve hundred. In short, it became evident that a spirit was awakened throughout the land which the Court had never expected, and that though the bishops and clergy might be broken, they would not bend. Whether the King could break them remained yet to be proved. On the evening of the 8th of June, all the seven bishops, in obedience to a summons from the King, appeared before him in Council at Whitehall. They went provided with the best legal advice and acted carefully upon it. They calmly refused to admit anything to criminate themselves, unless forced to do it by the King's express command. They were questioned and interrogated about the meaning of words in their Petition, but their answers were so guarded and judicious that the King gained nothing by the examination. They steadily held their ground, and would neither withdraw their Petition, nor confess they had done wrong, nor recede from their decision about the Declaration. At last they were informed that they would be prosecuted for libel in the Court of King's Bench, and refusing, by their lawyers' advice, to enter into recognizances for their appearance, they were formally committed to the

Tower. A warrant was made out, and a boat was ordered to take them down the river.

Their committal to the Tower was the means of calling out an enthusiastic expression of feeling in London, such as, perhaps, has never been equalled in the history of the metropolis. It was known from an early hour that the bishops were before the Council, and an anxious crowd had long waited round Whitehall to see what the result would be. But when the Londoners saw the seven aged prelates walking out of the palace under a guard of soldiers, and learned that they were going to prison (practically) in defence of English Protestantism, a scene of excitement ensued which almost baffles description. Hundreds crowded round them as they proceeded to Whitehall stairs, cheering them and expressing their sympathy. Many rushed into the mud and water up to their waists, blessing and asking their blessing. Scores of boats on the river full of people accompanied them down to the Tower with loud demonstrations of feeling. Even the very soldiers on guard in the Tower caught the infection and became zealous admirers of their prisoners. And when Sir E. Hales, the Popish governor, tried to check them, he was told by his subordinates that it was of no use, for his men "were all drinking the health of the bishops."

The seven prelates were kept in the Tower for a week. Throughout that time the enthusiastic feeling of admiration for them flared higher and higher, and increased more and more every day. They were almost idolized as martyrs who had refused to truckle to a Popish tyrant, like Latimer and Ridley in Mary's days. The Church of England at one bound rose cent. per cent. in public estimation. Episcopacy was never so popular as it was that week. Crowds of people, including many of the nobility, went to the Tower every day to pay their respects to the venerable prisoners. Among them a deputation of ten leading Nonconformist ministers went to express their sympathy, and when the King sent for four of them and upbraided them, they boldly replied that they "thought it a solemn duty to forget past quarrels and stand by the men who stood by the Protestant cause." Even the Scotch Presbyterians were warmed and stirred in favour of the bishops, and sent messages of sympathy and encouragement. From every part of England came daily words of kindness and approbation. As for the men of Cornwall, they were so moved at the idea of their countryman, Trelawney, being in any danger, that a ballad was composed to suit the occasion, and sung over the county, of which the burden is still preserved.[1]

---

[1] The following is said to have been the ballad, but it is doubtful whether any part except the chorus is as old as 1688:—

And shall Trelawney die? and shall Trelawney die?
Then twenty thousand Cornish boys shall know the reason why.

Even the miners took up the song and sung it with a variation—

Then thirty thousand underground shall know the reason why.

A king of more common sense than James might well have been staggered by the astounding popularity of the seven episcopal prisoners, and would gladly have found some pretext for dropping further proceedings. But, unhappily for himself, he had not the wisdom to recede, and drove on furiously, like Jehu, and drove to his own destruction. He decided to go on with the prosecution. On the 15th of June the seven bishops were brought from the Tower to the Court of King's Bench, and ordered to plead to the information laid against them. Of course, they pleaded "not guilty." That day fortnight, the 29th of June, was fixed for their trial, and in the meantime they were allowed to be at liberty on their own recognizances. It was well for the Crown that they did not require bail. Twenty-one peers of the highest rank were ready to give security, three for each defendant, and one of the richest Dissenters in the City had begged, as a special favour, that he might have the honour of being bail for Bishop Ken.

On leaving the Court, in order to go to their own lodgings, the bishops received almost as great an ovation as when they were sent to the Tower. The bells of many churches were set ring-

---

A good sword and a trusty hand,
A merry heart and true;
King James' men shall understand,
What Cornish men can do!
And have they fixed the where and when,
And shall Trelawney die?
Then twenty thousand Cornish men
Will know the reason why.

Chorus.

And shall they scorn Tre, Pol, and Pen?
And shall Trelawney die?
Here's twenty thousand Cornish men
Will know the reason why.

Outspake their Captain, brave and bold—
A merry wight was he:
"If London Tower were Michael's Hold,
We'll set Trelawney free!
We'll cross the Tamar land to land,
The Severn is no stay,—
All side by side and hand to hand,
And who shall bid us nay?"

Chorus.

And shall they scorn, &c.

ing, and many of the lower orders who knew nothing of the forms of law imagined that all was over, and the good cause had triumphed. But whether ignorantly or intelligently, such a crowd assembled round the prelates in Palace Yard, that they found it difficult to force their way through their friends and admirers. Nor could it be said for a moment that the people knew not wherefore they were come together. One common feeling actuated the whole mass, and that feeling was abhorrence of Popery and zeal for Protestantism. How deep that feeling was is evidenced by a simple anecdote supplied by Macaulay.

Cartwright, Bishop of Chester, a timid sycophant of the Court, was silly and curious enough to mingle with the crowd as his noble-minded brethren came out of the Court. Some person who saw his episcopal dress supposed he was one of the accused, and asked and received his blessing. A bystander cried out, "Do you know who blessed you?" "Surely," said the man, "it was one of the seven." "No!" said the other, "it was the Popish Bishop of Chester." At once the enraged Londoner roared out, "Popish dog, take your blessing back again."

At last, on the 29th of June, the ever-memorable trial of the seven bishops actually came off, and they were arraigned before a jury of their countrymen in the Court of King's Bench at Westminster. Such a crowd was probably never before or since seen in a court of law. Sixty peers according to Evelyn's diary, thirty-five according to Macaulay, sat near the four judges and testified their interest in the cause. Westminster Hall, Palace Yard, and all the streets adjoining, were filled with a multitude of people wound up to the highest pitch of anxious expectation. Into all the details of that well-fought day I cannot enter. How from morning till sunset the legal battle went on—how the Crown witnesses were cross-examined and worried—how triumphantly Somers, the fourth counsel of the bishops, showed that the alleged libel was neither false, nor libellous, nor seditious—how even the four judges were divided in opinion, and two of them went so far in their charge to the jury as to admit there was no libel—how the jury retired when it was dark to consider their verdict, and were shut up all night with the servants of the defendants sitting on the stairs to watch the doors and prevent roguery—how at length all the twelve jurymen were for acquittal except Arnold the King's brewer, and even he gave way when the biggest of the twelve said, "Look at me, I will stay here till I am no bigger than a tobacco pipe before I find the bishops guilty"—how at six in the morning the jury agreed, and at ten appeared in court, and by the mouth of their foreman, Sir Roger Langley, pronounced the bishops *Not Guilty*—how at the words coming out of his lips Lord Halifax waved his hat, and at least ten thousand persons outside the court raised such

a shout that the roof of old Westminster Hall seemed to crack —how the people in the streets caught up the cheer and passed it on all over London—how many seemed beside themselves with joy, and some laughed and some wept—how guns were fired and bells rung, and horsemen galloped off in all directions to tell the news of a victory over Popery—how the jury could scarcely get out of the Hall and were forced to shake hands with hundreds crying out "God bless you, you have saved us all to-day"—how when night came bonfires were lighted and all London was illuminated and huge figures of the Pope were burnt in effigy—all, all these things are so described in the burning words of Lord Macaulay's pictorial History that I shall not attempt to depict them. To go over the field so graphically occupied by that mighty "master of sentences" would be as foolish as to gild refined gold or paint the lily. Suffice it to say that the great battle of Protestantism against Popery was fought at this trial, that a great victory was won, and that to the prosecution and acquittal of the seven bishops James II. owed the loss of his Crown.

For we must never forget that the consequences of the trial were enormously great, and that results flowed from it of which myriads never dreamed when they shouted and cheered on the 29th of June. Within twenty-four hours of the trial a letter left England for Holland, signed by seven leading Englishmen, inviting the Prince of Orange to come over with an army and overthrow the Stuart dynasty. The hour had come at last, and the man was wanted. Within four weeks of the trial Archbishop Sancroft, warmed and softened by the events of May and June, drew up a circular letter to all the bishops of the Church of England, which is one of the most remarkable letters ever penned by an Archbishop of Canterbury, and has never received the attention it deserves. In this letter he solemnly enjoined the bishops and clergy "to have a tender regard to our brethren the Protestant Dissenters, to visit them at their homes, to receive them kindly at their own, and to treat them fairly whenever they meet them." Above all he charged them "to take all opportunities of assuring the Dissenters that the English bishops are really and sincerely irreconcilable enemies to the errors, superstitions, idolatries, and tyrannies of the Church of Rome." And lastly he urged them "to exhort Dissenters to join with us in fervent prayer to the God of peace for the universal blessed union of all reformed churches both at home and abroad." A wonderful pastoral that! Well would it have been for the Church of England if Lambeth had always held similar language and not cooled down and forgotten the Tower. But it was one of the first results of the famous trial. Last, but not least, within six months of the bishops' acquittal the Great Revolution

took place, the Popish monarch lost his Crown and left England, and William and Mary were placed on the English throne. But before they were formally placed on the throne the famous "Declaration of Rights" was solemnly drawn up and signed by both Houses of Parliament. And what was the very first sentence of that Declaration? It is an assertion that "the late King James did endeavour to subvert and extirpate the Protestant religion—by assuming a power of dispensing with laws and by committing and prosecuting divers worthy prelates." And what was the last sentence of the Declaration? It was the famous Oath of Supremacy, containing these words:—"I do declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate hath, or ought to have, jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm. So help me God." Such were the immediate consequences of the trial of the Seven Bishops. They are of unspeakable importance. They stand out to my eyes in the landscape of English history like Tabor in Palestine, and no Englishman ought ever to forget them. To the trial of the seven bishops we owe our second deliverance from Popery.

It remains for me to point out three practical lessons which appear to flow naturally out of the whole subject.

(*a.*) First and foremost, the reign of James II. ought to teach a lesson *about English rulers and statesmen*, whether Whig or Tory. That lesson is the duty of never allowing the Government of this great country to be placed again in the hands of a Papist.

If this lesson does not stand out plainly on the face of history, like the handwriting at Belshazzar's feast, I am greatly mistaken. Unless we are men who having eyes see not, and having ears hear not, let us beware of Popish rulers. We know what they were in Queen Mary's days. We tried them a second time under James II. If we love our country let us never try them again. They cannot possibly be honest conscientious Papists if they do not labour incessantly to subvert English Protestantism, and turn everything upside down. I yield to no man in abhorrence of intolerance and religious persecution. I have not the slightest desire to put the clock back and revive such miserable disabilities as those of the Test and Corporation Acts. I am quite content with the Constitution as it is, and the laws which forbid the crown of England to be placed on the head of a Papist. But I hope we shall take care these laws are never repealed.

Some may think me an alarmist for saying such things. But I say plainly there is much in the outlook of the day to make a thinking man uncomfortable. I dislike the influence which men like Cardinal Manning are gradually getting among the upper classes. I dislike the growing disposition to make an

idol of mere earnestness, to forget history, and to suppose that Rome has changed, and earnest Papists are as good as any Protestant. I dislike the modern principle, unknown to the good old Puritans, that States have nothing to do with religion, and that it matters not whether the sovereign is Protestant or Papist, Jew, Turk, Infidel, or Heretic. I see these things floating in the air. I confess they make me uncomfortable. I am sure we have need to stand on our guard, and to resolve that, God helping us, we will never allow the Pope to rule England again. If he does, we may depend upon it we shall have no more blessing from God. The offended God of the Bible will turn away His face from us, and we shall bid a long farewell to peace at home, influence abroad, comfort in our families, and national prosperity. Once more then, I say, let us move heaven and earth before we sanction a Popish prime minister or a Popish king. On the 28th of January, 1689, the House of Commons resolved unanimously "that it hath been found by experience inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this Protestant kingdom to be governed by a Popish prince." (Hallam, iii. 129.) I pray God that resolution may never be forgotten, and never be cancelled or expunged.

(*b.*) In the second place the reign of James II. ought to teach us a lesson *about English Bishops and Clergy.* That lesson is the duty of never forgetting that the true strength of the Established Church lies in loyal faithfulness to Protestant principles and bold unflinching opposition to the Church of Rome.

Never was the Church of England so unpopular as in the days of Laud, and never so popular as in the days of the seven bishops. Never was the Church so hated by Nonconformists as she was when Laud tampered with Rome, never so much beloved by them as when the seven bishops went to prison rather than help the Pope. Why was it that when Laud was committed to the Tower few hands were held up in his favour and few said, "God bless him?" There is only one answer, men did not trust him, and thought him half a Papist. Why was it that, when Sancroft and his companions were taken to the Tower fifty years after, the heart of London was stirred and the whole metropolis rose up to do them honour? The answer again is simple. Men loved them and admired them because they stuck to Protestantism and opposed Rome.

(*c.*) In the last place, the reign of James II. ought to teach a *lesson to all loyal Churchmen.* That lesson is the duty of using every reasonable and lawful means to resist the reintroduction of Romanism into the Church of England.

It is useless to deny that the times demand this, and that there is an organized conspiracy among us for Romanizing the Established Church of this country. Bishops see it and lament

it in their charges. Statesmen see it and make no secret of it in public speeches. Dissenters see it and point the finger of scorn. Romanists see it and rejoice. Foreign nations see it and lift up their hands in amazement. Whether this disgraceful apostasy is to prosper and succeed or not remains yet to be proved. But one thing, at any rate, is certain. This is no time to sit still, fold our arms, and go to sleep. The Church of England expects all her sons to do their duty, and much, under God, depends on the action of the laity.

It is false to say, as some of the advocates of Ritualism constantly say, that those who oppose them want to narrow the limits of the Church of England, and to make it the exclusive church of one party. I for one indignantly deny the charge. I have always allowed and do allow that our Church is largely comprehensive, and that there is room for honest High, honest Low, and honest Broad Churchmen within her pale. If any clergyman likes to preach in a surplice, or has the Lord's Supper weekly, or has Saints' day services, or daily matins and vespers, I have not the least wish to interfere with him, though I cannot see with his eyes. But I firmly maintain that the comprehensiveness of the Church has limits, and that those limits are the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Prayer-Book.

Controversy and religious strife no doubt are odious things; but these are times when they are a positive necessity. Unity and peace are very delightful, but they are bought too dear if they are bought at the expense of truth. There is a vast amount of maundering childish weak talk now-a-days in some quarters about unity and peace, which I cannot reconcile with the language of St. Paul. It is a pity, no doubt, that there should be so much controversy, but it is also a pity that human nature should be so bad as it is, and that the devil should be loose in the world. It was a pity that Arius taught error about Christ's person: but it would have been a greater pity if Athanasius had not opposed him. It was a pity Tetzel went about preaching up the Pope's indulgences: it would have been a far greater pity if Luther had not withstood him. Controversy, in fact, is one of the conditions under which truth in every age has to be defended and maintained, and it is nonsense to ignore it.

Of one thing I am very certain. Whether men will come forward or not to oppose the Romanizing movement of these days, if the Church of England cannot get rid of the revived Popish mass and the revived detestable confessional the people of this land will soon get rid of the Established Church of England. True to the mighty principles of the Reformation, our Church will stand and retain its hold on the affections of the country, and no weapon formed against us shall prosper. False to these principles, and readmitting Popery, she will certainly

fall, and no amount of histrionic sensuous ceremonial will prevent her ruin. Like Ephesus which left her first love, like Thyatira which suffered Jezebel to teach, like Laodicea which became lukewarm, her candlestick will be taken away. The glory will depart from her. The pillar of cloud and fire will be removed. The best and most loyal of her children will forsake her in disgust, and, like an army whose soldiers have gone away, leaving nothing behind but officers and band, the Church will perish, miserably and unpitied but deservedly, for want of Churchmen.

J. C. LIVERPOOL.

ART. II.—THE STUDY OF CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE WITH A VIEW TO MEET POPULAR OBJECTIONS.

1. *Principles of Mental Physiology.* By WILLIAM B. CARPENTER, M.D., LL.D. King. 1874.
2. *A Candid Examination of Theism.* By PHYSICUS. Trübner. 1878.
3. *Easy Lessons on Christian Evidence.* By Archbishop WHATELY. C.K.S.
4. *Word, Work and Will.* By the Archbishop of YORK. Murray. 1880.
5. *Lectures and Essays.* By the late W. K. CLIFFORD. Macmillan. 1879.

HITHERTO the study of evidence has not been made sufficiently popular. It is not easy to make it popular. The subject is abstruse, extending over a wide range, and tasking in no ordinary degree the attention and memory of the student. With the single exception of Archbishop Whately's "Easy Lessons on Christian Evidence," it is hard to find any treatise on evidence which is at once interesting in itself and within the comprehension of those persons by whom this instruction is the most needed. And it is well known that this little tract cost the illustrious author more labour, and was more carefully and more frequently revised, than any other of his numerous works—while, on the other hand, the greatest of all books on evidence, which is also, perhaps, the noblest example of accurate reasoning and judicial impartiality to be found in the whole range of English literature, Butler's "Analogy," is, at the same time, one of the most difficult and least attractive of all books to the non-professional student. Although the range of

physical science has been extended almost indefinitely since Butler's time, so that it would appear that the contest is henceforth to be waged on a different field and for other interests, there is really (with the single exception of the one chapter on the future life) scarcely a sentence in the whole book which is not as useful as ever to the student of evidence, and we see in almost every page, not less in his wonderful caution in never pushing an argument beyond its strictly logical application than in the fair statement of objections that Butler had foreseen and provided against difficulties which, in his day, were only coming into prominence, but in our time have excited an absorbing interest. The pure gold is there. It only needs to be re-minted, and issued in smaller coins, to meet the every-day wants of our modern readers, who have no taste for such books, and by whom such arguments would scarcely be understood.

The teacher of Christian evidence, with a view to the needs of the present time, will have to cultivate the art of exposing popular fallacies and bringing arguments which have been addressed to the student of divinity down to the level of the men who have had none of these advantages, and who have neither capacity nor inclination to weigh arguments which suppose some knowledge of the subject and which demand long and sustained habits of disciplined attention. He must not be afraid of science, nor unwilling to employ the accepted terms of science in defence of religion.

The struggle is no longer for a division of the territory of human thought between two jealous rivals, nor even of a compromise, but of an absolute, unconditional, and dishonourable surrender. If there be no personal God, no intelligent Creator, and no moral Governor of the world, religion is impossible, and in "matter" must reside the promise and potency of all external things, as well as all the thoughts and associations and works of the greatest as well as the meanest of men. In the presence of such a controversy as this all other questions are comparatively insignificant. Not only the questions which divide Churches from each other, but even essential verities of the Christian faith, and other departments of evidence such as miracles and prophecy, are small in comparison. It is useless to examine the claims of miracle and prophecy, so long as some men believe that there is no God who can act and who has spoken to mankind. The discussion may be painful, difficult, complicated, but it is inevitable. All other questions must wait until this has been considered. It is well to know, at least, what issues are at stake and on what field and with what weapons this decisive battle of all the ages is to be fought.

I shall give my readers certain cautions as to the salient points of this controversy.

It is necessary at the outset to understand the attitude of science towards religion. This meets us at the threshold of our subject and must be taken into account. It is important to show that the foundations of religion have not been weakened by the progress of modern science. We must notice the direction of modern scientific inquiry, especially those discoveries of very recent date which are supposed to have endangered the proof of an intelligent Creator and moral Governor of the world, so that our friends may understand exactly the present position of this controversy.

It is difficult to discuss these questions in popular language. And yet the attempt must be made. We must refrain from harsh words, and, however keenly we feel the immeasurable importance of the issues at stake, we must render impartial justice to the arguments of our opponents, and try to show that we can understand, and have weighed candidly and fairly, the difficulties of their position as well as the difficulties of our own, and that we give them credit for motives as honourable as those which influence ourselves.

We may even go farther than this and admit the intense earnestness which has marked the struggle between darkness and light in the souls of many who seem to have made shipwreck of their faith, and we may pray that through God's great mercy they may yet be led to retrace their steps, and may find that joy and peace in religion, the want of which has been to them the eclipse of the sun at noon-day. Few sadder words have ever been written than those in which the anonymous author of "A Candid Examination of Theism" concludes the treatise in which he has tried to controvert the well-known arguments for Theism:—

> Forasmuch as I am far from being able to agree with those who affirm that the twilight doctrine of the "new faith" is a desirable substitute for the waning splendour "of the old," I am not ashamed to confess that, with this virtual negation of God, the Universe to me has lost its soul of loveliness, and although from henceforth the precept "to work while it is day," will doubtless but gain an intensified force from the terribly intensified meaning of the words that "the night cometh, when no man can work," yet, when at times I think, as think at times I must, of the appalling contrast between the hallowed glory of that creed which once was mine and the lonely mystery of existence as now I find it—at such times I shall ever feel it impossible to avoid the sharpest pang of which my nature is susceptible.

One cannot but sympathize most deeply with the writer of this passage. Nor is he alone. Similar words are found in other writings of men who might be called the *Apostles of despair*.

On those who undertake to meet them on their own ground

there lies a heavy weight of responsibility that no words be spoken in bitterness, but rather in the hope that we may lead them to retrace their steps. Surely such men will be the first to acknowledge that they have spoken bitter things against themselves, and that the premises on which they have relied will not justify the inference that God has left Himself without a witness in the world around us, as well as in the mind and conscience and heart of man. This is not only right in itself and the only way by which we can hope to gain a hearing or to make any impression on the minds which we desire to convince, but it will be found to be the most effective of all arguments, for in many cases we shall see that, even granting the objection, it does not overthrow the truth against which it was directed. In other cases it will be found that men have taken up as a part of the Christian revelation, some theory of man's devising for which it is not responsible, or perhaps an injudicious advocate has employed an unsound argument, which, being refuted, is not allowed to drop out of the controversy altogether and count for nothing (as it ought to do), but is then paraded as a positive objection to the truth, so that it can easily be shown that even by its own admission, or rather on the admission of its most anti-Christian exponents, science has really proved nothing which the most devout Christian ought to be unwilling or afraid to accept.

We must distinguish between the unproved unverified hypotheses of science, the conjectures unsupported by a single fact, and the principles which are universally admitted. The former are not science but conjecture. The latter are not inconsistent with revelation.

What is the last utterance of science on this question of questions? Some men of science have assured us that, since the establishment of the scientific doctrine of the correlation of physical forces, and the publication of a famous treatise on the "Mechanical Equivalent of Heat," the belief in an intelligent author of the world is, perhaps, no longer scientifically indispensable.

Modern science has discovered that all the physico-chemical forces, through which the various changes in the world of matter have been produced, such as gravitation, motion, heat, electricity, and chemical affinity, are interchangeable, or convertible one into the other, that retarded motion turns to heat—that each force generates another equal force so much, and no more—that no force is lost, though a force may pass from an active to a potential state, that the force expended by the drops of water which turn the wheels of a corn mill is no more than the paying back a portion of the force which (perhaps ages before) was spent by the sun's heat which raised it by evaporation, drop by drop,

from the surface of the sea. This process of compensation is so perfect, that, before the water comes down again into the sea, it will have spent, through friction on the river-bed and tasks imposed on it by the ingenuity of man, exactly so much force as it originally cost the sun, perhaps centuries before, to raise it from the ocean-bed to that place in the overhanging sky, from which it was precipitated in fertilizing showers on the thirsty earth. We may therefore accept these two propositions, as demonstrated scientific truths, that the forces of physical nature are convertible, and that no force is ever lost. It is also an accepted truth that vital force, the force which is expended in the several operations of our bodies, the force by which we move our arms and by which every part of this our animal mechanism is kept going, has the same relation to the various forms of physical force which they have to each other.

The absorbing interest and grandeur and beauty of these discoveries no words can adequately describe. But it cannot be seriously maintained that they go so far as to disprove the existence of God. In fact there are certain words in the Psalms with which we are familiar which describe the unity of the works of God by language which would need very little change to make it an accurate scientific description of this newest and greatest discovery of modern scientific research. All men of science would admit, whether Theists or Atheists, that the history of the material universe could not be other than it is. The belief in special unconnected acts of creation is no part of the Christian faith. We all admit that God acts by general laws, that the sphere of the action of these laws is wider than we had anticipated, and goes farther back, even so far as to the period when this world, now so full of beauty and harmony and power and happiness and life, may have been only a rotating mass of heated vapour. But this is perfectly consistent with our belief in the Creator working by these laws. In the book called "A Candid Examination of Theism," by Physicus, which is the latest and the ablest exposition of the principles of materialism, the conclusion is given in these words:—"Result of the exposition—suspended judgment, the only logical attitude of mind with regard to the question of Theism." "*Suspended judgment*,"—*i.e.*, it is said to be no longer impossible to construct a theory of the universe without what has been called the *hypothesis of God*. This is the utmost point to which the most advanced thinkers of this school have been able to go. Let us examine it for a moment.

The treatise called "A Candid Examination of Theism," by Physicus, has been adopted by many anti-Christian writers as the latest and most accurate defence of their position. He examines the truth of Christianity from the side of science, and

absolutely declines to apply to the investigation any other than scientific tests. His words are:—

> If there is a God, it is certain that reason is the faculty by which he has enabled man to discover truth, and it is no less certain that the scientific methods have proved themselves by far the most trustworthy for reason to adopt. To my mind, therefore, it is impossible to resist the conclusion that, looking to this undoubted pre-eminence of the scientific methods as ways to truth, whether or not there is a God, the question as to his existence is both morally and more reverently contemplated if we regard it purely as a problem for methodical analysis to solve, than if we regard it in any other light. Or, stating the case in other words, I believe that in whatever degree we intentionally abstain from using in this case what we *know* to be the most trustworthy methods of inquiry in other cases, in that degree are we either unworthily closing our eyes to a dreaded truth, or we are guilty of the worst among human sins. "Depart from us, for we desire not the knowledge of thy ways." If it is said that, supposing man to be in a state of probation, faith and not reason must be the instrument of his trial, I am ready to admit the validity of the remark; but I must also ask it to be remembered, that unless faith has some basis of reason whereon to rest, it differs in nothing from superstition, and hence that it is still our duty to investigate the *rational* standing of the question before us by the scientific methods alone.

These words, which are found in the preface to the book and may therefore be regarded as describing the writer's object and method, show very clearly the fallacy which underlies his whole argument. No Christian would assert that Christian faith is based on mere authority without any basis of reason. Christ Himself and his apostles appealed to evidence of various kinds. Had there been no such proofs those who rejected Him would not have had sin. Every one of the writers of the New Testament speaks of proofs from miracle and prophecy. One of them warns his readers that they must be able to give a reason for the hope that is in them, and contrasts the facts of which he himself and the other apostles had been eye-witnesses with the cunningly devised fables of superstition (σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις) of Pagan mythology. It is unnecessary, therefore, to warn us that our faith must have *some* basis of reason. But it is a very different matter to assume that all questions involved in the Christian religion are to be determined by *scientific methods alone.* In the page next to that from which I have already quoted, the failure of the scientific method alone is admitted:—

> If it is retorted that the question to be dealt with is of so ultimate a character that even the scientific methods are here untrustworthy. I reply that they are nevertheless the best methods available, and hence that the retort is without pertinence; the question is still to be

regarded as a scientific one, although we may perceive that neither an affirmative nor a negative answer can be given to it with any approach to a full demonstration.

But this amounts to a complete surrender of the claim previously made for the scientific method *alone*. If the case against the truth of the Christian revelation amounted to demonstration we might say "the case is finished—science has spoken her last word." But when, on the other hand, we are told by the most accomplished scientific men that their answers are so vague and come so far short of full demonstration, we reply that they cannot reasonably decline to examine such other proofs as may be within their reach, and may help them to form a right conclusion on the most important of all questions which can engage the thoughts of mankind. We never asserted that science could demonstrate the truth of religion. Nor can she demonstrate its falsehood. But physical science is not the only field of investigation, nor physical methods the only methods within our reach, nor physical tests the only tests of truth. The whole field of moral questions cannot be excluded from this discussion, nor the absorbing and manifold interests which make up the practical life of men, including the great problems involved in the words "sin and sorrow."

No single department of human thought can claim the monopoly of evidence in deciding the question which, more than any other, concerns the happiness and the virtue of mankind.

The admission that physical methods have failed shows that the dogmatism of infidelity cannot be defended. It leaves the question of Theism an open question, to be determined by such evidence as may be within our reach, and with which we must be satisfied on all moral and practical and historical questions. Probability is the only kind of evidence of which such questions are capable. Christianity is a religion of facts, of the evidence for which men conversant with mathematical are less competent judges than lawyers, or historians, or men who have been engaged in the business of active life. In a letter to a friend Archbishop Whately said:—

> Though one might naturally expect that the fault of mere mathematicians would be an over-rigid demand for demonstration in all subjects, I have found the fact to be the reverse. They generally, when they come to any other subject, throw off all regard to order and accuracy, like the feasting of the Roman Catholics before and after Lent. With them mathematics is "attention" and everything else "stand at ease." The defect of mathematics as an exclusive or too predominant study is that it has no connection with human affairs, and affords no exercise of judgment, having no degrees of probability.

That mind is imperfectly and disproportionately trained which measures all kinds of evidence by the same standard, and which

in matters of religion, refuses to accept the only kind of evidence which can ever be produced in such cases, and with which in all other similar cases it is satisfied. This is, in truth, under the appearance of objecting to Christianity to find fault with the human faculties themselves, and to resign ourselves to universal scepticism in all the concerns of our daily life as well as in all that we can know of the history of the past.

But in reply to this whole argument, the desolating sweep of which has been described by the author himself in words of such terrible significance, we must observe that, even if we accept it, it has not loosened nor disturbed a single stone from the foundation of our faith. The existence of God is not merely nor mainly a question of science. No doubt, some scientific men, as well as some who are not men of science, are very impatient of the introduction of religious questions into the domain of science. Science herself remembers the day when theology compelled her to labour in chains; though she has long since outgrown her fetters and forged out of them hammers for the destruction of her prison doors, she often points to the scars of the prison-house and the instruments of torture. The memory of former suffering often perverts her judgment and warps her vision. She fancies that the presence of God and the thought of religion will only complicate what is simple, introduce controversies foreign to science, restrain the process of reasoning by fear of consequences, and trouble the calm atmosphere of abstract thought by the frivolous disputes and passionate hatreds of theology.

This is a very real sentiment, and has inspired many of the foremost writers of the day. In Professor Tyndall's famous Belfast address it held a prominent place, and it has been stated more explicitly by the late W. K. Clifford.

In the second volume of Clifford's "Essays," p. 233, he writes thus:—

> We are not much accustomed to be afraid, and we never know when we are beaten. But those who are nearer to the danger feel a very real and, it seems to me, well-grounded fear. The whole structure of modern society, the fruit of long and painful efforts, the hopes of future improvement, the triumphs of justice, of freedom, and of light, the bonds of patriotism which make each nation one, the bonds of humanity which bring different nations together—all these they see to be menaced with a great and real and even pressing danger. For myself I cannot help feeling as they feel. It seems to me quite possible that the moral and intellectual culture of Europe, the light and the right, what makes life worth having and men worthy to have it, may be clean swept away by a revival of superstition. We are perhaps ourselves not free from such a domestic danger; but no one can doubt that the danger would speedily arise if all Europe at our

side should become again barbaric, not with the weakness and docility of a barbarism which has never known better, but with the strength of a past civilization perverted to the service of evil.

I do not assert that these fears are absolutely groundless. For instance, if the daydream of some enthusiastic "Catholics" —a reunited Christendom—were to be effected, the Inquisition and the index of prohibited books would not lag far behind. But the danger in England at the present day comes from the opposite quarter. Let the men of science remember that prejudice of every kind is equally fatal to the investigation of truth, that there may be an anti-theological, as well as a theological bias. Let not the man who has been bitten by a serpent be afraid of a rope. Indeed, there could not be clearer proof of the strength of this anti-theological bias than the contrast between the moderate words in which Physicus states his conclusion and the language in which we are elsewhere told that the defence of Christianity is hopeless. *Suspended judgment* is the watchword. Scientific research is trying to account for everything without God.

If there were no other field of human knowledge except science; if science herself could give a perfectly complete and satisfactory account of all the phenomena of this world from the beginning till the present hour, if the belief in God were no more than one of those speculative questions, such as the theory of development, on which one might hold the judgment in suspense as long as he pleased, because it does not affect the practical business of life, every one who did not take a personal interest in such questions might leave the battle to be fought out between the philosophers and the theologians. This is the course which is often pressed on us under the name of *Agnosticism*—which means simply *ignorance*, and expresses that temper of indifference to theological questions, which implies that religion is a speculative theory which may or may not be true, but with which men of science, as such, have no concern. If God were nothing but an hypothesis to account for the world, this would no doubt be true. But nothing could be more contrary to the whole meaning and purpose of the Christian religion. In the case of religion *Agnosticism* is impossible, because religion is practical. Here then are only two possible alternatives, belief and disbelief. The life of the man who says, "I don't know whether there is a God or no," and of the man who says "I don't believe that there is a God," will, as a rule, virtually be the same, and will differ entirely from the life of him who believes in, and who directs his life by, that predominant and overmastering belief. In this case, a man's words are nothing, because his life decides for him, and the decision of the *Agnostic* and the *Atheist* are identical. They

both say in their heart, There is no God. But the premises of the scientist will not warrant the logical much less the moral conclusion of Agnosticism nor of Atheism.

They argue from tendencies, not from facts. They point to the triumphs already accomplished by science, and they ask us to believe that the method which has accomplished so much already will in due time accomplish all.

Here we pause and cry *Halt!* Our scientific friends are going too fast.

None of the triumphs of science gives us the slightest hope that she will ever come nearer than she is now to the last great secret of all. Phenomena due to physical forces may be analyzed. These are the proper subjects of physical science. But phenomena due to a Creator cannot be seen and classified, for they depend on laws of which we know nothing. We must distinguish between what are called the *mechanical* conditions of phenomena and the *dynamical* conditions. This is no unreal distinction drawn in the interest of religion, but it is insisted on by the greatest physical philosophers of the day, Mr. Mill, Professor Bain, and Dr. Carpenter. Mr. Mill teaches it in these words:—"The chief practical conclusion drawn by Professor Bain bearing on causation is that we must distinguish in the assemblage of conditions which constitute the cause of a phenomenon two elements, one the presence of a force, the other the collocation or position of objects which is required in order that the force may undergo the peculiar transformation which constitutes the phenomenon." It is evident that no amount of knowledge of the conditions under which the force is manifested will bring us any nearer to the knowledge of the force which impels them. If science had come to the very end of the phenomena of the universe, had analyzed and classified every phenomenon, and had written down the several conditions under which every possible change took place, she would find herself as far as ever from understanding the nature of the force by which all these things are moved. All former discoveries would not help her to say whether the force by which all things are moved is intelligent or not. For this reason we are sure that no discoveries of science will ever destroy religion, for they lie on totally different planes. The word *cause*, in the language of science, means one thing—the succession of external phenomena considered as signs; in the language of religion a totally different thing—the cause of force itself. The physicist investigates the external sign, the theologian the internal force. There is no ladder by which we can ascend from the lower of these stories to the higher. The most accomplished anatomist, looking at the cells of the human brain, knows as little of the power of thought as the infant in his mother's arms. This he never will know, for thought

and life fly before the surgeon's scalpel and defy his subtlest powers of microscopic observation. This is well illustrated by Dr. Carpenter in *The Modern Review* for January last. The worker in a cotton mill, the power of which is conveyed by a shaft from the outside, cannot know, without going outside, what is the nature of the power that sets so many parts agoing, whether it be water, or steam, or electricity, or horses. No investigation of cranks and wheels will give the slightest clue to the origin of the the force itself. These are the mechanical conditions—the force itself is absolutely and totally distinct. All that he knows is that it is directed by some power for the purpose of effecting those changes which the owner of the mill has designed. The inmate of the mill would never suppose that the force, whatever it might be, was not intended to work the mill, that the architect was wanting in intelligence, or did not intend that the force should be employed for the purpose for which the mill had been erected. If any one object to this inference he is bound to show why the form of argument which is valid in every case in which it can be applied within our reach should suddenly deceive when applied on the largest scale, and to prove that the force by which the whole world is moved proceeds from a Being of intelligence and volition. Moreover, this inference is not only legitimate but it has been actually formed by the vast majority of the human race from the earliest times, not only by the common people, but by the great thinkers of every age and country. This is the force of the argument from general consent, which is not in the sentiment of awe towards the Great Unknown, but is the inference which the mind of man, looking at the external world, has almost invariably drawn from the marks of design which everywhere meet his eyes.

It is wise, then, to show that we are not afraid of the progress of science, that, in reference to the fundamental question of the being of God, religion and science move in different orbits, and that, although the shadow of science may seem for a moment to intercept the light which the sun of God's revelation has thrown on our earth, we are quite certain that as she moves onward in her appointed course round the central Sun this present shadow will pass away, as other shadows have passed away, and leave to the inhabitants of our planet the light and heat and life from Him who is the Sun of Righteousness and the light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.

But while we concede so much to science, we are bound on the other hand to protest against unscientific science and unphilosophical philosophy. Great as are the claims of science on the gratitude of mankind, physical science is not the only department of knowledge accessible to mankind. To confine the

Christian advocate to scientific methods, and scientific facts, and scientific proofs, is to invite us to surrender our strongest position, to descend into the plain with our hands tied behind our backs, and to submit the decision of a question which is eminently and distinctively moral and historical to a tribunal which peremptorily refuses to accept any testimony higher than the testimony of dead matter and the brute creation.

You ask us to distrust the evidence of our own consciousness, which tells us, in the only instance in which we are brought into direct contact with the origin of force, that it is connected (obscurely, perhaps, and with many intervening links, but still indissolubly and invariably, connected) with volition and intelligence, and so with motive, and reason, and all the other attributes of mind in which our own personality consists. You ask us to distrust the evidence of our moral sense which tells us, and has told all the generations of men, including the Æschyluses and Sophocles, the Platos, and Aristotles of ancient times no less than all Christian dramatists and moralists, that guilt is a real sentiment and remorse a real suffering—you ask us to renounce the appeal to the common reason of mankind, which has decided with such wonderful unanimity in our favour—you ask us to silence the convictions of the hearts of millions who have found in these truths the only availing solace in the darkest passages of life and the only availing protection against the assaults of evil which seemed to them worse than death, and, what seems the most unreasonable of all your demands, you insist that the decision should be given either without consulting a page of the history of the human race, or else that we must produce, for the facts on which Christianity is based, proofs of such a kind as the very nature of the case absolutely precludes, which, moreover, never have been and never could be produced in proof of any fact or any series of facts which have ever taken place in the history of the world. "The Bible is the history of the world, as God's world," as Butler says. Christianity is based on a series of facts, the history of the effects of which we trace in the Christian Church up to the present day, so that we have a right to ask that its truth be decided, not absolutely as a question of the science which deals with dead matter and the development of the animal creation but as a question of the history of mankind.

There is, says the French philosopher M. de Quatrefages, the whole thickness of history between the brutes and mankind, and to determine an historical question without the aid of history is eminently unjust and illogical. Such a decision could only be justified if Atheism were capable of demonstration. This no man who knows anything of the subject would undertake to assert. As for us, we may without any hesitation refuse to

surrender the dearest hopes of humanity to an appeal to that evidence only which can be gathered from the study of inanimate matter and the dumb animals. Between us and them there is the whole thickness of history, and that is a wide enough interval to show how partial and one-sided, therefore how far short of demonstration, that science must be which does not take it into account.

That I am not exaggerating the systematic and sometimes ostentatious neglect of history which pervades many of the treatises which have been written against religion in the name of science, will be admitted by every one who is familiar with this department of literature.

But even where the principle is not avowed it is universally acted on by the deniers of revealed religion, when they come to speak of those parts of the Bible which contain prophecies or miracles, which are essential parts of its history, They come to the Bible with the foregone conclusion that all such passages are false. They stretch a perverted ingenuity to the utmost length of extravagance, they tax the credulity of scepticism to an extent which no religious enthusiast would dare to emulate, in order to get rid of the supernatural elements from the Bible, especially from the Gospels. They apply to them a method of mythical interpretation which Mr. Grote exposed and exploded from the legends of Grecian history thirty years ago. They would never venture to apply such a method to the interpretation of any other books than the Gospels. Why do they apply it to them? Simply because they have approached this subject with the preconceived theory either that there is no God, or that He has never interfered in the affairs of men. It has been already shown that the discoveries of science do not justify any such conclusion.

All that the least friendly witness can say is that perhaps God is not scientifically indispensable.

But we would remind our friends with all deference that our conception of God is very much truer and very much nobler than theirs, or than that which they erroneously attribute to us. We do not believe in a God who is restrained by his own laws, and who values the uniformity of the laws of inanimate nature more than the happiness and virtue of mankind. The moral and religious aspect of the miracles of the Gospels is always the most prominent feature of our history. To suppose that miracles are either interferences with God's original design, and so confessions of imperfection (as has been alleged by some), or that they are to be separated altogether from the purpose for which they are said to have been performed (as others say), is equally unfair. In fact, the authority of the Gospels never would have been questioned if they had not contained a record of miracles, and the

miracles would not have been questioned if men had not brought with them the conviction that miracles are impossible, and, therefore, that the evidence in favour of them does not deserve to be impartially examined. This nothing less than a demonstration of Atheism would justify, and this has never been attempted.

No doubt the stories of counterfeit miracles will justify you in testing all alleged miracles most rigorously.

The Christian advocate has nothing to fear from the most careful examination of the miracles of the New Testament. His chief difficulty is that men will not examine them at all, and that they are confounded with the counterfeit miracles of mediæval times. This is only to be met by insisting on the *uniqueness* of the Christian miracles. He must show that the so-called ecclesiastical miracles differ in almost every essential feature, prophetical, historical, doctrinal, and moral, as well as physical, from the miracles of which the apostles and their contemporaries were eye-witnesses. He must show that the reality of these miracles is the only adequate, the only assignable cause for the success of Christianity at the first, as well as for the continued transmission of the Sacraments of the Christian Church to our own day.

I conclude this Paper with a few practical suggestions:—

1. We must take care to show that Christianity is altogether independent of all scientific hypotheses, and to not assume that every new theory will necessarily be hostile to revelation.

2. We must refuse to look on the great fundamental questions of religion as questions to be decided by one kind of evidence only, and that the kind which is farthest apart from the moral purposes of religion and from the history of mankind, of which the history of our religion forms so large a part.

3. We must point out that religion, as a matter of practice, of morality, and involving the happiness of mankind, is not capable of scientific demonstration, but must rest on probable evidence which admits of degrees, and to all, even the strongest of which, some objections may be made.

4. We must remember that neutrality is in this matter impossible. When men of science ask us to be satisfied with a middle position between Theism and Atheism, which is called Agnosticism, they ask that with which it is impossible either for us or for themselves to concede. We cannot concede it, because in every hour of our lives, and in every sentiment of our hearts, and in all our prospects for the future, we must either acknowledge or deny God. If the question were not so momentous and so urgent we might delay coming to a decision, but our lives will answer for us, and we cannot accept an indefinite delay. Nay, more, it is evident that Agnosticism is no less difficult for

the scientist than for the humblest believer in Christ. Agnosticism assumes a position of impartiality between Theism and Atheism which it is as impossible to maintain as a philosophical speculation as in the business of life. A consistent Agnostic will approach the question of miracles without prejudice either for or against their truth. If there be a God who may interfere for the highest purposes in the affairs of men (and on this point the Agnostic will say that he has formed no opinion whatever) miracles are not impossible, nor the account of them incredible. But the leaders of Agnosticism are the first to forget these admissions when they speak of miracles. By taking for granted that they cannot be true they show that, in speculation as well as in the affairs of life, Agnosticism and Atheism are practically one and the same.

WILLIAM ANDERSON.

ART. III.—BRITISH BURMA.

Personal Recollections of British Burma, and its Church Mission Work in 1878–79. By the Right Rev. J. H. TITCOMB, D.D., First Bishop of Rangoon. Pp. 183. Wells Gardner, Darton and Co. 1880.

THE See of Rangoon, taken out of that of Calcutta, was founded in the year 1877. Churchmen in the diocese of Winchester raised £10,000, and to this noble contribution another £10,000 was added as a benefaction from the Societies for "Promoting Christian Knowledge," and for the "Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts," and from the "Colonial Bishoprics Fund." To these sources of endowment the Indian Government also consented to add the pay of a Senior Chaplaincy. The area of the diocese, coterminous with that of British Burma, including also the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, is about 100,000 square miles, and the population amounts to more than 3,000,000 souls. The great delta of the river Irrawaddy, which covers an area of about 11,000 square miles, is intersected by an immense network of tidal creeks with paddy-fields yielding rich harvests of rice. The richness of the soil may be imagined from the information that beneath these rice crops alluvial mould can often be pierced to the depth of twelve feet. In Tennasserim, one of the three divisions of British Burma—Arakan and Pegu being the other two—excellent tin is found; ores of manganese and iron are abundant, and coal has been discovered, although from the expense of removing it the seams are not worked. The tracts of uncultivated land in British Burma are enormous; but the percentage of increase on lands under cultivation is rising steadily.

The export trade, both foreign and coasting, in 1877–8 increased by 21 per cent. over that of the preceding year. The gross receipts of revenue for the same period were £1,988,244; out of which, after disbursements of every sort, as much as £544,338 (net cash) was remitted to the Imperial exchequer of India. The material prosperity of the country, in fact, is very great, and, under wise administration is likely to develop with rapidity. Its wealth, however, largely lies in non-Christian hands—*i.e.*, among Buddhists, Parsees, Chinese, Jews, Armenians, and Mohammedans. Local resources available for Christian Missions are limited. Many a long year will have to pass, writes its first Bishop, before British Burma can look within herself, however prosperous, for the due supply of her own Missionary finances.[1]

In November, 1877, the Bishopric of Rangoon was accepted by the Rev. J. H. Titcomb, Hon. Canon of Winchester, whom many of our readers will remember as some five-and-twenty years ago a hard-working incumbent in Cambridge. Brought back to England for a season by family affliction, Bishop Titcomb has done well in writing an account of his diocese, of which at present but little is known. His interesting "Personal Recollections," sent forth "to create sympathy with him in his labours, to extend information concerning a remote portion of the Indian Empire, and to advance the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ," form a very timely addition to our store of Missionary works.

Leaving Calcutta February 17, 1878, the Bishop arrived at Rangoon on February 21. The scene in the roads of that city he describes in glowing terms. He says:—

> The season in which we entered Rangoon river being especially devoted to the rice trade, all things were unsually busy; so that the shipping which was anchored along its shores impressed us with an amazing conception of the prosperity of the country. Upon steaming into port, indeed, the whole place strikingly reminded me of Liverpool. The line of buildings also—chiefly public offices—opposite to which we were moored, struck all of us as far more like European than Oriental edifices. Thus we were cheered with a home-like feeling from the first moment of our arrival. One thing alone dissipated this sensation—namely, the variety of costumes worn by the inhabitants; for Rangoon may be truly termed cosmopolitan. *First*, we have the indigenous Burmese, whose dresses, when grouped together in any large numbers, form a perfect flower-garden, particularly on Buddhist

[1] In referring to Mission work in British Burma, generally, the Bishop mentions as the first difficulty the variety of races and languages; Burmese, Chinese, Tamil, Telegu, and Karen. Another difficulty is the total lack of Christian literature in these languages; even school books for children to read have to be compiled. "The whole work of Church Mission is carried on in connection with the S.P.G., and is almost entirely supported out of its annual income." There were four ordained Missionaries in the country when Dr. Titcomb arrived; he left it with twelve.

festival-days, when pink, blue, green, yellow, scarlet, mauve, and every intermediate tint mark both their turbans and their tunics, or as they are more properly called, "putsoes." Besides which, the women, who walk about as freely as the English, constantly wear flowers in their hair, and that with an art which lends them a peculiar charm; a charm which is rather enhanced than lessened by their merrily pacing the roads with large cheroots, being smoked, or thrust through a hole in the lobe of the ear. I use the word "merrily," because the Burmese are among the most happy, good-humoured people possible; perpetually laughing and joking, never working when they can possibly afford to be idle, and often playing with all the joyousness of children—I grieve, however, to add, with a taste also for gambling, which constantly leads them into fatal quarrels. *Secondly*, we have a large Tamil population from the Presidency of Madras, who come over chiefly as household servants. The reason is that the Burmese are far too independent to act among the Europeans as household servants. Hence the force of circumstances has induced a great influx of these Hindu strangers, who for the sake of the high wages they are able to command leave their own land, returning to their homes and families as soon as they can save enough to live comfortably. They are generally dressed in white, the men, however, having very frequently red turbans, and the women scarlet linen carefully covering the breast, with one shoulder exposed. Nor are these the only Hindus. Chittagong supplies us with sailors and boatmen; Bengal with durwans, barbers, dhobies and tailors; Telugu and other parts of India with coolies (or street porters), whose more than semi-nudity adds a peculiarity to the streets which, at first sight, strikes the European visitor with astonishment. Then we have Bengalee Baboos of higher caste, and more refined look, who are employed as clerks in mercantile firms and Government offices. *Thirdly*, there is a large and increasing number of Chinese settlers employed as gardeners, agricultural labourers, pig-breeders, shoemakers, and carpenters, whose neat coats, either of black or white, and long pigtails increase the picturesqueness of the streets. Add to this, *fourthly*, Armenians, Jews, Parsees, and Mohammedans, who are generally shopkeepers or merchants, and whose dresses are all more or less divergent, together with European civilians, and British soldiers and sailors in their unmistakable uniforms.

Such a mingled mass of people, writes Dr. Titcomb, give to Rangoon a character almost peculiar to itself; nothing comparable to it, he thinks, is seen in Ceylon, Madras, or Calcutta. Every road, almost, out of the city is lined with beautiful trees, blossoming at certain seasons with variegated flowers;[1] the

[1] Almost all the trees in the country are evergreen. Although the year is divided into two parts, known by the names of wet and dry seasons, which are regulated by the setting in of the south-west and north-east monsoons, and although the latter continue without rain for six months, yet the foliage on the trees is as luxuriant and green at the end of that time as at the beginning. True, the grass is burnt up with heat; nevertheless, among trees where the roots lie deep the soil is sufficiently preserved with moisture to make Nature an everlasting summer.

houses of the European residents are all detached on intersecting roads in what looks like a fine park, but which is really the relic of an old primeval forest; banks of extensive lakes are covered with tropical verdure of the most luxuriant kind. A city of about 100,000 souls, with wide granite-paved streets, Rangoon possesses a custom-house, town-hall, law courts, a railway terminus, barracks, assembly rooms, clubs, and so forth; there are two daily newspapers, and at least nine places of Christian worship.

Of the climate of British Burma the Bishop gives an encouraging description. It is by no means unhealthy, he says, or unadapted to the European constitution:—

> In the frontier towns of Thayetmyo and Toungoo there is, during the cool season, a fair amount of cold weather: enough to make great coats and blankets extremely serviceable. At Akyab, also, the air is cooled by sea breezes up to the end of April. On the more southern coast-line, however, of Rangoon, it must be allowed that cold weather is nominal rather than real. The nights are nevertheless cool for the most part, even in the hottest weather—a circumstance by which one's strength is pleasantly renovated, and daily duties are made cheerful. Of course there are often cases in which persons expose themselves too much to the sun or who violate the laws of Nature by trifling with damp; who indulge in intemperate diet, or persist in over-fatigues without proper food and rest, and who then go home to their relatives saying that the climate has killed them. I admit that in low situations, such as the banks of rivers and jungle villages, there is necessarily a malarious and feverish climate; but on high ground, and where European houses are built, there is nothing of the kind. It must be acknowledged, indeed, that where any one, upon entering the country, is enervated by organic disease, the heat and humidity of some parts of Burma produce loss of appetite and consequent emaciation and distress. But for those in good health I am satisfied that it is as fairly salubrious as any tropical country can be. At any rate, I am bound to say of myself, that after eighteen months' residence in Rangoon, after travelling through different stations in the province, and sleeping in the open air at nights, I not only never suffered from the slightest ailment, but never even lost my elasticity of spirits, until beaten down by that heavy domestic affliction which drove me back to England.

On his arrival at Rangoon, Dr. Titcomb's first action was to assemble the clergy (two Chaplains and two Missionaries) in private, to consult concerning the work. He took this opportunity of explaining his "own Church principles, expressing a fervent hope that they should work together in love and harmony," all of which was most kindly received. The result has been, it appears, cordial co-operation. The religious condition of Rangoon viewed from a Missionary stand-point, is full of

promise.[1] Up to the present time, however, there is no Burmese church in the city in connection with the Church of England, a matter much to be regretted. In the way of direct evangelistic work in fact, comparatively little was being done before the Bishop's arrival. In a suburban village, however, a Missionary, assisted by two Burmese catechists, is labouring with signal devotion. Among the Chinese settlers in Rangoon an earnest work was begun, a Burmese Christian lady paying for the service of a Chinese catechist; and forty-two Chinamen have been baptized. A Tamil catechist and sub-deacon, Samuel Abishekanathan[2] was ordained; and there are, as a rule, about thirty communicants at the Tamil service.

Distant from Rangoon about 130 miles is Maulmain. A Government Chaplain being no longer provided, the duty here was served fortnightly by one of the Rangoon chaplains, or the Bishop went over himself. A fast-going paddle-wheel steamer, built for the Maulmain service, now accomplishes the journey in one day. Often called the queen of British Burma, Maulmain, about twenty miles from the sea, is beautifully situated on the Salween, with hill ranges and jungle forests. Its trade was injured by the transfer of the seat of Government to Rangoon in 1862, but wharfs and saw mills still speak of successful labours. A Burmese Mission here has been abandoned, and the Tamil Mission is extremely feeble; but the Orphanage for Eurasian children is doing a good work. In the absence of an officiating clergyman, Mr. Macleod, the Judge, an M.A. of Cambridge, was in the habit of putting on his University

---

[1] St. John's College, presided over by the Rev. Dr. Marks, aided by ten vernacular teachers, seems to be doing a remarkably good work. There are over 500 pupils on the books. "The delight with which I first walked into its spacious hall and class rooms," writes the Bishop, "and beheld this mass of youth under *Christian instruction*, may be well imagined, especially in view of the fact that it has had to compete with our magnificent Rangoon High School; which, though built and conducted by Government at an enormous cost, upon the avowed principle of *non-religious instruction*, has nevertheless been fairly beaten in numbers by this Missionary institution." Work is daily commenced by the reading of the Bible in English and Burmese, by the singing of a hymn also, and by prayers in both languages. The Christian boys alone are permitted to kneel while prayers are read. The Burmese, in fact, have no objection to Christian teaching. In St. Mary's school one hundred girls of different races are instructed in like manner.

[2] "It is impossible," says the Bishop, "to describe the delight of the Tamil Christians in their receiving a clergyman of their own race to minister among them. Nor was my own pleasure less. For I am persuaded that it is only through the development of a native Pastorate we shall ever be able to extend Mission work upon any sound and proper basis, or to raise up native Christians into habits of self-reliance and strength."

hood and surplice and taking duty both in the church and cemetery.[1]

It should be added [says the Bishop] that both the Roman Catholic and American Baptist Missionaries have large and flourishing establishments here, each putting our own work to the blush, in consequence of their much longer occupation of the field. I need scarcely remark that I entertained no idea of interfering with these workers, still less of assuming hostility towards them . . . . I left my own country filled with polemical strife, and I arrived among Christians where religious strife seemed unknown.

The Bishop's visit to Maulmain was followed by one to the Andaman Islands, where there is a Government chaplaincy and a large penal settlement for Indian convicts, together with a corresponding force of military. Steam communication between Rangoon and Port Blair is only monthly. The Chaplain had been living here ten years, and seemed rooted to it with a home-affection. In the church—"the model of a well-appointed sanctuary"—the Bishop preached twice; he held a confirmation also in the little Tamil church close at hand. He had a conference, moreover, with the Church council (of which General Barwell, the governor, was one) in which he endeavoured to se what could be done for the benefit of the native Andamanese.[2] At present, it appears, an Andamanese Home is supported by the Government, in which a few of these poor creatures are clothed fed, and instructed.

Prome, afterwards visited by Bishop Titcomb, was taken by the British forces in 1825, in what is called our first Burmese war. Prome possesses a good Mission establishment belonging to the American Baptists; an excellent boys' school belonging to the Government, and a very efficient girls' school belonging to the Ladies' (S.P.G.) Association. The Bishop started by rail for this journey, the Irrawaddy Valley State Railway, 165 miles long, having been opened a year previously. The Chief Commisisioner, Mr Aitcheson, "like his predecessor, a noble and enlightened Christian," joined the Bishop in laying the foundation-stone of a church.

To Toungoo, where a Mission church had to be consecrated,

[1] On the subdivision of the diocese of Calcutta, the Metropolitan assigned to the diocese of Rangoon five Chaplains out of the Bengal establishment; of whom the city of Rangoon required two, one was called to Thayetmyo, one in Toungoo, and one at Port Blair, in the Andaman Islands.

[2] A good foundation for Mission work has been laid by the indefatigable labours of Mr. Man (son of General Man, formerly Governor of the settlement), who has reduced the Andamanese language into Roman characters, and has published a grammar and vocabulary.

and four Karen teachers ordained,[1] the Bishop accomplished the journey, in a friend's steam launch, in four days. Ordinarily the journey, 300 miles, taken in a native boat, is very tedious, requiring fifteen days. The Sittang river, not so vast as the Irrawaddy, is more varied, and has more pleasing scenery :—

We saw herds of buffaloes [writes the Bishop] standing up to their chins in soft mud as a protection from the tormenting mosquitoes; blue and silver spangled kingfishers, darting from the bushes into the water; huge grass, well named "elephant grass," fifteen feet high; gardens of plantain trees covering two miles or more of river frontage; while, at every village which we passed, men, women, and children came crowding down to the water's edge to indulge their looks of curiosity. Besides which, we were deeply interested in the large number of teak logs, formed into rafts (with bamboo huts on them) which were floating down the river on their way to the timber yards of Rangoon.

At Toungoo, elephants, it seems, are quite an institution. The military authorities employ from sixty to seventy, not only for commissariat purposes, but for serving what is called a "mountain battery." It is a splendid sight, says the Bishop, to see the way in which these noble animals move the guns, and obey military orders. He gives two anecdotes illustrating their strength and sagacity. He says :—

On one occasion in Toungoo, after a hard day's labour, during which an elephant had been moving logs of timber, the yard bell rang for ceasing work. It happened, however, that one immense log of timber remained, and it being thought advisable to have all cleared away before morning, this elephant was set to remove it. The animal offered no resistance, yet found, alas, that with all his pulling and straining, the weight was too much for him. Seeing this, the manager of the yard brought a second elephant to assist in the work; yet strange to say, the two unitedly could do nothing; their trunks twisted and their limbs strained, but all in vain! Thus the work ended for the night. What was the surprise next morning when, upon the ringing for work, the first elephant moved the log by himself as easily as a child would have moved a stool! So clear was it that these sagacious brutes had determined the night before, by some sort of secret and mutual compact, that they would do no work for their masters after work hours were over!

I am not sure, however, that my next story is not a better one. It has to do with a Rangoon elephant employed at Delhi. The owners of this fine brute desired on one occasion to get him upon a raft, that he might be transferred to the Rangoon side of the river. But his

[1] A full translation of the Prayer Book into Karenese had at this time been accomplished, and was being printed in Rangoon at the expense of the S.P.C.K. The publication of this work, says the Bishop, reflects great credit on Mr. Windley, the Missionary. The Karens, next to the Burmese, are the chief people in our British territory.

quadruped lordship did not seem to be quite in the mood for that sort of thing, and totally refused to have anything to do with the raft. Efforts of every kind were in vain. At length some one wiser than the rest proposed that the raft should be removed and the elephant secured to a steam launch by means of a strong cable, in order that he might be made to swim after the vessel to the side of the river designed for him. His majesty had no objection to the swimming part of the business, and therefore willingly allowed himself to be drawn into the water. But, to the infinite surprise and merriment of all the spectators, he had no sooner got fairly into the water, after tamely following the steam launch a little way, then he suddenly turned round, and swimming in the opposite direction, had strength enough to drag the vessel back with him, landing the whole party just where they had been at first, the "monarch of all he surveyed."

Of the Bishop's journey to Akyab, distant from Rangoon 500 miles, and of other events described in the closing chapters of this volume, we are unable from lack of space to give any account. The Bishop did not visit Mandalay, but he gives some interesting information concerning that city from one of the Missionaries who had laboured there. Prince Theebau was educated in an English School; and, at one time, Missionary prospects in Upper Burma seemed bright.

Art. IV.—THE VENI CREATOR.

AT the close of one of Canon Liddon's University Sermons occurs the following paragraph:—

"If you make it a rule to say sincerely the first verse of the Ordination Hymn every morning without failing, it will in time do more for you than any other prayer I know, except the Lord's Prayer," were the words of one who had a right to speak from experience and who has now gone to his rest.

Veni, Creator Spiritus,
Mentes Tuorum visita:
Imple supernâ gratiâ
Quæ Tu creasti pectora.

Certainly this prayer does not take long to say; and perhaps fifty years hence in another state of existence some of us will be glad to have acted on the advice.

This almost unequalled Latin hymn, "was probably introduced into the Service late in the eleventh century, when it occurs in the Pontifical of Soisson. Dean Comber observes that the composition of this hymn was ascribed to St. Ambrose: it is not, however, claimed by his Benedictine editors."[1] Even in this

[1] See *Annotated Prayer-Book*, page 560.

venerable hymn there are some variations current; but as given in the *Liber Precum Publicarum*, (Rivingtons, 1877), it is as follows:—

Veni, Creator Spiritus,
Mentes Tuorum visita:
Imple supernâ gratiâ
Quæ Tu creasti pectora.

Qui diceris Paraclitus,
Altissimi donum Dei:[1]
Fons vivus, ignis, caritas,
Et spiritalis unctio.

Tu septiformis munere,
Dextræ Dei Tu digitus,[2]
Tu rite promissum Patris,
Sermone ditans guttura.

Accende lumen sensibus,
Infunde amorem cordibus;
Infirma nostri corporis
Virtute firmans perpeti.[3]

Hostem repellas longius,
Pacemque dones protinus:
Ductore sic Te prævio
Vitemus omne noxium.

[Da gaudiorum præmia;
Da gratiarum munera;
Dissolve litis vincula,
Adstringe pacis fœdera.][4]

Per Te sciamus da Patrem,
Noscamus atque Filium,
Te[5] utriusque Spiritum
Credamus omni tempore.

Sit laus Patri cum Filio,
Sancto simul Paraclito;
Nobisque mittat Filius
Charisma Sancti Spiritus.[6]

Amen.

This noble hymn is mainly known to the English Church through the very beautiful, but much abbreviated, translation of Bishop Cosin, which is found in his private devotions, 1627:—

Come, Holy Ghost, our souls inspire,
And lighten with celestial fire.
Thou the anointing Spirit art,
Who dost Thy sevenfold gifts impart.
Thy blessèd unction from above
Is comfort, life, and fire of love.
Enable with perpetual light
The dulness of our blinded sight.

---

[1] Qui Paraclitus diceris
Donum Dei altissimi.—*Annotated Prayer-Book.*

[2] Digitus Paternæ dexteræ.—*Pontificale Romanum Romæ* (1818).

[3] Perpetim.—*Annotated Prayer-Book.*

[4] This verse is omitted in the *Pontificale Romanum* and in the *Annotated Prayer-Book.*

[5] Teque.—*Pontificale Romanum.*

[6] This verse in the *Pontificale Romanum* is very different:—

Deo Patri sit gloria
Et Filio, qui a mortuis
Surrexit, ac Paraclito
In sæculorum sæcula;

but may probably have been in Bishop Cosin's mind when he wrote the fine line—

That through the ages all along.

Anoint and cheer our soilèd face
With the abundance of Thy grace.
Keep far our foes, give peace at home;
Where Thou art guide, no ill can come.
Teach us to know the Father, Son,
And Thee, of Both, to be but One;
That through the ages all along
This may be our endless song,
Praise to Thy Eternal merit
Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

Nothing could ever displace this version from the sacred place it holds in our hearts. It has transfused itself into the deepest life of our Church. But the reader will observe that it only consists of eighteen lines, whereas the original has thirty-two; and many of those omitted contain germs of thought which no one would willingly let die. It is true that these are for the most part preserved in the second version given in our Ordination office; but this version is of far inferior calibre to Bishop Cosin's terse and sententious rendering, and amplifies as much as the other abbreviates the hymn, consisting of sixty-four lines against the Latin thirty-two. It contains some verses of great merit, but is far too long for ordinary use.

Come, Holy Ghost, eternal God,
Proceeding from above,
Both from the Father and the Son,
The God of peace and love.

Visit our minds, into our hearts
Thy heavenly grace inspire;
That truth and godliness we may
Pursue with full desire.

Thou art the very Comforter
In grief and all distress;
The heav'nly gift of God most high
No tongue can it express.

The fountain and the living spring
Of joy celestial;
The fire so bright, the love so sweet,
The Unction Spiritual.

Thou in Thy gifts art manifold,
By them Christ's Church doth stand;
In faithful hearts Thou writ'st Thy law,
The finger of God's hand.

According to Thy promise, Lord,
Thou givest speech with grace;
That through Thy help God's praises may
Resound in every place.

O Holy Ghost, into our minds,
Send down Thy heavenly light;
Kindle our hearts with fervid zeal
To serve God day and night.

Our weakness strengthen and confirm
(For, Lord, Thou know'st us frail):
That neither devil, world, nor flesh
Against us may prevail.

Put back our enemy far from us,
And help us to obtain
Peace in our hearts with God and man
(The best, the truest gain);
And grant that Thou being, O Lord,
Our leader and our guide,
We may escape the snares of sin,
And never from Thee slide.

Such measures of Thy powerful grace
Grant, Lord, to us we pray;
That Thou may'st be our Comforter
At the last dreadful day.

Of strife and of dissension
Dissolve, O Lord, the bands,
And knit the knots of peace and love,
Throughout all Christian lands.

Grant us the grace that we may know
The Father of all might,
That we of His beloved Son
May gain the blissful sight.

And that we may with perfect faith
Ever acknowledge Thee,
The Spirit of Father and of Son—
One God in Persons Three.

To God the Father, laud and praise,
And to His blessèd Son,
And to the Holy Spirit of grace,
Coequal Three in One.

And pray that we our only Lord,
Would please His Spirit to send
On all that shall profess His Name
From hence to the world's end.
Amen.

There remains Dryden's very excellent hymn, which is justly entitled in his works "The VENI CREATOR paraphrased." It is a paraphrase and not a translation. It has held its place in the Church for two hundred years, and many modern hymnals include it; but with so many variations, that evidently great difficulty has been felt in singing it as it flowed from Dryden's classic pen:—

Creator Spirit, by whose aid
The world's foundations first were laid,
Come visit every pious mind;
Come pour Thy joys on human kind;
From sin and sorrow set us free,
And make Thy temples worthy Thee.

O source of uncreated light,
The Father's promised Paraclete!
Thrice holy fount, thrice holy fire,
Our hearts with heavenly love inspire.
Come and Thy sacred unction bring,
To sanctify us while we sing.

Plenteous of grace, descend from high,
Whose power does heaven and earth command.
Proceeding Spirit, our defence,
Who dost the gifts of tongues dispense,
And crown'st Thy gift with eloquence!
Refine and purge our earthly parts;
But, oh, inflame and fire our hearts!
Our frailties help, our vice control,
Submit the senses to the soul;
And when rebellious they are grown,
Then lay Thy hand and hold them down.

Chase from our minds the infernal foe,
And peace, the fruit of love, bestow;
And lest our feet should step astray,
Protect and guide us in the way.

Make us eternal truths receive,
And practise all that we believe;
Give us Thyself that we may see
The Father and the Son by Thee.

Immortal honour, endless fame,
Attend the Almighty Father's name;
The Saviour Son be glorified,
Who for lost man's redemption died;
And equal adoration be,
Eternal Paraclete, to Thee.

It is with much diffidence, after reviewing the labours of others, that I venture to offer to the reader yet another version of this noble hymn. But there are at least three admirable translations of St. Ambrose's *Jesu, dulcedo cordium*, by Neale, Caswall, and Ray Palmer, all of which are in frequent use. So that possibly another rendering of the *Veni Creator* may find a niche in our English Hymnology. I have striven to keep as closely as possible to the Latin; and, with the exception of transposing a line in the third verse, have been surprised to find with what facility the original yields itself line by line, and often word for word, to the rules of English verse. If this version shall make this devout prayer, which has come down to us hallowed with the recollections of centuries, more available in its completeness for the present use of the Church, it will be an abundant recompense for the pleasurable labour spent upon it.

1.

Creator Spirit, make Thy throne
The hearts which Thou hast seal'd Thine own;
With grace celestial fill and warm
The bosoms Thou hast deign'd to form.

2.

To Thee, Great Paraclete, we cry;
O highest gift, O God most High.
O fount of life, O fire, O love,
Baptize, anoint us, Holy Dove.

3.

Thou finger of God's hand in heaven,
The Father's promise duly given.
Sevenfold in Thy munificence,
Enrich our lips with eloquence.

4.

Enflame, enlighten all our powers;
Breathe love into these hearts of ours;
Our body, strengthless for the fight,
Strengthen with Thy perpetual might.

5.

Keep far aloof our ghostly foe,
And ever-during peace bestow;
With Thee our Guardian, Thee our Guide,
No evil can our steps betide.

6.

With heavenly joys our service crown;
On earth pour heavenly graces down;
From chains of strife Thy saints release,
And knit them in the bonds of peace.

7.

Vouchsafe us in Thy light to see
The Father and the Son and Thee,
Our God from all the ages past,
Our God while endless ages last.

8.

Be glory to the Father, Son,
And blessèd Comforter, in One.
Grant we may through the Christ inherit
Thy grace and glory, Holy Spirit. Amen.

The reader will observe I have allowed myself a little more freedom in the last two stanzas, for the precision of Latin, when treating of the highest mysteries of our Holy Faith, renders any transfusion into English more difficult without the appearance of stiffness; and I was also glad to try and preserve with Bishop Cosin the grandeur of the version *in sæculorum sæcula* rather than the feebler expression *omni tempore*. The introduction of the word "glory" in the last line is hardly beyond the full meaning of the word *Charisma* in the light of such Scriptures as "The Lord will give grace and glory," and "The Spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you."

But if it is thought better to adhere more closely to the structure of the original, these verses might be rendered thus:—

Vouchsafe us in Thy light to see
The Father, and the Son; and Thee,
Of Both the Spirit, to adore;
Our refuge now and ever more.

Praise to the Father and the Son,
And Holy Paraclete in One.
Grant we may through the Christ inherit,
Thy chrism of grace, Eternal of Spirit.

If "chrism" is not deemed too antique, it seems to retain, by its reference to "the Christ" in the previous line, the force of *Mittat Filius charisma.*

* * * * *

Since the above translation was written, I have seen two other versions, which were before unknown to me, or quite forgotten by me, one by E. Caswall, and the other by R. Campbell, in Mr. Godfrey Thring's new Hymn-book. And I have also discovered that Caswall's version, though with many variations, is given in "Hymns Ancient and Modern," and in the "Hymnary." It is curious that, without any reference to, or remembrance of, their efforts, my fifth and sixth lines should be almost identical with Caswall's, and my twentieth line with Campbell's. But that two other writers in recent days should have essayed the same thing, may be at least an apology for my attempt. The common object of all must be to reproduce as nearly as possible in English the condensed thought of this noble Latin hymn.

E. H. Bickersteth.

Art. V.—THE RISE OF THE HUGUENOTS.

Part II.

1. *History of the Rise of the Huguenots.* By Henry M. Baird. Professor in the University of the City of New York. Two Volumes, pp. 577, 681. Hodder & Stoughton. 1880.
2. *History of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century.* By J. H. Merle D'Aubigné, D.D. Simpkin, Marshall & Co.
3. *Life of Marguerite d'Angoulême, Queen of Navarre; Life of Jeanne d'Albret, Queen of Navarre.* By Martha Walker Freer. Hurst & Blackett.

THE thunderstorm which was to destroy *Huguenotrie* was slowly gathering over the heads of these devoted men. Yet only a few black drops were to fall during the reign of Francis I. The King—whom the German Reformers had dubbed Sardanapalus—was no lover of cruelty; his proclivities were towards the literary, the æsthetic, and the ideal. It is probable that he would never have been a persecutor at all, had not political expediency forced him to it. And by his side, always

ready to stay his hand in that direction, was the really Protestant Queen of Navarre, the beloved sister who through life had more influence over Francis than any one else. But both these were about to quit the stage. As regarded the Reformation, they might have left France in a very different position, but for one event now to be noticed, which changed the whole aspect of things. And whether this occurrence was due to the malice of an enemy or to the indiscreet zeal of a friend, the evidence which has come down to us is insufficient to show.

The year 1534 had opened with an appearance of high promise. Melanchthon had been requested to draw up a scheme of compromise between the old doctrine and the new, under auspices which made it seem extremely probable that the request came from King Francis himself. He eagerly applied himself to the task: but the result would have pleased neither party, for the suggested concessions were too great to be offered on either side.

Beyond the mass of the Huguenots, who tried to steer in the middle of the stream, there were now two extreme factions, of whom the one was ready to sacrifice almost vital truth for the sake of peace, while the other would not resign even the most non-essential minutiæ. These factions can scarcely be said to be limited either to the Huguenots of France or to the sixteenth century.

But while matters remained in this promising condition, and every Huguenot heart was beating high with hope, an unseen hand, in the darkness, placarded all the walls of Paris with a diatribe inveighing against the Mass in the most violent and passionate language. Nay, a copy of the obnoxious thing was found affixed to the very door of the King's bedchamber—the most sacred sanctum of the Eldest Son of the Church.

The rage of the entire Roman Catholic population of Paris was only equalled by the fury of King Francis. In vain did the Queen of Navarre urge that "an enemy had done this." The incensed King hastened to Paris, determined to find and execute summary justice on the culprit. He suspended all action of the press throughout France, made a grand arrest of Lutherans, real or suspected, held a magnificent expiatory procession, and executed and tortured numbers of the proscribed heretics. There was a new Pope, who must be conciliated; and blood was just then the only acceptable sacrifice.

It is actually asserted that the new Pope himself interceded for the hapless victims. It is more likely that the gentle voice of Queen Marguerite at last succeeded in penetrating the tumult, and that the refined feelings of Francis himself made him only too glad to cease the persecution, as soon as his anger was appeased, and he could allow himself to think calmly. The reason alleged by himself was that he had imitated the example of the

Emperor. Professor Baird thinks that his real motive is to be found in the discovery that he was alienating the Protestant princes of Germany, whose co-operation against the Emperor he earnestly desired.

The connection between France and Germany, whether civil or religious, certainly became weaker from that time. The term "Lutherans" now disappears from French documents, and soon "Calvinists" comes instead.

The pause was only temporary. The King had flattered himself that heresy was banished from his realms. He woke to the conviction that it was spreading faster and further than ever. As it always had been, "the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the Church." Moreover, it was becoming evident that some recognized standard of orthodoxy must be adopted. The heretics, put on their trial, were so inconveniently Scriptural, and so provokingly logical, that those who came to scoff were apt to remain to pray. Nay, some of them even went so far in audacity as to summon the Fathers themselves in defence of their doctrine. To have the Church openly convicted of error by appeals to the Bible and the Fathers, was a kind of thing which it would never do to allow. A new formulary was therefore issued, and confirmed by the King in 1543; but it was accompanied by a fresh edict of persecution. Until now the persecution had been carried on in a spasmodic and irregular manner. Preparations were now made for a holocaust on a methodical plan, and under the direct supervision of the Crown. It was easy to win over King Francis: he had only to be well frightened. The faintest scent of insurrection would terrify him into any amount of severity. Marvellous stories were told him by the astute Cardinal de Tournon, who chose his time well, during the absence of Queen Marguerite. The King was informed that the district around Mérindol—a Vaudois town from remote times—had broken out into open rebellion. Fifteen thousand insurgents were marching on Marseilles, capturing towns and opening prisons as they went; their intention being to institute a republic after the model of Switzerland. The King yielded; nothing roused his fury like an attack on his prerogatives. The massacre took place: but the victims were not fifteen thousand insurgents. Mérindol was found silent and empty, the inhabitants having fled to the woods. Only one human being was discovered in the whole town—a half-witted youth. The poor lad had promised the soldier who took him two crowns for his life. D'Oppède, the French commandant, actually paid the two crowns to the soldier, and ordered the boy to be tied to an olive-tree and shot. With the last breath which he was to draw, the victim appealed to a higher Potentate and a juster Judge. But there was no vengeance in the cry; there was nothing but

faith and hope. "Lord God, these men are snatching from me a life full of wretchedness and misery; but Thou wilt give me eternal life, through Jesus Christ Thy Son."

The King was induced to write a letter expressing his approval of the massacre, perpetrated on trembling old men and helpless women, in the woods surrounding Mérindol. Francis added—probably not at the Cardinal's instigation—a recommendation of mercy to all who abjured. That is, to all Lutherans. "Sacramentarians"—namely, those who denied any and every corporal presence of Christ in the elements—had been long ago exempted from all mercy. They were not to be permitted to abjure, if they would.

The next massacre was at Meaux—that old centre of heresy. A gathering of sixty-two persons for divine service was dispersed, fourteen being burned at the stake; among whom was their minister, Pierre Leclerc, brother of the earlier martyr. This took place on the 8th of September, 1545, and it was the last important act, as respected his religious policy, of the long reign of Francis I. On the last day of March, 1547, the King, whose one aim had been to do according to his will, bowed to the summons of the inevitable Angel: and some two years later, Queen Marguerite of Navarre followed the same dread messenger into the presence of Him whom she had served in much weakness and trembling, and yet with a true and faithful heart.

A new era had begun. And the Huguenots may be pardoned if at first their hopes rose above their fears. The new King, who held their lives in his hands, was the pupil of Lefevre, and was said to be a man of gentle and humane disposition. But it very soon appeared that what had been called gentleness was simply mental indolence. The young King was ready to do anything but think. Any one who would take on his own shoulders the intolerable burdens of reflection and decision, would find Henri II. as plastic clay in his fingers.

Three persons stepped into the gap, and lifted off the burden. They were, the Constable de Montmorency, a brave but narrow-minded man, the slave of Rome; the Cardinal de Guise, an astute man, whose only principle was expediency; and the Duchess de Valentinois, of whom the less said the better. They were the real rulers of France during the twelve years of the reign of Henri II. Behind them, however, was a fourth person, who thirsted for personal power as none of them thirsted, and yet, possessing more shrewdness than any of them, clearly perceived that her time had not yet come. Neglected, disliked, repressed in every way, the young Queen kept her own secret purpose locked in her breast, and went gliding through life in silent calm, quietly ignoring all that she might have resented,

and answering coldness and disrespect by silken speeches and soft, sweet smiles. Catherine de Medici is a living illustration of the Arabic proverb that "All things come to him who knows how to wait." At this time, indeed, the leaders of the Reformation looked upon Catherine as a friend. She had dared to plead for the mitigation of some severe edicts, and she frequently spoke with great respect of the deceased Queen of Navarre.

The character of the Queen [writes Miss Freer], at that early period, was little understood. The people pitied her as a forsaken wife, domineered over daily by Madame de Valentinois. She was supposed to have little influence in the State, and yet, by some means as surprising to Henry's Ministers as the obstacle often proved unexpected, Catherine showed herself indirectly a formidable opponent to many of their projects. The Queen never in any circumstances abated her submissive protestations, or voluntarily offended any one; she was never elated—never dejected. Above all, she avoided that shoal upon which so many princes make shipwreck—she never took a favourite. In fact, the protection of the reformed party, which numbered many great and influential nobles, was, at this period, Catherine's only road to power . . . . The Queen, therefore, perceiving her advantage, accepted it with her usual address.

Very early in the reign of Henri II. it became evident that persecution would flourish so long as his weak hand held the sceptre. A severe edict came out which forbade all hawking of books, and even oral discussion of any religious question. The King's faith was not at all shaken by the profligate life of Pope Julius III., but he was sorely scandalized when that pontiff issued a bull permitting the faithful to eat eggs, butter, and cheese, during Lent. This was a lamentable "relaxation of public morals" indeed. The bull was burnt openly at Paris, by order of King and Parliament.

Notwithstanding all the persecution directed against it, and notably the martyrdom of the Five Scholars of Lausanne—"among the most touching passages of the French martyrology"—the Reformation continued to spread.[1] The Huguenots became

[1] The *Five Scholars of Lausanne*, natives of different parts of France, had enjoyed the instructions of Beza, and other theologians, in the school of the chief city of the Pays de Vaud. "A short time before Easter, 1552, these young men, who had reached different stages in their course of study, conceived it to be their duty to return to their native land, whence the most pressing calls for additional labourers qualified to instruct others were daily coming to Switzerland. Their plan was cordially endorsed by Beza, before whom it was first laid by one of their number, who had been an inmate of his home, and then by the Church of Lausanne, for it evidenced the purity and sincerity of their zeal. Provided with cordial letters from Lausanne, as well as from Geneva, through which they passed, they started, each for his native city, intending to labour, first of all, for the conversion of their own kindred and neighbours. But a different

bolder. Placards advocating their doctrines were posted up by unseen hands, and invisible singers made the dark lanes resound with sarcastic ballads against the monks. The "friends of the Church," of whom the Cardinal de Lorraine stood at the head, urgently represented to the King that for all this there was only one remedy—the establishment of the Inquisition. But the Parliament of Paris, which had moved too quickly for Francis I., was too slow to please those now in power. The royal command notwithstanding, Parliament decided by a large majority that "other means of eradicating heresy were more consistent with the spirit of Christianity."

An attempt was made at this time to colonize South America with Huguenots. It failed, owing chiefly to the treachery of an enemy mistaken for a friend; and the fugitives returned home, bearing with them a letter which they supposed to be a recommendation to pity, but which was in reality an order for their destruction, addressed to the magistrates of any French

---

field and a shorter term of service than they had anticipated were in store for them. At Lyons, having accepted the invitation of a fellow-traveller to visit him at his country seat, they were surprised, on the 1st of May, 1552, by the provost and his guards, and, although they had committed no violation of the King's edicts by proclaiming the doctrines they believed, were hurried to the archiepiscopal prison, and confined in separate dungeons. From their prayers for divine assistance they were soon summoned to appear singly before the "official"—the ecclesiastical judge to whom the archbishop deputed his judicial functions. The answers to the interrogatories, of which they transmitted to their friends a record, it has been truly said put to shame the lukewarmness of our days by their courage, and amaze us by the presence of mind and the wonderful acquaintance with the Holy Scriptures they display. He who will peruse them in the worm-eaten pages of the "Actiones Martyrum," in which their letters were collected by the pious zeal of a contemporary, cannot doubt the proficiency these youthful prisoners had attained, both in sacred and in human letters, at the foot of the renowned Beza. Their unanswerable defence, however, only secured their more speedy condemnation as heretics. On the 13th of May they were sentenced to the flames; but an appeal which they made from the sentence of the ecclesiastical judge, on the plea that it contravened the laws of France, secured delay until their case could be laid before Parliament. Months elapsed. Tidings of the danger that overhung the young students of Lausanne reached Beza and Calvin, and called forth their warm sympathy. The best efforts of Beza and Viret were put forth in their behalf. . . . . The Parliament of Paris decreed that the death of the 'Five' by fire should take place on the 16th of May, 1553, and the King refused to interpose his pardon. Their mission to France, however, had not been in vain. . . . . The memory of their joyful constancy on their way to the place of execution—which rather resembled a triumphal than an ignominious procession—and in the flames, was embalmed in the heart of many a spectator." We read that after mutual embraces and farewells, their last words, as their naked bodies, smeared with grease and sulphur, hung side by side over the flames, were "Be of good courage, brethren, be of good courage!"

port at which they might land. But God watched over the devoted band. Wind and waves cast them on shore at Hennebon, where the town officers were themselves of "the brethren," and the half-famished refugees received a loving welcome.

The first Huguenot church was founded in Paris in 1555, and was rapidly followed by others at Meaux, Blois, Tours, Poitiers, Bourges, Pau, and many other places. The infant churches were protected by the breaking out of war between France and Spain, which turned the thoughts of the persecutors in another direction. Under cover of the war, Protestantism made rapid progress. The very judges were infected, and could not be relied upon to condemn heretics that were brought before them.

This was the state of affairs when the French troops sustained a crushing defeat at St. Quentin from the Spaniards, on the 10th of August, 1557. It was easy to persuade the ignorant populace that the calamities of the State were a mark of the displeasure of God—"not because of the ignorance or immorality of the people, or the bad doctrine and worse lives of its spiritual leaders, or the barbarous cruelty, the shameless impurity, and unexampled bad faith, of the Court, but because of the existence of heretics, who denied the authority of the Pope, and refused to bow down and worship the transubstantiated wafer." Accordingly, persecution increased. Scarcely a month after the battle at St. Quentin, a Huguenot *prêche* was dispersed and every member arrested, at Paris. Several martyrdoms followed. The slanders which the heathen had poured on the early Church of Christ were revived by the semi-heathens of this later age. The Huguenots were accused of eating children, and of celebrating midnight orgies of the most shocking kind. In vain was it shown that these accusations were merely old calumnies in a new dress; and in vain did the Protestant cantons of Switzerland intercede with the King for mercy to his helpless victims. They were frigidly requested to attend to their own affairs.

Notwithstanding all this, the proscribed doctrines grew and flourished in a style unaccountable to the persecutors. The oppressed Church was openly joined by D'Andelot, the brother of Admiral Coligny; by the Prince of Condé; and by the King of Navarre, the husband of Jeanne d'Albret. Strange to say, Jeanne, the daughter of Queen Marguerite, and afterwards the chief heroine of the French Reformation, was longer in giving in her open adhesion to the cause than was her light-principled and rather hare-brained lord. For some months, events seemed to favour the Huguenots. The treaty of peace, concluded between France and Spain in the spring of 1550, contained no stipulation referring to religion, beyond one clause which bound both monarchs to use their

utmost energies in securing the assembling of a general council.

It must have seemed a hopeful sign that there was even a dissension between the Parliament of Paris and the Sorbonne, so long banded together against the infant Church. The Sorbonne accused the Parliament of being altogether given up to heresy. A host of ecclesiastics crowded round the inert King, vehemently exhorting him to attend the sitting of Parliament, and impress upon that assemblage the absolute necessity of suppressing heresy. So violent were they that Henri "thought himself consigned to perdition if he refused to go." He did as he was told: he even stated his intention, when the approaching marriages of his sister and daughter were over, to undertake a crusade against the Huguenots, in those southern valleys where "the soil had been watered by Albigensian blood" ages before, and "in which the seed sown by the Reformers, three hundred years later, sprang up most rapidly and bore the most abundant harvest."

But as men of the world usually do, he reckoned without God. Ten days after the marriage festivities, and one month after his visit to Parliament—July 10, 1559—the corpse of Henri II. lay in State in his palace-hall. This was Catherine de Medici's hour of triumph. The sceptre of her dead husband passed into her hands, and the down-trodden woman, whom the Huguenots had regarded with a mixture of hope and compassion, proved herself the most terrible and relentless tyrant with whom they had as yet had to deal. The reign of Henri II., at its close, left two women facing each other, each of whom was a fair embodiment of the feelings and opinions of her party. Catherine de Medici, plausible, affable, soft and gentle in outward seeming, while war was in her heart to the bitter end—true daughter of Rome—was contrasted with Jeanne d'Albret, blunt and straightforward, transparent, shrewd, and true to the heart's core.

For the remainder of the history, which is no longer that of the *rise* of the Huguenots, we must refer the reader to Professor Baird's interesting volumes. His style is clear and pleasant. Some readers may think it a little heavy, but this is mainly due to his stern rejection of everything but fact. Undoubtedly, his work does not woo the reader from page to page like the fascinating volumes of D'Aubigné; but as the Professor sarcastically alludes to that charming writer's "characteristic embellishment," he would probably consider this less of a censure than of a compliment. Accuracy is evidently the main point at which the Professor has aimed: and surely for the absence of this precious quality no charm can compensate. At the same time it must be owned that, in a few instances, a slight change of expression or a little explanation would have been

advisable. When the Professor quotes the remark of the Venetian Ambassador (vol. i. page 7) that "whereas England had once been . . . dependent upon the Church . . . France had always been a sovereign state," it strikes an English ear that a word of correction might not be out of place. Surely England never was dependent upon the Church—that is, the Pope—in any other sense than that in which France might be termed a province of England during the short period when our Henry V. and VI. nominally reigned over it. Again, on page 17, the Professor speaks of "the province of Guienne recovered from the English." It is difficult to *recover* a thing which one never had. Guienne had never been in possession of the King of France (except as Lord Paramount, which he had always been) saving for those few years when a sovereign Duchess of Guienne had been queen-consort of France; and until she ceased to bear that title it did not become an English province. Our author also tells us that the portraits of Marguerite, Queen of Navarre, "convey no impression of beauty." Of that one which is best known, and has been most frequently engraved, this is true enough; but that was taken at the close of her life, and some of the Professor's readers who remember the two youthful portraits engraved in Miss Freer's "Life," will find it difficult to ratify this conclusion. It is also questionable how far the epithet "queen-mother" can be justified, when applied to one who never bore the queenly title; but Professor Baird is by no means the only offender in this respect. Nor do we think it an undoubted advantage that reprints of American works in England should always be careful to reproduce American orthographic peculiarities. It may be very reasonable that Americans should spell after their own fashion in America: but when their books come out in English dress, we think that such words as "neighbor, "behavior," and "forever," might wisely be presented in English dress also. Yet these are, after all, small blemishes, and mere spots in the sun, when compared with the earnest straining after accuracy, the close study of original authorities, the discrimination of character, and above all, the true ring of unwavering and uncompromising Protestantism, which characterize this "History of the Rise of the Huguenots." In these days of rebuke and blasphemy, we heartily welcome a trumpet which gives so decided a sound. Professor Baird has produced a book of sterling worth, both as a contribution to historical literature, and as specially interesting to the Church of Christ.

EMILY S. HOLT.

ART. VI.—THE SUNDAY SCHOOL CENTENARY.

THE former half of the eighteenth century was not more remarkable for spiritual torpor than was the latter half for the revival of true religion and the commencement of great religious movements. The first important centenary commemoration of work begun in the eighteenth century took place in 1839, when the Wesleyan Conference ordered the celebration "of the centenary of the formation of the Wesleyan Methodist Society under the providential instrumentality of the ever-to-be-revered and venerated John Wesley." The second great centenary, celebrated last month, is that of Sunday Schools. The former occasion was chiefly observed by the members of one denomination of Christians; the whole Church of Christ claims an interest in the latter.

Robert Raikes was not so great a man as John Wesley; only half a line of recognition is assigned to him in Bishop Ryle's "Christian Leaders of the Last Century;" and Messrs. Abbey and Overton, in their "English Church in the Eighteenth Century," content themselves with a foot-note allusion to his work. But no centenary commemoration was ever celebrated with a more hearty and universal enthusiasm than that which the Sunday School Centenary has called forth. Churchmen and Nonconformists vied with each other in doing honour to the memory of Raikes.

A hundred years ago, the *Gloucester Journal*, conducted by Raikes, was the chief, if not the sole organ of opinion by which the Sunday School system was made known to the country. But, during the centenary week, the whole Press, from the *Times* to the most obscure provincial newspaper, teemed with articles, paragraphs, and criticisms, of which Sunday Schools were the theme. Eminent men from France, Germany, the United States of America, and from the Colonies, bore testimony, at the various meetings, to the world-wide spread of this simple agency. Perhaps the spirit of the celebration cannot be expressed in more appropriate language than that of the first resolution, which was unanimously carried at the inaugural meeting held at Guildhall, under the presidency of the Lord Mayor of London:—

> "That this meeting, inspired with feelings of profound thankfulness to Almighty God for the blessing vouchsafed to Sunday Schools during the past hundred years, desires on the occasion of the commemoration of this centenary to acknowledge the benefits which have accrued from their establishment to *the whole of Christendom*."

This resolution was moved by the Archbishop of Canterbury, seconded by Sir Charles Reed, Chairman of the Sunday School Union, and supported by Lord Aberdeen, and Dr. Vincent, of New York. During the week a festival was held at the Crystal Palace, under the auspices of the Sunday School Union, when 30,000 teachers and scholars were present. The Earl of Shaftesbury officiated at the unveiling of two statues of Raikes; one at Gloucester, where the founder of Sunday Schools was born, the other in London, in the middle garden of the Thames Embankment; the cost of the latter is defrayed by subscription, in which 4,000 Sunday Schools have taken part.

Naturally, however, we regard this celebration chiefly from a Churchman's point of view. *Vixere fortes ante Agamemnona;* and there were Sunday Schools outside as well as within the limits of the Church of England before Raikes' time. Cardinal Borromeo founded Sunday Schools in his diocese in the sixteenth century; Joseph Alleyne, the eminent Nonconformist minister, made use of them in the seventeenth; and Miss Hannah Ball, a Methodist, started a Sunday School at High Wycombe in 1769. These, however, and others which might be mentioned, were but isolated efforts. The Sunday School movement dates from the year 1780, and was the work of Raikes. To use the language of his fellow-worker, Thomas Stock, "the progress of this institution through the kingdom is justly attributed to the constant representations which Mr. Raikes made in his own paper of the benefits which he perceived would probably arise from it." Now Raikes was a decided Churchman, and Stock, who took almost as prominent a part in the establishment of Sunday Schools at Gloucester as Raikes himself, was a clergyman. In 1780, Stock was Fellow of Pembroke College, Oxford, head master of Gloucester Cathedral School, and Curate of the parish of St. John the Baptist, in Gloucester. It was in this parish that the undertaking originated and Stock says, with reference to his own share in it, "As minister of the parish, I took upon me the principal superintendence of the schools and one-third of the expense." It is evident, indeed, that the work commenced and was carried forward on Church lines. The scholars were taken to church every Sunday. Through Raikes' influence many of the boys regularly attended at "the Ladye chapel" of the cathedral at seven o'clock for morning prayers; and the more advanced scholars were instructed in the Church Catechism.

It was, therefore, to be expected that the Church of England would cordially fall in with the Centenary movement. Her Sunday Schools are the lineal descendants of those established at Gloucester in 1780. The Church of England Sunday School Institute, with more than its wonted zeal, undertook the arduous task of organizing the various services and meetings which were

to be held during the week; and but one opinion has been expressed as to the admirable manner in which that task has been fulfilled. The Institute, which was founded in the year 1843,[1] claims to be the centre of Sunday School work in connection with the National Church. That claim has again and again been made good, but never more conspicuously than in the arrangements made for the observance of the centenary. The programme included special sermons in St. Paul's Cathedral and Westminster Abbey on Sunday, June 27th; a special commemoration service at St. Paul's on the Monday evening, when a sermon was preached to a vast congregation by the Archbishop of York; a meeting at Exeter Hall on the Tuesday evening, at which the Bishop of St. Albans presided; and conferences at Cannon Street Hotel and at Lambeth Palace on the Wednesday and Thursday afternoons. If a friendly criticism may be passed on the proceedings at the conferences, it would have been well if each speaker had been limited to a particular branch of the general subject. The need of this was specially observable at the Cannon Street conference. The subject was "The Sunday School: its Growth, Value to the Church, and Means of Improvement." Here were three departments of the subject. Canon Barry, in an exhaustive paper, covered the whole ground; the consequence of which was that Mr. Saumarez Smith, who followed him, was obliged to complain in a good-humoured way that all his points had been taken up by the previous speaker. The truth is, that the Sunday School, though a topic full of interest, is limited in its range; hence the importance of assigning to each speaker, as far as may be, some definite theme, especially when, as in this instance, there is a rapid succession of meetings.

The crowning event, however, of this memorable week—an event which will long be remembered when all else is forgotten—was the gathering, on the Saturday afternoon, of children belonging to the Church Sunday Schools at Lambeth Palace, by the kind permission of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Twenty thousand children were assembled in the grounds behind the Palace. Their vast numbers, the marshalling, grouping, and marching, the music and singing, the distinguished company present—including the Prince and Princess of Wales, their five

[1] Among its founders or earliest supporters we find the names of Bishop Villiers, then Rector of St. George's, Bloomsbury; Prebendary Auriol, Rector of St. Dunstan's, Fleet Street; Dean Champneys, then Rector of St. Mary's, Whitechapel; Canon Dale, then Rector of St. Bride's; the Rev. Daniel Moore, then of Camden Chapel, Camberwell; and the Rev. Josiah Pratt, Vicar of St. Stephen's, Coleman Street. Mr. J. G. Fleet, the first corresponding secretary of the Institute, is still actively engaged in furthering its interests.

children, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishops of London and Rochester—presented a truly impressive spectacle. Perfect order was maintained, and the arrangements reflected great credit on all concerned in them; Mr. Pennefather, a lay member of the Institute Committee, deserves the highest praise for the skill with which he organized this grand gathering.

The centenary observance now brought to a close suggests a spirit of devout thankfulness to Almighty God for the blessing which has followed the seed sown in our country a century ago. Herein is that saying true, "One soweth and another reapeth." As the eye rested on the venerable Archbishop, standing among the children at Lambeth, we called to mind the manly piety and Christian consistency of character which adorn the high position which he occupies. And memory reverted to his predecessor of a hundred years ago, who brought such scandal on the Church by the balls and routs which he gave at Lambeth, that George III. addressed a letter of remonstrance to him, requesting him to desist from such improprieties at once. The parochial clergy, who marched past the Royal party at the head of their schools, may be said to contrast favourably, in point of zeal and love, with the clergy of a hundred years ago—a period in which Blackstone is said to have gone from church to church, to hear every clergyman of note in London; the result being that he did not hear a single sermon which had more Christianity in it than the writings of Cicero.[1] If it be otherwise now, if the Church of our day is reaping the fruit of increased zeal, piety and consistency in her clergy, she owes it to the labours of the men who were raised up in those days to sow the seed of Gospel truth, and to set the example of holy living: men like Whitfield, Wesley, Venn, Romaine, and others, who sowed in tears, amid obloquy and derision.

The many hundreds of teachers present at Lambeth, suggested a similar cheering contrast. A century ago, very little Church work was done by laymen. In most parishes there was scarcely any parochial organization; and the clergy generally had no inclination to encourage or utilize lay zeal. At such a time it was that Robert Raikes established Sunday Schools, conducted by

[1] Mr. Overton, however ("English Church in Eighteenth Century," ii. 37), thinks that "too much stress has been laid upon" this "somewhat random observation of Sir William Blackstone;" and he adds: "It is not true that the preachers of this period entirely ignored the distinctive doctrines of Christianity; it would be more correct to say that they took the knowledge of them too much for granted—that they were, as a rule, too controversial, and that they too often appealed to merely prudential motives. And therefore the sermons of the century may rightly be noticed among the Church abuses of the period, although the abuse of this powerful engine for good was by no means so flagrant as it is sometimes represented to have been."

poor women who were paid a shilling a Sunday for teaching the children. Thus was the seed sown; and what do we now reap? It is calculated that in Great Britain alone there are more than half a million voluntary teachers; and if we add to these figures the statistics of Sunday Schools in other lands, we have a total, it is said, of a million and a half. And it would be a great mistake to suppose that the benefit accruing to the Church from this agency is confined to Sunday Schools; for Sunday School teaching draws out the sympathies, and develops the talents of the laity in such a manner as to fit them to serve the Church in every branch of her operations.

The spectacle, too, of the vast assembly of children at Lambeth, suggested the marvellously rapid growth of the Sunday School system since its foundation. The Sunday School has become a nursery to our Church in all parts of the British Empire. When Queen Charlotte sent for Raikes, she expressed a desire to know "by what accident a thought, which promised so much benefit to the lower order of people, was suggested to his mind." Those were the days of sowing. How little could she have anticipated that within a century of her interview with Raikes, her great-great-grandchildren would receive Bibles presented to them by 20,000 Sunday scholars, who themselves were but a small section of that world-wide nursery in which above twelve million of the young (five million in Great Britain alone) are being trained up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Truly "the little one has become a thousand."

While, however, we thank God for the success already achieved, it must need be the wish of every wise friend of Sunday Schools that the general interest awakened by the Centenary Commemoration should take a practical form, and that it should result in the extension and improvement of the Sunday School system. We disclaim all sympathy with the violent and indiscriminate censure lately poured on this agency by a clergyman whose words mingled harsh discord with the harmony of the centenary season; we cannot at all agree with the gloomy critics who continually complain of the failures; nevertheless, it would be unwise to shut our eyes to many defects which impede the progress of Sunday Schools. The most urgent need, however, is that the teachers themselves should be duly qualified for their work. And it is in this point of view that the great value of the Church of England Sunday School Institute is most clearly seen. The Institute helps the teacher. It provides him with carefully prepared Notes of Lessons on the Bible and the Prayer Book. It maintains an able deputation staff, the members of which visit every part of the country to deliver practical lectures to teachers, and to give, in their presence, lessons to a class of children, in order that the right

manner and style of teaching may be more clearly understood by teachers. The Institute also conducts Annual Examinations of teachers, and it is encouraging to learn from the Report for last year that upwards of 900 teachers were examined, of whom 538 obtained first-class certificates. Indeed, so useful and so highly appreciated are the efforts of the Institute to raise the standard of attainment in the Sunday School teachers, that a more generous support accorded to it by the Church at large would be a most satisfactory result of the Centenary of 1880.

There is one consideration specially calculated to stimulate the zeal of Churchmen in the work of strengthening and perfecting the Sunday School system. It is that School Boards are becoming universal, and that their action is such as to render the efficient maintenance of Church Day Schools in poor parishes a matter of increasing difficulty. A timely regard to the possibilities of the future demands that Sunday Schools should be more directly recognized as part of our Church's system; that defects in their working should be more promptly supplied; and, above all, that the teaching provided in them should be more thorough and distinctive, embracing both Bible and Prayer Book, and thus (in the words of Mr. Bridges in his "Christian Ministry") "framing Churchmen and Christians by the same process, in the same mould."

F. F. Goe.

THE YOUNG RULER.

"*He was very sorrowful, for he was very rich.*"

And this was all for which thy wealth sufficed,
With a sad heart to turn away from Christ,
To gaze on splendours with a secret pain,
To toss upon a gorgeous couch in vain,
(Fevered and sleepless for the words He said
Who had not where to lay His tranquil head,)
While through the darkness flame His eyes which saw
Through all thy virtues that undream'd-of flaw,
And the calm voice thou never shalt forget
Tells through the silence what thou lackest yet.
Ah, smoother were thy brows, thine eyes less dim,
If, reft of all, thy feet had followed Him.

Geo. A. Chadwick.

Reviews.

Old Testament Prophecy: its Witness as a Record of Divine Foreknowledge. By the Rev. STANLEY LEATHES, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, King's College, London. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1880.

THE whole history of controversy justifies the belief, that the great Head of the Church ever overrules the attacks of the sceptical critic to the more certain confirmation of the fact. Accumulated facts show that this old process is being renewed once more in regard to the onslaught on the evidential value of ancient prophecy, of which Professor Kuenen is the leader. When public attention was called to his work on Hebrew Prophets and Prophecy, a general, though vague, feeling of consternation was produced at the supposed failure of an important branch of Christian Apologetics. A reference to the work itself, made accessible to English readers by the translation published by Messrs. Clark, soon served, however, to dissipate these apprehensions, and proved that the strong foundations which support the truth of revelation remain as unshaken as ever. The attack is now being retorted back upon the sceptic, and his own methods are being applied to show the absolute untenability of his position. This counter-attack is still apparently at its commencement, for the subjects announced both for the Bampton and the Boyle lectures of the ensuing year are evidently directed to this argument. Meanwhile, Professor Stanley Leathes, in his Warburtonian lectures for 1876–1880, has done admirable service in the same direction, and his lectures, in their collected form, will be read by all interested in these questions with equal pleasure and profit.

The proper office of the critic is to deal with the literary value of the work which he reviews. But in the present case we shall secure at the same time a yet more important object, if we deal rather with the substance of the argument than with the precise form in which it was presented in this volume, and endeavour to convey to our readers some general impression of its character. The idea is to accept the conclusions at which Dr. Kuenen has arrived, as themselves the subject of a critical examination, and to show that they are full of contradictions and perplexities, and are consequently improbable to the point of absolute incredibility. If the conclusions can be shown to be wrong, the process of reasoning by which they have been reached must evidently be wrong likewise, even though the student does not care to trace out one by one the sources of the error. Dr. Kuenen's general conclusions are these—that the Hebrew prophets were pious and well-meaning patriots, who embodied their national hopes and aspirations in their prophecies, and who, in the loose morality of their day, thought it consistent with their piety to deceive the people by the profession of a divine and superhuman character for communications, which they knew perfectly well all the time were the simple issue of their own thoughts. Their religious object was to promote the cause of the national deity of the Hebrew nation against the profligate worship of the local deities of the surrounding nations. In pursuit of this plan Dr. Kuenen dislocates the entire accepted order of the ancient Scriptures. He not only re-arranges the dates of the prophetic books at the pleasure of his critical caprice, in the exercise of which he fixes the date of Daniel at B.C. 165; but he also places the date of the Law subsequent to that of most of the prophets, and regards it as a subsequent embodiment, in a fictitious form, of the various hopes and fears, struggles and aspirations, contained in the prophetic writings. Professor Stanley Leathes says, in effect: "Very well; we accept for

the moment these conclusions; but before we regard them as finally established, let us see how they cohere with the literary peculiarities of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and how far they are consistent with the known and undisputed facts of the history."

For this purpose he takes his stand at the New Testament times. As a matter of fact, the Apostles, in preaching Christ, based His claims on the belief of mankind upon the authority of ancient prophecy. Their argument was that Christ's person, life, and office constituted the fulfilment of predictions which those to whom they spoke believed to be divine. The reverence which the Jews of that day paid to their ancient Scriptures was analogous to that produced by the highest view of inspiration and in this estimate of them they were supported by the authority of the Apostles and of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. If this view was erroneous and the ancient Scriptures were no more than the human, and not always credible, compositions which Dr. Kuenen affirms them to be, the Apostles, in common with the Jews of their day, were altogether deceived, and our Lord Himself partook of the deception. But in any case these prophetic books themselves are acknowledged to be older by centuries than that accomplishment of their predictions which the Apostles affirmed to have taken place in the person and life of Jesus of Nazareth. The latest of them, Daniel, is placed by his Rationalist critics at B.C. 160, an interval of years quite sufficient to confirm the fact of the prediction, and to make it impossible that the prediction can have been suggested by the history. In the accomplishment of these predictions the Apostles had an absolute confidence, and to the general belief of it is largely to be ascribed, the popular and rapid success of Christianity at its first announcement. Their acceptance of the authority of the Scriptures was implicit, and the coincidence of the prediction and the fulfilment too broad and plain and palpable to be denied. We have therefore to deal not only with the ancient documents themselves, but also with another fact wholly independent of the authority one might allow, or might deny, to the documents; wholly independent, likewise, of any judgment we might form of their authors or of the circumstances and methods of their production. This is the fact of the belief placed both by the Apostles and their converts, and, indeed, by the Jews in general, both in the Scriptures and in the events they predicted—a belief as wide almost as the then known world, and so firm and deep-seated as to have borne the superstructure of the Christian faith. If the ancient Scriptures are, and were then, what Dr. Kuenen affirms them to be, how came this belief into existence, how is it to be accounted for, how are its strength and prevalence to be explained? The author of these lectures replies that on the principles of the destructive criticism no intelligible account can possibly be given of the facts, no explanation which is not embarrassed with such insuperable difficulties as to be absolutely incredible.

In illustration of this assertion he adduces a series of illustrative instances. The first is the promise to Abraham, including both the possession of the land of Canaan and a blessing to the whole world through his seed. It is remarkable that to the second and the more important half of this promise no further reference is made in the Old Testament, while it is this on which the New Testament writers lay the stress of their argument. The Jewish nation were more engrossed in the former part of the promise than in the latter. They cared more for the possession of the land flowing with milk and honey than for the prospect of being the centre of blessing to the world. Yet the neglected promise survived, and to the survival no human patriotism can have been instrumental, for in that case it would have been noticed, and not passed over in silence. Yet to this strangely neglected portion of

the promise the New Testament teaching gave emphatic prominence. The Apostles not only saw in Jesus one who invested the ancient prediction with a meaning it had never had before, but they made its fulfilment the actual foundation of a society which has lasted for well-nigh as many centuries after Christ as the hope enshrined in the promise had survived before Him. The whole prediction is contained in Genesis, commonly believed to have been composed fifteen centuries before Christ. The language of Joel, ii. 3, seems to prove that the book was, at all events, in existence nine centuries before Christ.

"The problem therefore we have to solve is the existence of this pro-"mise or prophecy as a literary fact. It does not matter now when it "was given; it is no concern of ours how it was given. For our present "purpose it is even a matter of subordinate interest whether it was ever "given at all. The only point for which we have inevitably to account "is that for some indefinite period before Christ—shall we say a thousand "years?—there existed and was highly prized in the Jewish nation the "record of this promise. And be it observed, it is no such easy matter to "account for this phenomenon whenever it first appeared, because the "historic condition of the whole Jewish literature is bound up with it. If "we turn to the national poetry it is full of it. If we examine the his-"torical writings they imply the existence of it. If we inquire of the "prophets they abound in allusions to it. There is no analogous instance "in all human literature of a national history and a national literature "being thus permeated, transfused, and inspired with one idea. The "influence of the original promise, supposed to have been given to Abra-"ham, upon the history and literature of Israel may be illustrated, but "very faintly, by the influence of the Norman Conquest on our own "national history and literature. Eight centuries have elapsed since "that event, and our language, our literature, our history, our laws, our "social life, still bear witness to its abiding influence. But take the "Hebrew history at any one point you please, and it will be impossible "to account for the phenomenon presented on the supposition that this "promise, or something answering to it, was then unknown, or had no "existence. If we begin with the century before Christ—though the "interval was then more than twice that which has elapsed since the "occupation of this country by the Normans—we find the effect of the "supposed promise distinct and deep; and if we go back in succession to "the era of the Maccabees, to the return from Babylon, to the divided "monarchy, to the undivided monarchy, to the period of the Judges, to the "exodus from the thraldom of Egypt, we shall find it equally difficult to "account for the phenomena which confront us on the hypothesis that "the supposed promise to Abraham was unknown to the nation before "the time of Moses, or was the invention of Moses, or was the self-"originated idea springing upon the minds of the people—how we can-"not tell."

The antiquity, therefore, of the promise is a proved fact, and its development is to be traced in Balaam's prediction of the star and the sceptre, and the prediction by Moses of a prophet like unto himself. Yet, while the promise is everywhere, there is no hint ever dropped in the whole collection of the ancient Scriptures down to the time of Malachi, that any of the great personages depicted in it realized, in any degree, the conditions of the promise. The prediction stretched on, till it found its recognized fulfilment in Christ. But how could this undying belief have been possible if there were no divine revelation; if the ancient Scriptures were a mere collection of untrustworthy documents of uncertain date, and if the prophets were but a set of human enthusiasts who looked no higher

than to national hopes, and drew their inspiration from nothing better than their own sanguine imaginations.

There is an excellent passage in the second lecture in which the author vindicates the divine character of ancient prediction: —

"The position that is commonly assumed by the impugners of prophecy "is this, that to regard 'the New Testament explanation' of Hebrew "prophecies 'as binding,' involves a dogmatic assumption 'at variance "with' the true critical method; that the true way of studying prophecy "is to ascertain what the prophets meant; and that if it can be shown, as "it obviously very soon can be, that the New Testament meaning was one "which never entered into their minds, then it must forthwith be rejected. "Whereas to reason in this way is only to cast dust in men's eyes, because "it is no part of the argument from prophecy to assert that New Testa- "ment historical events entered into the area of Old Testament prophets' "vision, nor is that the teaching of the Nicene Creed, which declares that "the Holy Ghost 'spake by the prophets.' What we affirm is, that the "broad, general, and patent correspondence between Hebrew prophecy and "New Testament history being such as was manifestly not brought about "by the Apostles and Evangelists of the New Testament on one hand, "and such as the prophets themselves were clearly unconscious of pro- "ducing on the other, is nevertheless a phenomenon which points us no "less distinctly to the operation of a will rather than to the forces of blind "chance, than do the manifold and undeniable tokens of design in "nature."

The argument which we have endeavoured to explain at some length in the case of the promise to Abraham, is pursued in these lectures in eight other instances. Thus the apostle James quotes the prediction of Amos, who is admitted to have flourished in the early part of the eighth century before Christ, and who, living at a period of remarkable national prosperity, yet foretold the ruin of David's house and the rebuilding of his tabernacle —that is the restoration of David's glory. Thus Paul referred to the "true mercies of David," as predicted by Isaiah, who prophesied only thirty or forty years later than Amos, and is consequently a witness only one degree less reliable. Thus St. Peter, in his Pentecostal sermon, quotes the words of David in the sixteenth Psalm as referring to the Messiah as the true heir of David's throne and the realiser of his promised glory. Thus Stephen appeals to the prediction of Amos of the captivity of Israel, and the threat was repeated with great precision and particularity by Micah; while Jeremiah presented the other side of the picture and foretold the restoration. In these instances the author carefully adjusts the relative position of prophecy and prediction, and argues that the one was given as a guarantee for the divine inspiration of the other, and that the messengers and the message were indeed authorised of God. He asks, "Were these predictions a substantive part of their prophecies, or were they not? Did they themselves challenge the verdict of posterity on the fulfilment of them, or did they not? Is there reason to believe that they were fulfilled, or is there not? If there is, does not the sublime moral and spiritual character of their writings lend its weight to the authority of their predictions, and do not their predictions irresistibly tend to show that the moral and spiritual character of their writings was indeed stamped with the authority of Him in whose name they were recorded, and that in fact it was none other than He "who spake by the prophets."

Lastly, we have two lectures in which the author maintains with great ability the earlier date of Daniel, and discusses his prediction of the seventy weeks. He considers that all the references of the New Testament to the fulfilment of an appointed time refer to the dates of Daniel. He points out with great force that, on the supposition of Dr. Kuenen

that Daniel wrote, B.C. 160, the prediction of the seventy weeks is absolutely without object and without meaning. Compute the weeks how we will, the close of the period falls at such a date as to reduce to an absurdity the object of comforting and encouraging his countrymen, which Daniel is admitted to have had in view. Whereas if Daniel's book be referred back to its true date, and the period of the seventy weeks be computed—not from the decrees of Cyrus or of Darius, neither of which had any reference to the restoration or re-building of the city of Jerusalem, but from the decree of Artaxerxes, B.C. 457, which had this special object—the termination of the allotted period falls in the year of our Lord 33, when all its clauses found their remarkable fulfilment in the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. We have no space to pursue this subject further, and must refer our readers to the lectures themselves and to the ample notes which are appended to them. But we wish to acknowledge, before closing this somewhat imperfect review of a really valuable work, the high-toned faith in Christ as a Saviour and the earnest, devotional spirit in which the whole design of the lectures has been conceived and carried out. In illustration we once more leave Prebendary Leathes to speak for himself:—

"Prophecy is not to be regarded as a string of isolated and detached "sentences, each of which had one definite meaning and no other, but much "rather as a consistent and composite whole, which must be dealt with "as a whole, and interpreted as a whole. When we so deal with it, our "difficulty is not to discover here and there marks of something unusual "and more than human, but to shut our eyes to the broad, patent, and "innumerable indications which confront us everywhere of one vast "design never lost sight of, never forgotten, but continually unfolding "itself, continually expanding, and yet also continually contracting and "converging, till it centres in one object, which gathers in itself all the "many-coloured rays to reflect them again in multitudinous directions "and a variety of forms. In fact, it is this feature and characteristic "of the prophetic writings which is the most permanent and indestructible. After every individual prophecy has been dealt with separately "with an exhaustive and inexhaustible array of minute and ruthless "criticism, far more than sufficient to demolish it utterly were it not for "an inherent principle of deathless vitality common to all, one has only "to open the writings of the prophets to feel that they have been "endowed with gifts of immortality and truth, of which no criticism can "deprive them. It is not what has been or can be said about them "which is their strength, but much rather what they say for themselves, "and have been saying for five-and-twenty centuries. The danger is "lest amid the din of discussion and the strife of tongues, we should "fail to hear what they say themselves; but if we hearken to it we "need have no apprehension as to the result."

The Holy Bible according to the Authorized Version (A.D. 1611), *with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary, and a Revision of the Translation, by Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church.* Edited by F. C. Cook, M.A., Canon of Exeter. New Testament. Vol. II. St. John—The Acts of the Apostles. Murray. 1880.

OF the Introduction in the first volume of "The Speaker's Commentary"—New Testament portion—written by the Archbishop of York, some remarks have appeared in previous numbers of this Magazine. The archbishop's argument, dealing generally with the four gospels, but especially with the Synoptic gospels, is fresh, full, and on every point forcible. Canon Westcott's Introduction in the volume

before us is a not unworthy companion of the archbishop's, and with the Commentary it will take its place, we think, at the head of the valuable works on the fourth gospel which have been published in recent years. Canon Westcott considers, in the first place, the authorship of the gospel; secondly, its composition; thirdly, its characteristics; fourthly, its relation to other Apostolic writings; and he concludes his masterly Introduction by discussing the history of the gospel. Of the scholarship, thought, literary skill, and argumentative ability displayed in this Introduction it is needless to write. More than four-and-twenty years have elapsed, the Professor mentions, since he began work seriously at the Gospel of St. John.

At the outset, Canon Westcott shows that the writer of this Gospel must have been a Jew. The Old Testament is certainly "the source of the religious life of the writer. His Jewish opinions and hopes are taken up into and transfigured by his Christian faith; but the Jewish foundation underlies his whole narrative." It must be borne in mind that "the Evangelist vindicates both for the Law and for the people their just historical position in the Divine economy. The Law could not but bear witness to the truths which God had once spoken through it. The people could not do away with the promises and privileges which they had inherited." Again. "It is assumed as an axiom," writes Dr. Westcott, "that *The Scripture cannot be broken* (x. 35, v. 18, note). That which *is written in the prophets* (vi. 45; comp. vi. 31) is taken as the true expression of what shall be. *Moses wrote of Christ* (v. 46; comp. i. 45). The types of the Old Testament—the brazen serpent (iii. 14), the manna (vi. 32), the water from the rock (vii. 37 f.), perhaps also the pillar of fire (viii. 12), are applied by Christ to Himself as of certain and acknowledged significance. Abraham *saw His day* (viii. 56). It was generally to 'the Scriptures' that Christ appealed as *witnessing of Him*. Even the choice of Judas to be an apostle was involved in the portraiture of the divine King (xiii. 18, note, *that the Scripture might be fulfilled*; comp. xvii. 12); and the hatred of the Jews was prefigured in the words *written in their Law, They hated me without a cause* (xv. 25)." Such words of Christ, continues Dr. Westcott, must be considered both in themselves and in the consequences which they necessarily carry with them, if we are to understand the relation of St. John's gospel to the Old Testament. In the fourth gospel no less than in the other three gospels, Christ is represented as offering Himself to Israel as the fulfiller—not the destroyer—of the Law. Nor is this all. Just as the words of our Lord recorded by St. John confirm the Divine authority of the Old Testament, so also the Evangelist, when he writes in his own person, emphasizes the same principle. And on this point Canon Westcott refers to ii. 17; xii. 14 ff.; xii. 37 ff.; and, in relation to special incidents, to xix. 23, 28, 36, 37. We may quote here, from the Commentary, Canon Westcott's exposition of xix. 28: "Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst."

were now accomplished] *are now finished.* The A. V. loses the striking parallel between this clause, "are now finished" (ἤδη τετέλεσται) and what follows, "It is finished" (τετέλεσται).

that the scripture might be fulfilled]. This clause can be connected either with the words which precede ("were now accomplished that the . . . . ") or with the words which follow ("accomplished, that the Scriptures might be fulfilled, saith . . . . "). The stress which the Evangelist lays upon the fulfilment of prophetic words in each detail of Christ's sufferings appears to show that the latter interpretation is correct. The "thirst," the keen expression of bodily exhaustion, was specified as part of the agony of the Servant of God (Is. lxix. 21), and this Messiah endured to the uttermost. The incident loses its full significance unless it be regarded as one element in the foreshadowed course of the

Passion. Nor is there any difficulty in the phrase "are now finished" as preceding it. The "thirst" was already felt, and the feeling included the confession of it. The fulfilment of the Scripture (it need scarcely be added) was not the object which the Lord had in view in uttering the word, but there was a necessary correspondence between His acts and the divine foreshadowing of them.

be fulfilled] *be accomplished, perfected.* The word used (τελειωθῇ Vulg. *consummaretur*, for which some copies substitute the usual word πληρωθῇ) is very remarkable. It appears to mark not the isolated fulfilling of a particular trait in the Scriptural picture, but the perfect completion of the whole prophetic image. This utterance of physical suffering was the last thing required that Messiah might be "made perfect" (Hebr. ii. 10, v. 7 ff.), and so the ideal of prophecy "made perfect" in Him. Or, to express the same thought otherwise, that "work" which Christ came to "make perfect" (ch. iv. 34. xvii. 4) was written in Scripture, and by the realization of the work the Scripture was "perfected." Thus, under different aspects of this word and of that which it implies, prophecy, and the earthly work of Christ, and Christ Himself, were "made perfect."

The true character of the Law, therefore, concludes Dr. Westcott, was unfolded by St. John. The object with which he wrote the fourth gospel was to show that Jesus was not only the *Son of God*, but also *the Christ* —the promised Messiah of the Jews (xx. 31); just as Nathanael, the true representative of Israel (i. 47), had recognised Him at first under this double title.

The question of the Jewish authorship, in its various aspects, is well worked out, and though the argument is condensed, its grip never fails; an ordinary reader will follow it step by step with interest. It is proved that the writer of the fourth gospel was not only a Jew, but a Palestinian Jew of the first century. The Evangelist undoubtedly speaks of what he had seen, and this, as is proved by arguments drawn from political, social, religious,[1] and local knowledge, was before the old land-marks, material and moral, had been removed by the Roman war. On one point, in connection with this portion of his argument, Canon Westcott lays great, but certainly not undue, stress. This point has been, as he observes, commonly passed over, namely, the doctrine of the Word as it is presented in the Prologue. Taken in connection with the whole gospel, verses 1-18 of the first Chapter show that the writer was of Palestinian and not of Hellenistic training. The teaching of St. John on the Logos, the Word, is characteristically Hebraic; it is not intelligible as an application or continuation of the teaching of Philo. Many of the Rationalist objections brought in recent years against the fourth gospel, as, *e.g.*, in the book mis-named "Supernatural Religion," are especially

[1] It is said that the author of the fourth Gospel was so ignorant of Jewish affairs that he represented the high priesthood as an annual office when he writes of Caiaphas as "high priest in that year" (xi. 49, 51, xviii. 13). But what does a consideration of the clause solemnly repeated three times really show? "The emphatic reiteration of the statement," says Dr. Westcott, "forces the reader to connect the office of Caiaphas with the part which he actually took in accomplishing the death of Christ. One yearly sacrifice for atonement it was the duty of the high priest to offer. In that memorable year, when all types were fulfilled in the reality, it fell to Caiaphas to bring about unconsciously the one sacrifice of atonement for sin. He was high priest before and after, but it was not enough for the Evangelist's purpose to mark this. He was high priest in that year, "the year of the Lord" (Luke iv. 19); and so, in the way of Divine Providence, did his appointed part in causing "*one man to die for the people*." (xi. 50).

weak in relation to this point; and much nonsense has been written as to the agreement between Justin and Philo. What, we have often asked, is the central fact of this controversy? Surely, it is this: St. John's affirmation, *the Word became flesh*, is absolutely new and unique. That this is so, as Canon Westcott points out, "is admitted on all hands." But there is another fact, too often ignored, viz.—the scope of the Old Testament writers is religious, whereas the scope of Philo is metaphysical. The inspired writers move in a region of life and history; Philo moves in a region of abstraction and thought. Canon Westcott's observations on these matters are, in our judgment, quite unanswerable.

Having demonstrated that the fourth Gospel was written by a Palestinian Jew, by an eye witness, by *the disciple whom Jesus loved*, by John the son of Zebedee, the Professor turns to the direct evidence of the Gospel as to its authorship. And first, he says that the words at the beginning of the Gospel *we beheld His glory* must be considered together with the words at the beginning of the Epistle (written, it may certainly be assumed, by the same author) *which we have heard . . . . seen . . . . beheld . . . .;* and in the second passage there can be no doubt, he says, that the "beholding" must be understood literally—*we have seen with our eyes.* "Language cannot be plainer. The change of tense, moreover, emphasises the specific historical reference (*we beheld*, and not as of that which ideally abides, *we have beheld* [1 John iv. 14. John i. 32, *n*])" Further, the original word (θεᾶσθαι) is never used in the New Testament of mental vision (as θεωρεῖν). [John i. 32, 38, iv. 35, vi. 5, xi. 45; 1 John i. 1, iv. 12, 14.] The conclusion, therefore, is that the writer claims to have been an eye-witness of that which he records. Similarly in regard to xix. 35. On xxi. 24, Canon Westcott says:—"The fourth Gospel claims to be written by an eye-witness, and this claim is attested by those who put the work in circulation." That chap. xxi. may be termed an appendix to the Gospel we do not at all dispute;[1] but it is clear that it was written by St. John. Canon Westcott observes that the style and character of the language in xxi. 1—23 lead to the conclusion that it is the work of St. John. "There is no evidence," he says, "to show that the Gospel was published before the appendix was added to it." In the Commentary on xxi. 24 we read as follows:—

> vv. 24, 25. These two verses appear to be separate notes attached to the Gospel before its publication. The form of v. 24, contrasted with that of xix. 35, shows conclusively that it is not the witness of the Evangelist. The words were probably added by the Ephesian elders, to whom the preceding narrative had been given both orally and in writing. . . . . The change of person in v. 25 (*I suppose*, compared with *we know*) marks a change of authorship. It is quite possible that this verse may contain words of St. John (comp. xx. 30), set here by those who had heard them.

In considering the external evidence, Dr. Westcott remarks that the teaching of Justin Martyr on the Word presupposes the teaching of St. John, and in many important details goes beyond it. It is no matter of surprise that in Justin should appear thoughts which are Alexandrian rather than Hebraistic.

On other points in this elaborate introduction we are unable to make any remarks. Turning to the Commentary itself, which bears on every page the marks of patient labour and wide research, we may make a single extract. In his exposition of the wonderful discourse in chap. vi. the Professor observes on verse 54, that the phrase "*drink his blood*" is

---

[1] Dr. Arnold, in one of his sermons, if we remember right, points out that chap. xx. ends with, "Jesus . . . . is the Son of God," and that with this note the fourth Gospel begins.

unique in the New Testament. "The thought is that of the appropriation of life sacrificed. St. Bernard expresses part of it very well when he says:—Hoc est si compatimini conregnabitis ('De Dil. Deo.' iv.) Compare 'in Psalm,' iii. 3, Quid autem est manducare ejus carnem et bibere sanguinem nisi communicare passionibus ejus et eam conversationem imitari quam habuit in carne?" In an additional note the Professor remarks that this "eating" (v. 53—57) leads necessarily to life in the highest sense; it has no qualification (such as eating "worthily"); it is operative for good absolutely:—

It follows that what is spoken of "eating (φαγεῖν) of the bread which cometh down from heaven," "eating (φαγεῖν) the flesh of the Son of Man," "eating (τρώγειν) His flesh and drinking His blood," "eating (τρώγειν) Him," "eating (τρώγειν) the bread which came down from heaven"—the succession of phrases is most remarkable—cannot refer primarily to the Holy Communion; nor, again, can it be simply prophetic of that Sacrament. The teaching has a full and consistent meaning in connection with the actual circumstances, and it treats essentially of spiritual realities, with which no external act, as such, can be coextensive. The well-known words of Augustine, *crede et manducasti*, ("believe and thou *hast* eaten"), give the sum of the thoughts in a luminous and pregnant sentence. But, on the other hand, there can be no doubt that the truth which is presented in its absolute form in these discourses is presented in a specific act and in a concrete form in the Holy Communion; and yet further, that the Holy Communion is the divinely appointed means whereby men may realize the truth. Nor can there be a difficulty to any one who acknowledges a divine fitness in the ordinances of the Church, an eternal correspondence in the parts of the one counsel of God, in believing that the Lord, while speaking intelligibly to those who heard Him at the time, gave by anticipation a commentary, so to speak, on the Sacrament which He afterwards instituted. But that which He deals with is not the outward rite, but the spiritual fact which underlies it. To attempt to transfer the words of the discourse with their consequences to the Sacrament, is not only to involve the history in hopeless confusion, but to introduce overwhelming difficulties into the interpretation, which can only be removed by the arbitrary and untenable interpolation of qualifying sentences.

For a notice of the second portion of the very valuable volume before us we have left ourselves no space. The Introduction to the Book of the Acts is written by the learned editor, Canon Cook, and the Commentary by the Bishop of Chester. We had marked several passages in the succinct, scholarly, and suggestive notes in the Commentary, rather lacking, however, in dogmatic fervour, but we must content ourselves with expressing the regret that there is not more of direct exposition. There are several interesting illustrative quotations, such as those from Bull (p. 419), and Bentley (p. 449). The ably-written introduction by Canon Cook—whose book on the Acts, with Mr. Humphry's and Dr. Hackett's, has done good service—contains much that is important, and we follow him with pleasure all through. In regard to the design of the Acts, however, we are inclined to agree with Chrysostom and others. Without laying great stress on ἤρξατο, in verse one, (although we cannot deem this word to be pleonastic), we think that St. Luke's second "treatise" opens Christ's work in the Church by His Spirit. (See St. Mark xvi. 20; Bengel, Burton's "Bampton Lectures," Olshausen, and Wordsworth.)

Thoughts on the Times and Seasons of Sacred Prophecy. By THOMAS RAWSON BIRKS, M.A. With a Preface by EDWARD BICKERSTETH BIRKS, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Pp. 130. Hodder and Stoughton. 1880.

THIS book did not reach us in time for a notice in the July CHURCHMAN. We have much pleasure in recommending it as a work of singular interest and value at the present moment. It is brief, but full. No other book, indeed, as far as we know, gives, in a short compass, a clear, comprehensive narrative of prophetical interpretation, with a sound summary of the very latest works. We may claim some sort of editorial interest in the book, on the ground of recent correspondence with the eminent author; but, apart from this, and simply taking the book on its merits, we can cordially commend it. Viewed from what we may term the historical stand-point of prophetical interpretation, it just now stands alone.

The sudden stroke of illness, which has called forth so much sympathy, prevented Professor Birks from correcting the proofs of the last chapter, and the task of supplying a Preface devolved upon his son, Mr. Edward Birks. The main portion of the Preface we quote, as follows:—

This little book consists of four parts. The author had often been urged to republish some of his early works on prophecy, but had never found the leisure requisite. Suddenly he discovered that in the fifth edition of the late Mr. Elliott's "Horæ Apocalypticæ," he was credited with a conversion to notions to which he had never been converted, and that this misrepresentation of his views, founded on a misapprehension of his meaning in a private letter, had long been in circulation, while he himself had been left wholly uninformed of it; and he felt it his duty to protest. It seemed that the error might most simply be corrected by reprinting his earliest utterances on the structure of the Apocalypse, and stating in what respects, and to what extent he had subsequently been led to modify his opinions, and to approximate to Mr. Elliott's.

While thus engaged he was urged to express his opinion of the recent work of Mr. Grattan Guinness, on "The Approaching End of the Age;" and he preferred to take this opportunity of commenting on it, rather than attempting formally to review it in a periodical. Commendation of a work whose merits have so soon carried it to a fifth Edition would be superfluous, and to commend an author who has so fully acknowledged large obligations to himself, might seem out of place. It has been a great cause of thankfulness to him, to find his own earlier works on Prophecy utilized and enforced by so earnest and vigorous a writer, while he has felt it the more necessary to point out wherein he differs from his conclusions.

He was anxious also to make his work practically useful; and with this aim he has added two chapters on the moral aspects both of belief in the literal fulfilment of prophecy, and of inquiry into the nature of the times and seasons signified by the prophetic spirit.

Lastly, he found he could no longer be content simply to restate what his views were when Mr. Elliott misconceived them, because in one important respect renewed meditation on the subject had led him to reconsider them, and thankfully to believe that the predicted limit of delay of the impending final judgment may be more distant than he had once supposed. "The Lord is not slack concerning His promise, but long-suffering to usward."

Professor Birks had intended, in the present work, to make some reply to Canon Farrar in regard to the prophecy of the "Man of Sin;" but the pamphlet of Bishop Wordsworth "left nothing to be desired."

The book begins with the remark that fifty years have passed since the author began the study of the Prophetic Scriptures. His first printed paper on the subject was in 1833; and his first book, "Elements of Prophecy," was published in 1844. He says:—

Alike in physical science and in Christian theology, one first requisite for

real progress, is to distinguish between first principles, and the superstructure to be raised upon them. Full truth cannot be attained by a sudden bound, but by a gradual progress. In the interpretation of the Apocalypse, the last and crowning message of the Holy Spirit, a law of continuity has been followed in the gradual communication of light and the detection of partial error. Sir Isaac Newton's remark on this subject is quite true: "Among the interpreters of the last age there is scarce one of note who hath not made some discovery worth knowing, whence I gather that God is about opening these mysteries."

Mr. Birks' object in the "Elements of Prophecy" was to mark and emphasize the contrast between some first maxims of interpretation, and a superstructure in which there was great diversity of opinion. He showed the great number of consenting authorities, and the direct proof in the testimony of Scripture by which these are confirmed. The book began with the following passage:—

Ever since the time of the Reformation the following maxims in the interpretation of the sacred prophecies have been generally received by the Protestant Churches.

1. That the visions of Daniel commence with the times of the prophet.
2. That the events predicted in the Apocalypse begin from the time of the prophecy, or within the first century.
3. That the fourth beast (Dan. vii. 7) denotes the Roman Empire.
4. That Babylon in the Apocalypse denotes Rome.
5. That the little horn in Daniel vii. denotes the Papacy.
6. That the 'Man of Sin' (2 Thess. ii. 3-5; Dan. xi. 36–39) relates to the same Power.
7. That the prophecy in 1 Timothy iv. is fulfilled in past events.
8. That Babylon denotes, at least inclusively, Rome papal.

The three following have also been received by the most learned and able commentators of our own country, from the time of Mede down to the present day:—

9. That the two woes (Rev. ix.) relate to the Saracens and the Turks.
10. That the two beasts in Revelation xiii. denote the civil and ecclesiastical Latin Empire.
11. That a prophetic day denotes a natural year, and a prophetic time three hundred and sixty natural years.

Of these leading maxims, the four first are held by the Fathers of the Early Church and most of the Roman commentators, as well as by the Reformed Churches. On the other hand, the three last, though generally received by interpreters of the English Church, have been rejected by many foreign Protestants, especially among the Lutheran divines.

All these maxims, without distinction, have been rejected by the writers commonly called Futurists, and many of them by the writers of the "Tracts for the Times" and their disciples. These writers agree in few points, except in rejecting the conclusions of all previous expositors; and maintain that nearly the whole of Daniel's prophecies and of the Apocalypse are unfulfilled.

These maxims, continues Professor Birks, have been received and held in common in the prophetical works of Mr. Cuninghame, Mr. Frere, Mr Bickersteth, Mr. Faber, Mr. Habershon, Dr. Keith, Dr. Brown, Dr. Fairbairn, Mr. Elliott, Dr. Cumming, Mr. Brookes, and of Mr. Grattan Guinness.

All these maxims, except the 11th, are held also by Bishop Wordsworth in his Commentary on the Apocalypse.

I believe we have now, in 1880, writes Mr. Birks, reached the last night watch of the great Saturday of the world's history. The two works of Mr. E. B. Elliott and Mr. Grattan Guinness, the "Horæ Apocalypticæ" (5th edition, 1862), and the "Approaching End of the Age Viewed in the Light of Prophecy and Science" (2nd edition, 1879), may be said conjointly to indicate a penultimate stage of prophetical exposition. In the following pages I wish to indicate some of the great truths unfolded in each of these, and some remaining defects, by which a penultimate is naturally differenced from an ultimate and final stage of prophetic interpretation, which can only be reached when the end itself comes.

Professor Birks then points out wherein he differed, and still differs, from the exposition of Mr. Elliott. In the fifth edition of that great work, the "Horæ Apocalypticæ," he recently found, to his great surprise, a series of affirmations that he had abandoned and reversed his view of the structure of the Apocalypse. He now reprints a letter, written in the year 1833, giving his view of the structure; and the chief point where the view diverges from that of the "Horæ" is in the relation of the Seals and Trumpets. The same view, expressly derived from Mr. Birks, was given in Mr. Bickersteth's "Practical Guide to the Prophecies" (6th edition, 1844), in contrast to Mr. Elliott's view, and continued to its 8th edition, 1852, the year after the publication of Mr. Elliott's 4th edition. The statements of Mr. Elliott, founded on his construction of a line in a private letter to him in 1856, were in circulation for seventeen years without Mr. Birks being aware of their existence, the edition of the "Horæ" which contains them (vol. i. p. 549) not having been brought under his notice.

The words he (Mr. Elliott) quotes, are these—"I agree with you now in the points following—the *Subordination* of the Trumpets to the Seals," to which he appends his own construction, "*i.e., that the seventh Seal is unfolded in the seven Trumpets.*" His view of my meaning is plainly disproved by his further quotations from the same letter. A structural "subordination" requires two conditions to be fulfilled; that no part of the Seals belong to the fourteen centuries after the death of Theodosius, and none of the Trumpets to the four centuries after that date. The fourth and eighth points which I expressly reaffirmed in the letter quoted were, "The mystical sense of the sealed tribes, Rev. vii., as reaching through the whole dispensation;" and that, "in the palm-bearing vision, Rev. vii., there is prospective reference to a time still future." As to the other point of the application of the earlier Trumpets, I reaffirmed my own view of the third and fourth parts in contrast to his. Vitringa, the leading advocate of the view I hold, expressly says, "As to the Trumpets, even if they are *subordinated*[1] to the Seals, according to the series of the prophetical context, nothing hinders them from commencing a new series of matters of a distinct argument; this no skilful interpreter of the Book can deny, that the same is observed elsewhere in this very book, and everywhere in the prophecies."

Of "The Approaching End of the Age" by Mr. Grattan Guinness, Professor Birks writes that it is a work worthy of most careful study.

---

[1] This very word appears to have been borrowed from Vitringa by me in my letter.

The Great African Island. Chapters on Madagascar. A Popular Account of Recent Researches in the Physical Geography, Geology, and Exploration of the Country, and its Natural History, and Botany; and in the Origin and Divisions, Customs, and Languages, Superstitions, Folk-lore, Religious Beliefs and Practices of the Different Tribes. Together with Illustrations of Scripture, and Early Church History from Native Statists and Missionary Experience. By the Rev JAMES SIBREE, jun., F.R.G.S. Pp. 371. London: Trübner, & Co., Ludgate Hill. 1880.

MR. SIBREE is known as the author of a pleasantly written and interesting book, published some ten years ago, entitled "Madagascar and its People." Many books have been written about Madagascar during the last twenty years; but the majority of these have had reference chiefly to the religious and political history of the country down from the entrance of Christian missionaries. In writing the present work Mr. Sibree's object, as appears from its title-page, has been to supply information of a more general character; and for several years he has been noting down facts of interest in regard to the luxuriant flora and exceptional fauna of the great African Island, and the language and customs, tribe-characteristics, and superstitions of the Malagasy. The volume is readable and contains much that is both curious and instructive.

From the pages on insects of Madagascar, we extract the following :—

One of the mason wasps found in the central province builds a pocket-like nest of clay. These are often constructed within dwelling-houses, the busy little worker coming in with a loud hum, bearing a pellet of clay in its jaws; this is deposited on the edge of the work already finished, the wasp getting inside the little chamber and finishing it off smoothly with her antennæ and fore limbs, the loud triumphant note changing to a lower one of apparent satisfaction during the process of working. These nests are about two inches deep, and wide enough to admit a little finger, and I frequently found several of them securely fixed to the underside of the unceiled rafters of my study. I believe they are filled with insects as food for the young of the wasp.

In the warmer parts of Madagascar the nights are lighted up by numbers of fireflies. On the south-east coast I was once lost in the woods for some time during a dark evening, and was extremely interested with the numbers of minute lamps which danced through the air and amongst the trees. So brightly did a particular one shine out now and then, that we were several times deceived by them, and felt sure that we saw the lights of a village a few hundred yards ahead of us. The light of these insects is of a greenish hue; it is not continuous, but is quenched every second or two; as in some lighthouses, the interval of darkness is a little longer than the time when the light is visible. When caught and held in the hand the insect gives a continuous glow, and not the series of flashes seen when it is flying.

In some other order of insects there are most interesting forms. A mantis, closely allied to those of Africa and America, goes through his seemingly devotional, but really bloodthirsty attitudes, folding his saw-like arms as if in prayer, but in reality to strike an unwary insect. This creature is called by the natives *famàkilòha—i.e.*, "headsman," literally "head-breaker." It has a peculiarly weird, "uncanny" look, from the large green head turning round on the neck, and staring at one in a way no other insect seems able to do.

Over many portions of the central provinces great numbers of ant-hills occur. These are conical mounds of a yard or so high, and are made by a white, or yellowish ant called *vitsikàmbo*. If a piece of one of these mounds is broken off, the ants are seen in a state of great excitement, running in and out of the circular galleries which traverse their city in every direction. There are vast numbers in one nest, and they have a queen, who is nearly an inch long, while the workers are about three-eighths of an inch in length. A serpent is said to live in many of these ant-hills.

Of another insect, common to every part of the tropics, and to many

temperate countries also, which is far too numerous in Madagascar, the mosquito, Mr. Sibree writes as follows:—

> In the interior we are comparatively free from this minute plague in the cold season, but in many parts of the warmer maritime plains it is a terrible pest all the year round, and is said to often cause the death of young animals left exposed to its attacks. This I can well believe from what I have seen in several places—*seen*, but also *heard*, and unmistakably *felt*. But in travelling to the north-west coast, we fell in with another insect pest, in addition to the mosquito. This was a stinging-fly called alòy. It is about a third the size of a house-fly, but with the wings less divergent. It attacks with a sharp prick, sometimes drawing blood. The flies are found in swarms along a belt of beautifully-wooded country, with clear streams of bright sparkling water. They fly by day, but retire as soon as the sun sets, when their place is taken by the mosquitos, who roam by night, so that the unfortunate traveller has little respite either by night or day.

Many of the spiders of Madagascar are very large and brilliantly coloured. The legs of some of the largest spread over a circle of six or seven inches in diameter. They spin immense geometric webs, which span the beds of considerable streams or wide paths; and these are anchored to the surrounding vegetation by such strong silken cords that it requires an effort to break them. Only once, however, did Mr. Sibree meet with one of the venomous spiders of the island, an insect about the size of a small marble: its bite is said by the natives to be fatal, and it probably is so unless speedy measures are taken to cauterize the wound.

The smaller amphibia are not very well known; but the crocodiles are familiar to every traveller in the island. They swarm in every river and lake, and even in many small pools. On a river bank as many as a hundred—it is said as many as a thousand—may be seen in a day. They are often attended by a small bird which feeds upon the crocodile's parasites, and in return is said to warn it of any danger. They are regarded with a superstitious dread by many of the Malagasy tribes. In some river-side villages a space is carefully fenced off with strong stakes, so that the women can draw water without the risk of being seized by the jaws or swept off by the tail of these disgusting looking creatures.

With two or three exceptions, the serpents of Madagascar are harmless. A species of boa is found in the Sàkalàva country.

The vegetable productions of Madagascar are very varied and abundant. Rice is already exported in some quantity; the production of coffee is increasing; sugar, indigo, tobacco, and spices might, with European skill and capital, be produced in immense quantities. A very interesting plant, almost if not quite peculiar to Madagascar, called by Sir J. Hooker one of the most curious of Nature's productions, is the Lace-leaf plant, or water-yam. It has an edible root, and grows under water a foot or more deep; from this spring a number of graceful leaves, which spread out just under the surface. Mr. Ellis was the first to bring plants of the lace-leaf to England, and from these specimens have been obtained for the principal botanic gardens of London and its neighbourhood.

Concerning the vital and spiritual influence which Christianity is exerting upon the mass of the professedly religious people of Madagascar, it is difficult, writes Mr. Sibree, to speak with certainty and confidence. The indirect results of the preaching of the Gospel have unquestionably been very real. On this he gives some curious facts. For example, "It can be shown from consular returns," he says, "that so much has Christianity opened up trade in Polynesia, that every Protestant Missionary is worth £10,000 per annum to European and American com-

merce. So much cannot yet be claimed for Christian missions in Madagascar; but, perhaps it would not be too much to say that each missionary represents a value of from £2,000 to £3,000 per annum of foreign imports." Christianity is certainly the best civiliser.

The Human Species. By A. DE QUATREFAGES. London: Kegan Paul & Co.

M. DE QUATREFAGES' work on "The Human Species" forms the twenty-sixth volume of the "International Scientific Series," published by Messrs. Kegan Paul & Co., and is probably the most valuable of that series, inasmuch as it takes the rational and Scriptural side against the school of Darwin respecting the much-disputed question of the present day in all that relates to the origin of man. Whether the work is written in English by the distinguished French savant, or whether it is a remarkably good translation, we are unable to determine; but with the exception of many unusual words — such as "intussusception," "aponeurotic," "solidungulate," "olecranon," "musmons," "platycnemic," "villosities," &c., &c.—which might have been better rendered, it affords an admirable reply to the speculations of Darwin in England, and to the still more impossible hypotheses of Haeckel and the German school of naturalists, who have gone much further in the direction of atheism than anything which can be fairly ascribed to our English naturalists. Haeckel's description of the origin of species is somewhat different from that of Darwin, as the latter's well-known pedigree is summed up in these words, "Man has been gradually evolved, first from the larvæ of an Ascidian tadpole, and finally from an old-world monkey;" whereas Haeckel declares the first ancestor of all living beings to be the *monera*, which M. de Quatrefages says "are nothing more than the *amœbæ*, as understood by Dujardin." From this initial form man has reached his present state, according to Haeckel, by passing through twenty-one typical transitory forms. At present our nearest relations are *the tailless catarrhine apes;* and although the distance between them and man appears to be but small to the German naturalist, he has thought it necessary to admit the existence of an intermediate stage between ourselves and the most highly-developed ape. "This purely hypothetical being," as De Quatrefages terms him, "of which not the slightest vestige has been found, is supposed to be detached from the tailless catarrhine apes, and to constitute the twenty-first stage of the modification which has led to the human form." Well may the distinguished French savant conclude his brief notice of Haeckel's folly by the remark, "Further examination is useless."

Treating Mr. Darwin with the utmost courtesy, and setting an admirable example thereby to some of our theological controversialists at home which they might profitably follow, M. de Quatrefages nevertheless points out and demonstrates with overwhelming force, and with the skill of one who is completely master of his subject, the impossibility of the Darwinian theory being true, notwithstanding that Professor Huxley has the astounding temerity to declare that Darwinism is no longer a theory, but a proved fact, and that Darwin himself deserves to be placed on a leve with Sir Isaac Newton! If we had not the Bible to convince us of the falsity of this conclusion, the testimony of such savants as De Quatrefages, Agassiz, and others would be quite sufficient to assure us that certain eminent scientists of to-day are labouring under an hallucination as dense and impervious to reason as Mr. John Hampden appears to be when pronouncing the Copernican system to be false, and that the world we inhabit is not globular in shape, but as flat as a pancake! M. de Quatre-

fages, while admitting some points in the Darwinian theory, such as *the struggle for existence* and *selection*, to be "unassailable," and recognising what he terms Darwin's "ingenious conception, supported by immense knowledge and ennobled by his loyal honesty," frankly adds:—

> I should doubtless have yielded as so many others have done, if I had not long understood that all questions of this kind depend especially upon physiology. Now, my attention once aroused, I found no difficulty in recognizing the point at which the eminent author quits the ground of reality and enters upon that of inadmissible hypothesis. . . . . It is evident, especially, after the most fundamental principles of Darwinism, that an organized being cannot be a descendant of another whose development is an inverse order to its own. Consequently, in acordance with these principles, *man cannot be considered as the descendant of any simian type whatever* (p. 111).

We are glad to perceive indications, even amongst professors of the scientific world, who do not regard Scripture with that reverence which every honest and sincere Christian pays to the infallible Word of life and truth, that the wild hypothesis of Darwin and his school has had its day, and that a more rational view of the origin of man is being entertained by those who think nothing is impossible if it only has the sanction of the so-called science of the present time, while everything may be rejected which rests solely on the testimony of Scripture. No one has done more to correct such fatal reasoning than the illustrious French savant, whose work on "The Human Species," we venture to predict, will enhance his fame, and which must be regarded as the ablest answer which has yet appeared to the anti-Scriptural theory of Haeckel. The ideal "pithecoid man" is, as De Quatrefages justly remarks, "an abuse of words."

We regret to see, on the subject of the age of man and the known chronology of his history, he is not so reliable. When our author speaks of the Zend Avesta belonging to the "twentieth or the twenty-eighth century before our era," and the deluge of Noah as being dated B.C. 3308 (p. 130), we see that he accepts the computation of the Septuagint in preference to that of the Bible, though we think his alternative date for that of the Zend Avesta is considerably too high in either case; but when he contends that "the Skovmoses and the remains at Shussenreid show that man existed in Europe at the close of *the Glacial epoch*" (p. 142), we frankly own that we are amazed at the boldness of this statement. Far sounder are the conclusions of distinguished men of science as set forth in the thirteenth volume of the *Transactions of the Victoria Institute*, on the discussion which arose after reading Professor Hughes's able paper on "The Present State of the Evidence bearing upon the Question of the Antiquity of Man." Thus Mr. Whitley, one of the ablest practical geologists of the day, observes:—"In all cases where it has been attempted to assign to man a period more remote than that of the post-glacial river gravels the evidence has completely broken down. *Man is neither Pre-glacial, nor Inter-glacial, but Post-glacial.*" Dr. Southal, of America, "concurred in what Professor Hughes says as to the breaking down of the evidence for the existence of Miocene, Pliocene, and *Glacial man*. Bringing forward insufficiently-considered facts for the purpose of establishing the antiquity of man brings discredit on the cause of science." Professor Birks regarded "Professor Hughes's paper a valuable contribution towards a fair and impartial estimate of the conjectures on the one side and the definite evidence on the other." How varied and speculative these conjectures are may be judged from the fact that Lyell dates *the Glacial period*, in the tenth edition of his "Principles of Geology," as having happened 800,000 B.C., while in the eleventh edition he allows it

only an antiquity of 200,000 B.C.! thus cutting off at a stroke 600,000 years, and proving how little regard can be paid to the speculations of men who are unrestrained by the evidence afforded in the Word of God.

The Sunday-School Centenary Bible. The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, with various Renderings and Readings from the best authorities. Edited by Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., Fellow of Balliol College, Rev. R. L. CLARKE, M.A., Fellow of Queen's College, S. R. DRIVER, M.A., Fellow of New College, ALFRED GOODWIN, M.A., Fellow of Balliol, and Rev. W. SANDAY, D.D., Principal of Bishop Hatfield's Hall. With which is incorporated the "Aids to the Student of the Holy Bible." Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1880.

THIS edition of the Authorised Version, entitled *The Sunday-School Centenary Bible*, or Variorum Teacher's Bible, is—view it however we may—a remarkable book; and the more we examine it, the more we admire it. Its excellence will not be understood, however, without a little inquiry. The ordinary reader, indeed, may imagine, as he first looks at the volume, that he has before him merely a reference Bible, with a concordance at the end, and some maps. Even so, he will admire it as beautifully got up in every way—the model of a portable Concordance and Reference Bible. A short examination, however, serves to show the real character of this novel edition. It combines—

I. The familiar Reference Bible.

II. The Queen's Printers' "Aids to the Student of the Holy Bible," by Cheyne, Green, Gruggen, Hole, Hooker, Leathes, Lumby, Madden, Sayce, Stainer, Thomson, Tristram, &c.

III. The Queen's Printers' *Variorum Bible*, or Authorised Version, with a complete Selection in English of the best Various Readings and Renderings of the Text advocated by Hebrew and Greek Scholars. Edited, as is stated on the title-page, by Cheyne, Driver, Clarke, Goodwin, and Sanday.

The Variorum foot-notes, as far as we have examined, well deserve the praise which has been bestowed upon them. They summarise for the reader unacquainted with the Hebrew or Greek languages, the surest results of Hebrew and Greek textual criticism and scholarship, and discriminate for him the degree of authority attaching to each; the alternative translation thus suggested will often render note or comment needless. The special or professional student of the original text will find in this *conspectus*, as Canon Westcott writes, a more careful selection of critical data and authorities (especially in the Old Testament), than is elsewhere accessible. The unpublished edition of the Greek New Testament by Canon Westcott, and the Rev. Dr. Hort, the result of more than twenty years' labour, has been used throughout, by their kind permission. In a note by the publishers we also read:—

> The objects of the present work are to some extent analogous to those of the Westminster revision, but whenever that revision shall be completed (and the Old Testament cannot be published for a few years), it will retain its independent value; for while the revision may be expected to give results only, this volume will indicate the places of the Authorised Version in which the important changes are to be found, will give in a brief and concise form the authority for the changes adopted, and will call attention to the balance of opinion upon disputed points.

In the "Aids to the Student" are given a Concordance, Indexed Atlas, Index of Names and Subjects, historical, chronological, and analy-

tical summaries, and a series of original articles by eminent writers explanatory and illustrative of the Holy Scriptures. Professor Leathes writes on the Bible as a whole, and on the separate Books. From Dr. Thornton we have a valuable Chronological Table, and a Harmony of the Gospels. Dr. Staines writes on Bible Music. Sir J. Hooker writes on Plants of the Bible; and Canon Tristram on Animal Creation in the Bible. There is a review of the foreign history of the Jews, and of the influence exercised upon them by neighbouring and more remote nations, down to the Return from Babylon, by the well-known Oriental scholar, the Rev. A. H. Sayce. The Glossary of Bible words, edited for the Teachers' Bible, with illustrations from English writers contemporary with the Authorised Version, by the Rev. J. Rawson Lumby, D.D., Norrisian Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, is added in full.

Of the patient, honest, labour everywhere manifest in this most comprehensive edition; of its accuracy, completeness, and, considering all things, its wonderful cheapness; of the finish and thoroughness displayed in the carrying out of an admirable plan, down to the very smallest details, we need not write. Good wine needs no bush. This book reflects great credit on all concerned; and we tender our hearty thanks to the eminent firm to whom the Christian public is indebted for it.

Short Notices.

The Two Sides of the Question. A Sermon on behalf of the Church of England Temperance Society, preached in St. Augustine's, Highbury, April 18th, 1880. By the Rev. Gordon Calthrop, M.A., Vicar. Elliot Stock.

The title-page of this sermon will explain why we specially recommend it. The subject is of an importance which hardly can be exaggerated; and Mr. Calthrop has treated it with his wonted vigour and judgment. Both sections of the Society may aid in circulating the sermon. We quote one passage:—

> Or it was a woman, perhaps—a lady—with the education, the instincts, the refinement of a lady. She suffered pain, and she used some treacherous sedative to remove or to dull it. And that opened the door for something more potent; and she began to take her drams secretly. And the appetite fastened itself with claws and hooks of steel upon her sensitive woman's frame: the moral sense was dulled and degraded by the secrecy of the thing: and the doctor wondered first, and then suspected, and afterwards knew what was the real character of her frequent ailments; and the mischief has gone so far that it is almost (God forbid that we should say altogether) past repairing.

De Christo et suo Adversario Antichristo. Ein polemischer Tractat Johann Wiclif's aus den Handschriften der K. K. Hofbibliothek zu Wien und der Universitätsbibliothek zu Prag zum ersten Male herausgegeben von Dr. Rud. Buddensieg, Dresden. Gotha: Friedr. Andr. Perthes. 1880.

In laborious Wicliffite investigations, German scholarship has done pre-eminent service; and many readers of Professor Lechler's volumes may be glad to obtain the eighty-paged quarto pamphlet before us, Wiclif's *De Christo et Suo Adversario Antichristo*, with Introduction, and critical annotations, by Dr. Buddensieg.

"Natural History Rambles." *Ponds and Ditches.* By M. C. Cooke, M.A., LLD. *In Search of Minerals.* By D. T. Ansted, M.A., F.R.S., S.P.C.K.

These two volumes—the first instalment, apparently, of a series of "Natural History Rambles," are illustrated, well-printed, and very tastefully got up. In the first volume we have read several passages, here and there, with much interest. Capital gift books.

Deep unto Deep. An Inquiry into some of the Deeper Experiences of the Christian Life. By the Rev. Sir Emilius Bayley, Bart., B.D., Vicar of St. John's, Paddington. Author of "Thorough," "Christian Life," &c. Pp. 380. Hatchards. 1880.

Thoughtful, tender, and thoroughly practical, breathing that culture which is above all things spiritually minded, this book will be read with interest and profit by many who are passing through *de profundis* experiences. Sir Emilius Bayley first states the case, secondly gives examples, and thirdly applies the key-principles of Scripture. One specially instructive passage, under the heading, "Typical Sorrow," is the reference to Napoleon. The brutal selfishness of that man, we may remark, is shown in the recently-published "Memoirs of Madame de Rémusat." The points of Napoleon's character to which we referred in reviewing the Autobiography of Prince Metternich are in these "Memoirs" brought out with much detail. We heartily recommend "Deep unto Deep."

The Mexican Branch of the Church. Pp. 54. Spanish and Portuguese Church Missions. 8, Adam Street, Adelphi, London.

We gladly call attention to this pamphlet. It contains many interesting documents, and gives a sketch of the movement from the year 1861. Letters are given showing how the Reformed Church in Mexico has the sympathies of Bishops of the Church of England, the Church of Ireland, and the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. A letter from the Bishop of Huron also appears. We call to mind with pleasure that in the first number of The Churchman, when comparatively little was known concerning "the Movement in Mexico," and but few even in Evangelical circles had shown any sympathy with it, we drew attention to the work which had been done, and to the prospects before Dr. Riley, who had recently been consecrated Bishop of the Valley of Mexico. The present pamphlet, following several tracts published in the United States, gives all the information which is needful, and we hope it will be widely read. It is stated that Bishop Riley has consecrated his private fortune to the work:—

He can no longer sustain the burden of the increasing organization without further help from without. Baptized and educated in the Church of England, and in full sympathy with it, he calls upon his brethren in the faith in Great Britain to follow up by their hearty co-operation the work which by the providence of God they have been instrumental in originating, through their generous circulation of the Holy Scriptures in Mexico. The importance of this earnest Scriptural Church raised up among the 50,000,000 Spanish-speaking people can scarcely be over-estimated.

From Messrs. George Routledge and Sons we have received a copy of Prebendary Harland's new Hymn-Book or Hymnal, an old favourite of ours, which we gladly recommend. The full title is "*Song of Praise.* Psalm and Hymn Tunes, collected and arranged by Victoria Evans-Freke, for a Church Psalter and Hymnal, edited by Edward Harland, M.A., Vicar of Colwich, Prebendary of Lichfield. The music revised and corrected by George Prior, Mus. Doc. Oxon." The work of Lady Victoria Evans-Freke has been done throughout with taste and judgment, and *The Song of Praise* is a really good Hymnal. The musical edition before us is well printed, and cheap.

From Messrs. Nisbet and Co. we have received a little volume of Addresses by Mr. Stevenson Blackwood, C.B., under the title *Heavenly Arithmetic.* Addition, Subtraction, Proportion, and such like, are the titles of the chapters. The Addresses, suggestive, cheery, and practical, were delivered at a weekly gathering of friends and neighbours in the village hall at Crayford. Books of this kind may do good with many, where more formal or conventional addresses would fail.

From Messrs. Kegan Paul and Co. (1, Paternoster Square) we have received, too late for notice in the present number, an exceedingly interesting volume, Mr. W. Baptist Scoones' *Four Centuries of English Letters;* just the book to put in the portmanteau for the leisure half-hours of an autumn "run."

I have kept the Faith is the title of an interesting sermon preached in Emmanuel Church, Maida Hill, by the Vicar, Mr. Tanner, in memory of that faithful man, the Rev. E. H. Carr. (J. F. Shaw & Co.). We read:—

> A former highly-valued and much-loved minister of this church, the Rev. E. H. Carr, has lately been very suddenly called to his rest. Although seventeen years have passed away since he was your stated minister, and many of those to whom he preached the Word of Life have preceded him into the presence of the King, yet there are others of you in whose memories and affections he was ever fresh, and who maintained a Christian fellowship with him to the last. At any rate, it may be truly said, with regard to his connection with this congregation, that to you he devoted his choicest years, and that his most vigorous powers were given to your service. No minister who has laboured among you was more holy in his relation towards God, or more guileless in his intercourse with his fellow man. To him the words of the text are eminently applicable.

Mr. Tanner states in this discourse, and we gladly recall the fact, that Mr. Carr "took an active part in the formation and establishment of Theological Halls at Oxford and Cambridge, for the training of young men designed for the ministry in sound Protestant principles, and was honorary secretary to this movement to the end of his life. His latest thoughts were occupied with this important undertaking, to which he had largely contributed his substance. He has also bequeathed a part of his valuable library to Ridley Hall, at Cambridge."

In a reprint from *The Church Sunday School Magazine*, Mr. John Palmer gives some very practical advice. *The Sunday School: What is it?* (Hamilton, Adams and Co.) Pp. 16. We quote a few sentences:—

> The Sunday School has done more to bring the clergy and laity into intimate relationship with each other than any other branch of Church work. Think of the thousands of lay-helpers it has trained for useful service, and what a power this has been in furthering the cause of Christ in populous districts? How many a hard-working clergyman, struggling bravely in the midst of the teeming populations of our large towns, would be compelled to give up the unequal daily struggle with sin and ignorance, if the help afforded by his staff of voluntary teachers were withdrawn. It is no exaggeration to say that the Sunday School is in many places the most active sign of spiritual life, and that it is a focus round which many useful operations centre.

The first volume of *Plutarch's Lives*, by Mr. Aubrey Stewart (George Bell and Sons), is well printed and got up. Thirteen Lives were translated by the late Mr. George Long, and the present version, as a complement to these Lives, was undertaken with his approval. We hope shortly to notice the second volume.

THE MONTH.

CONVOCATION of Canterbury assembled on the 14th. In the Upper House the Archbishop read the Queen's answer to the loyal address. One sentence in Her Majesty's gracious answer runs thus:—

> Your representation that the Province of Canterbury might better discharge its duty if some addition were made to the number of Proctors in the Lower House shall receive my full consideration.

In conversation upon this subject, his Grace said that he had communicated with the President of the Northern Convocation, with the result that some changes had been made in the last election. As to further reforms, it was very important that no step should be taken but that which was beyond all doubt constitutional and legal. In the Lower House this subject was brought forward by Canon Gregory; and, after debate, a resolution including a Petition to the Queen was agreed upon, praying that Letters of Business might be issued "directing the Convocation of Canterbury to prepare the draft of a Canon, by which the number of elected Proctors, the manner of their election, and the qualification of the electors may be regulated." On the following day, in the Upper House, his Grace the President said that there would be an inconvenience in approaching the Crown with a request of this character, for the law officers of the Crown had given an opinion that there were precedents against such changes being made by a Canon of Convocation as proposed in this resolution of the Lower House. The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol afterwards moved:

> That his Grace the President be respectfully requested to place himself in communication with Her Majesty's Government with a view of securing a more ample representation of the clergy in the Lower House of Convocation, in accordance with the humble request of Convocation to Her Majesty, to which Her Majesty was pleased to return a gracious answer.

This proposal was carried, and the Lower House afterwards agreed to concur in it.[1]

---

[1] The Bishop of Hereford, in the absence of the Bishop of Bath and Wells, presented a petition from the Ruridecanal Conference of Bath and Keynsham praying for the adoption of healthy changes in the constitution of Convocation whereby the two houses could meet together, the union of the two provinces of Canterbury and York for the deliberation on great and sufficient occasion, the fuller representation of the parochial clergy by the election to the Lower House of two proctors for each arch-

In the Lower House was presented a report on Intemperance. The members of the Upper House were requested—

To support in Parliament all wise measures for the further regulation of the trade in intoxicating drinks, and especially such as would carry out some or all of the following objects :—1. The gradual extinction of grocers' excise licenses. 2. The gradual suppression of houses for the sale of beer to be consumed on the premises. 3. The gradual reduction of the number of public houses until a limit shall have been reached which shall correspond to the wants of a temperate population, inasmuch as any excess of such houses beyond this limit represents so many centres of temptation to intemperance. 4. A large restriction of hours for Sunday traffic, together with some measure for country places for earlier closing at night.

Archdeacon Harrison referred to Canon Miller's work and character.[1] Canon Hopkins in presenting a report on National Education, spoke of the great burdens laid upon ratepayers in many districts by School Boards, and complained of "extra" subjects. A Manual of Private Prayer, which had been prepared by a Committee of the House, and printed by Messrs. Whitaker, was brought forward by the Prolocutor, Lord Alwyne Compton, as Chairman of the Committee, who proposed that it should receive the general approval of the House. Considerable objection was raised to its following the ancient form of the seven hours, and it was eventually referred back to the Committee.

In reply to Canon Trevor, the Lord Chancellor has written that "the Burials Bill does not authorize anything to be done by a layman in the church, but only in the churchyard, and at the grave." An address from nearly 600 clergymen of the diocese of Lincoln has been presented to the Bishop approving the "strong opposition so ably made by his lordship against the Burials Bill."

---

deaconry, and the use of voting papers in the elections, and the election, throughout both provinces, of a body of lay representatives or assessors to meet and confer with the Houses of Convocation, on the understanding that no action was to be taken on the part of this body without the consent of Convocation.

[1] The Ven. Archdeacon said: "I may claim a special right to speak of Canon Miller (although it is proclaiming my own antiquity), for forty-two years ago I examined him for priest's orders, he then being curate of Bexley, one of the Archbishop's peculiars. I need not remind the House of the part he has taken in our debates. We all remember that his main characteristic was his great honesty. No one could hear him speak without being strongly impressed with the conviction, even when differing from him, that there was the most perfect honesty in all he said. We know that for twenty years he held a most important post in Birmingham; and at a period of great difficulty—although Lord Clarendon says that clergymen are bad men of business—Canon Miller was looked up to more than any other man for the restoration of confidence and order."

The York Convocation devoted a two days' session to the consideration of the Burials Bill. By 35 to 16 the Lower House delivered itself of its responsibility by making a protest. The Bishop of Liverpool thought it was their duty, as the Bill had now become inevitable, to make the best of it.

The Annual Meeting of the Church of Ireland Sustentation Fund was held in the library of Lambeth Palace, the Archbishop of Canterbury in the chair. The Ninth Annual Report—

> Showed that the amount received in England from all sources only amounted to £2,090. This made a total of £61,274 received since 1871, when the fund was formed. Of this sum £10,750 had gone to the Episcopal Endowment Fund of various dioceses, £6,110 being thus appropriated by the Bishops of the Church of England, while the remainder was either specially allocated by the donors to that fund or was voted out of the General Fund. To the Representative Church Body, for distribution among the most necessitous parishes £37,000 had been remitted, and £1,789 had been allocated by the donors to particular cases. This left £5,201 invested at interest. The decline of much of the support that was hoped for was a fact to which no one could be blind who studied the conditions under which the Church of Ireland was holding her noble protest, amid the darkness of surrounding superstition.

The Earl of Harrowby moved, and the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol seconded, a resolution commending the report and appointing a committee for the ensuing year. The Bishop of Meath (Lord Plunket) delivered an address on "The Claims of the Irish Church as the Witness for the Reformed Faith in Ireland," and, in the course of his speech, gave some very interesting information showing the vitality of the Church. An eloquent speech by Mr. Robert Hamilton, of Belfast, contained several striking passages.

In considering the Local Option Debate, "Sir Wilfrid Lawson's Victory," *The Church Temperance Chronicle* says:—"Without discounting in the smallest degree the important significance of the heart-cheering victory, we must frankly avow that we still feel but in the beginning of that full perfection to which we are confident the legislative control of the liquor traffic will eventually be brought." The movement for restraint in licensing, whether by local "option" or local "control," has unquestionably been making great progress. The success of Mr. Pease's motion for further restrictions in the hours of Sunday trading, and of a resolution in favour of Sunday closing in Wales, are not unimportant signs and symptoms.

On the 17th, in the House of Commons, Mr. Briggs brought forward a motion condemning the erection of a statue to the late Prince Imperial in Westminster Abbey, as inconsistent with

the national character of the edifice, and calculated to impair the good feeling between England and France. This motion, limited, according to the suggestion of Mr. Beresford Hope, to the former point, was carried by 171 to 116.

The Compensation for Disturbance Bill (Ireland) has taken up no small portion of the present short session. The changes of front by the Government have been almost unparalleled; and they prove the Bill is not the product of mature reflection on carefully collected *data*. Mr. Gibson's speeches against the Bill have, says the *Times*, shown debating power of the first order. Whig supporters have appealed to Mr. Gladstone to withdraw the Bill, and the *Edinburgh* has protested against principles which seem to tend dangerously in the direction of Communism.[1] Much mischief, we fear, is already done. The condition of Ireland in regard to the land agitation appears to be growing worse and worse.

Sir J. E. Eardley-Wilmot's Bill to incapacitate atheists from sitting in Parliament has been shelved on a question of form. Mr. Bradlaugh was permitted, through the intervention of the Government, to make an affirmation, and to take his seat.

The Bishop of Liverpool has issued an admirable Pastoral Address to his clergy. We quote a few sentences:—"I do entreat every clergyman in my diocese, for Christ's sake, to abhor and avoid all needless divisions on non-essential matters, and to follow after peace as well as truth. Let us never forget that division is weakness, and union is strength. I ask no one to give up his principles for the sake of apparent unity, or to cease to work his parish in the way which his conscience tells him is right. But I do ask every one to remember the words of St. Paul: 'Let all your things be done with charity.' By all means let us 'contend earnestly for the faith' handed down to us by the Reformers of our Church. But let us always contend in the spirit of love, both in word and deed."

Evangelical Churchmen throughout the country will regret the loss of Dr. Miller. A First-Class man at Oxford in 1835, ordained in 1837, he left Birmingham for Greenwich in 1866. A very effective preacher, with a firm grasp of Evangelical

[1] Mr. Justice Lawson, in a charge to the Grand Jury of Kerry, has referred to a determined and organized opposition in certain districts to the payment of rents and to the carrying out of the process of the law, a state of things, which, if allowed to go on unchecked, must lead to the breaking up of all the bonds of civilized society. "Communistic doctrines," added the eminent Judge, "are contagious." Mr. Disraeli's remark, "confiscation is contagious," with other sayings in the Irish Church Debate, are not likely to be forgotten by many eminent Liberals. The Marquis of Lansdowne, a large owner of land in Ireland, a representative Whig, has resigned his Under-Secretaryship for India.

principles, a ready speaker—not seldom eloquent—and a hard worker, "in his parish indefatigable," Dr. Miller won, as the *Times* remarks, "the warm respect and affection of men of very opposite opinions."

Of Mr. Roundell's proposal to throw open to laymen all Fellowships and Headships of Colleges at the Universities, the Prime Minister expressed neither approval nor disapproval.

Affairs in Afghanistan make, unhappily, but little progress. The error with regard to the cost of the Afghan war, discovered a few months ago turns out to be nine millions.

There is some reason for serious anxiety respecting the Eastern Question. It has entered into a new phase. The Porte may submit, however, if the Powers of Europe exercise pressure.

The action of the French Government in regard to the Jesuits has so far proved successful.

The Sunday School Centenary Conferences and Meetings throughout the country have been as a rule satisfactory; they are likely to prove beneficial in many ways.

The settlement of the case which has been going on for some years in the Courts of the Free Church of Scotland against Professor W. Robertson Smith, of Aberdeen, was deemed by many staunch members of that Church unsatisfactory. Two months ago, it will be remembered, an admonition was addressed to the Professor by the Moderator of the General Assembly, and he was replaced in his chair. A new prosecution has been initiated on the ground of an article on "Hebrew Language and Literature" in the eleventh volume of the "Encyclopædia Britannica" lately published, in which, according to the Edinburgh correspondent of the leading journal, he repeats his offence.[1]

---

[1] *Times*, July 15th.—He has been at no pains in it to conciliate his opponents or to show regard to the sensitiveness of the traditionalists, though it would have been prudent for him to do so, and he probably would have done so could he have foreseen the Assembly's deliverance in his case at the time of writing it. Indeed, it is known that he endeavoured to withdraw the article and to stop its circulation after the meeting of the Assembly, but by that time the volume had been printed off, and the matter was beyond his control. . . . . "It may fairly be made a question," he says, "whether Moses left in writing any other laws than the Commandments on the tables of stone."