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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

SEPTEMBER, 1880.

ART. I.—REMINISCENCES OF THE HON. AND RIGHT REV. HENRY RYDER, D.D.

Successively Bishop of Gloucester and Lichfield.

THE propensity to disparage present times has always existed, and shows no symptom of discontinuance. We hear this complaint especially in reference to the offsprings of the press. In one branch of writing, however, there is no deficiency. Biographies slumber not. They spring up in lively activity. Characters of eminence are seldom allowed to sink into the grave unnoticed—unhonoured—uncommended. The breath of life is scarcely extinguished, and mourning eyes have scarcely wiped away regretful tears, when the departed are again before us in admiring memoirs. The labours, exploits, distinguishing qualities, which had awakened admiration in the living, are themes of posthumous praise. Readers are called to contemplate the events of the life now ended, and to learn much from the example and the walk.

This is especially true of worthies in ministerial life. No country exceeds ours in such biographical treasures. It is an instance of God's abundant goodness to our land, that it has been the home of such pre-eminence. It is an additional subject for gratitude that some friendly pen forbids oblivion. We cannot over-estimate the value of such memorials. These faithful pictures teach—exhort—admonish—strengthen—comfort. We see in them how men of like passions with ourselves—exposed to the same difficulties—harassed by the same trials—assaulted by the same temptations—similarly exposed to the fiery darts of the Evil One—enfeebled by the common weaknesses of body—disheartened by the saddening treachery of false friends, have persevered, through grace, and have been made more than conquerors through Him whose love is the same yesterday, to-

day, and for ever. In harrowing circumstances, many have been sustained by the memorials of support afforded to preceding sufferers. Thus the lesson is inculcated to lean on the strengthening arm which never fails the true believer; joys brighten; faith is armed for trials; and believers rise from such perusals animated to run the race which is set before them, and are encouraged to fight more valiantly the good fight of faith, and to grasp more firmly the hope of eternal life.

Let not these observations seem for one moment to assume that the lives of men can take the place of the precepts and directions of the Word of God. These precepts are the chart and compass of Christian life. With earnestness they should be studied. By constant perusal they should be made the mould in which our inner life is formed. "The Word of Christ should dwell in us richly in all wisdom." Our contention only is that example deepens precept and invigorates the effort to obey. We may learn much by clear directions: but we learn more when we see these directions in active work. A machine of many and of intricate parts may be tolerably understood by delineation of its composition: but how vastly is the intelligence increased when it is seen in motion! Thus the preceptive portions of Scripture become more vivid when displayed in the obedient walk of a child of God. Hence it is a blessing never to be disregarded, that so many precious volumes are within our reach exhibiting the Word of God embodied in examples. Such perusal inspirits us not to be sluggards in the Christian race—not to be shortcomers in the heavenward march—not to be cowards in the Christian warfare—not to be loiterers in the godly path—not to look backward in the flight from the accursed cities of the plain: but rather to gird up the loins for the holy struggle—to anoint the shield for the inevitable combat—to put on the whole armour of God, and to be followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises. It is recorded of that eminent servant of God, Charles Simeon, that he would often fix his eyes on the picture of Henry Martyn and smilingly exclaim, "I will not trifle—I will not trifle." The earnest man became more earnest when dwelling on the features of that heavenly-minded missionary.

But while we are thankful that our libraries are so enriched, regret may sometimes arise that there are vacancies in our shelves. In this feeling I have been disposed to participate. Deep personal attachment, ardent affection, and profound reverence have led me to desiderate a continuous memoir of Bishop Ryder. Affectionate remembrance gives conviction that such a work would have been an inestimable treasure. But such was not constructed when materials were at hand: and it would now be vain to attempt the search. A complete record

of his instructive career cannot be disinterred. Doubtless when his days on earth were ended, contemporaneous obituaries contained both truthful and grateful mention of his distinguished course. Especially the *Christian Observer* gave a most interesting sketch; but this periodical was limited in its circulation, and the mention of the deceased prelate was given in four disjointed papers, and thus continuity was interrupted. I had the great privilege of personal intercourse with the bishop for a brief period: and I have found his reminiscences revived and strengthened by reference to the above-mentioned articles. Thus I am bold to contribute this notice, which will not have been written in vain if it gives gratification to the reader at all in proportion to the delight with which I record my grateful respect.

Henry Ryder was the youngest son of Nathaniel, Lord Harrowby, of Sandon, in the county of Stafford. His mother was a daughter of Dr. Terrick, Bishop of London. The year of his birth was 1777. His early life was not remarkable, except for sweetness and amiability of disposition. The ready smile which usually gladdened his features could not fail to attract kindly regard. He received the rudiments of his education at Harrow. From this school he passed to St. John's College, Cambridge. It has been related by one who had thorough acquaintance with the University, that at the entrance of young Ryder at St. John's, the sons of our nobility were regarded as almost exempt from strict attention to the studies of their colleges; and too often passed their time with little intellectual improvement. It was not so with this youth. His regularity and submission to college discipline, and his blameless demeanour, were influential to produce a marked reform among undergraduates of his social position. He was early designated for the work of the ministry; and when the accustomed age was reached, he was ordained by Cornwallis, Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, to the curacy of Sandon, his paternal abode. He was appointed to the living of Lutterworth almost as soon as age permitted him to hold a benefice. Many hallowed reminiscences clustered round this place. Here Wickliffe, "the morning star of the Reformation," exercised his enlightened ministry; and here the same truths dawned on the mind of Ryder. It is not given to us to reveal with particularity the mode of the Spirit's working in his heart. In general these modes are diversified. In some cases a soft and gentle whisper reaches the dormant conscience, and leads by the bands of loving-kindness to the Redeemer's Cross. Sometimes appalling terrors, as of the earthquake and the storm, shake the affrighted penitent. Lydia can scarcely trace the first ray of the Gospel-hope: the jailer can mark the moment when the cry issued, "What must I do to be saved?" But whenever the soul is brought to Jesus, though the particulars of

the change cannot be portrayed, it is always true that supernatural power has been put forth; and thus self-righteousness is dethroned, and the finished work of Jesus is clearly seen and fervently embraced. The effect is, that faith flees to the all-cleansing blood—washes in the fountain opened for all sin and uncleanness—puts on Christ as the justifying robe which is the plea for heaven, and strives to adorn the doctrines of the Gospel by a life devoted to the Saviour's service. The change at first may not be exhibited in startling manifestations; but it is always real. A new character is formed. The convert feels that he is bought with a price, and therefore is no more his own. To him to live is Christ, as surely as to die is gain.

Details of this saving work in the case of Ryder may be hidden from external view; but the change produced its fruit. Christ became the mainspring of his future ministry—the centre around which his thoughts revolved—the lustre of his bright life—as well as his hope of everlasting glory. There was one text to which he was known to have adverted with singular emphasis when his views of divine grace were controverted. He feelingly stated that he entirely received the Gospel declaration, "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof: but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit." He experimentally responded to the essential truth, "By grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." Hence Ryder laboured lovingly and indefatigably in his important parish, pointing to Jesus, and calling sinners to repent, believe, and live.

In the year 1808 he was advanced to a canonry at Windsor. It is scarcely needful to state that he, who preached Christ so faithfully and fully in his parochial charge, was the same ambassador when he stood before nobles and princes in the Royal Chapel of St. George's. Here among his auditors he had occasionally the pious and exemplary monarch George III., and the writer of the sketches in the *Christian Observer* states that the King expressed in very emphatic terms his admiration of the young Canon's sermons. The Royal listener remarked that "they reminded him of the divinity of former days."

It would indeed have been marvellous if such faithfulness and devotedness had excited no hostile feelings. If sweetness and gentleness could have averted the offence of the Cross, it would have been so in the case of this most amiable of men. But it is an unchangeable truth, "If ye were of the world, the world would love its own: but because ye are not of the world, but I

have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you." In various ways Ryder had to meet this unkindness. An instance was much noticed at the time. He proceeded to Cambridge to go through the steps necessary for the reception of the degree of Doctor of Divinity. On this occasion he boldly evidenced that he was not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ. He consented to appear in the pulpit of Charles Simeon, at that time so much reviled for his proclamation of Gospel-truth. I recall the circumstance not merely to record that this conduct was regarded with hostile feeling, and made the ground of objection to his promotion to higher office in the Church, but to prove how firm and consistent Ryder was in maintaining what he believed to be the true cause of Christ, and how utterly he disregarded all semblance of compromise. He would not swerve from the path of conscientious duty to avert opposition, and to procure external advantage. He had learned "If I yet pleased men I should not be the servant of Christ." Like the great Apostle, he counted all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus his Lord. Happily, the adverse representations were regarded as frivolous, and were no barrier to the approval of the Crown.

In the year 1812 Ryder relinquished the Canonry of Windsor, and accepted the Deanery of Wells, which at that time was a post of much influence. The writer in the *Christian Observer* remarks that he "carried with him the same decision of character, the same conscientious sense of responsibility, deepened and strengthened by his more experimental acquaintance with the truths of the Gospel. And here he found that neither dignity of station, nor courtesy of demeanour, nor disinterested labour, can prevent, or even materially abate, the offence of the Cross. His known adoption of Evangelical views, his association with men of marked religious character, and especially his public patronage of some religious societies which were at that time looked upon with no friendly eye, had excited considerable prejudice against him before his coming to the Deanery."

Instances might be adduced: but Christian charity would fain leave them to slumber in oblivion's grave. One only shall receive present notice. He consented to preside at Bath at a public meeting of the Church Missionary Society. On this occasion the Archdeacon of Bath of that day entered the place of meeting to protest against Ryder's occupancy of the chair. The occurrence obtained wide notoriety in the public journals. The uncourteous demeanour—the insulting expressions—the extravagant warmth of the Archdeacon, were contrasted with the Christian gentleness, meekness, and humility of the assaulted chairman. General indignation was aroused. Enlarged attention to the claims of the Society was called forth, and increased

contributions flowed into its revenue. Thus the violence of the assault redounded to Ryder's fame and the Society's more acknowledged importance. Shortly after, tidings reached him of the severe illness of his assailant. The opportunity was instantly seized, and access was requested to the sufferer's chamber. Assurance was given by him that no unkindness existed, but that true sympathy was felt for the pains of sickness, with no recollection of preceding difference. Thus, the more Ryder became known, the more brightly did the sincerity of his Christian character shine.

On the occasion of his elevation to the Episcopate, the pious Simeon addressed him with much affection. The letter and the reply are so precious, and so indicative of Christian character, that no apology is offered for their introduction. They are extracted by permission from the invaluable Memoir of Mr. Simeon, for which we are indebted to the Rev. W. Carus, his faithful curate and devoted friend.

To the Hon. Dr. Ryder, Dean of Wells, on his Appointment to the Bishopric of Gloucester.

May 24, 1815.

My dear Sir,—Whilst all your friends are congratulating you on the attainment of your new dignity, I, though not worthy to be ranked in that number, take the liberty of expressing to you my feelings on the occasion. There are two grounds only on which I consider the congratulations of your friends due personally to yourself; the one is, that when God has given to you so strong a desire to serve him, He has now enlarged your means of glorifying His name: and the other is, that this honour has not been obtained by any sacrifice of principle, or dereliction of duty on your part; so that you may assuredly expect the blessing of God upon all your exertions in his service. In all other points of view, especially when I consider the difficulties which you will have to encounter through life, so far beyond those which attach to the discharge of the pastoral office in a lower sphere, I feel inclined to think my congratulations due to the Church rather than to you.

That tender and enlightened conscience, with which you have executed the ministerial office hitherto, will, I doubt not, conduct you safely through the arduous duties which you are now called to perform: but in many respects your circumstances will be altogether new, especially with regard to what I may call the religious world. You have hitherto seen religion only as on the day of Pentecost: but now you will on some occasions be constrained to see it rather as portrayed in the Epistles to the Galatians and Corinthians; and there is danger lest the pain occasioned by these discoveries should have an unfavourable influence upon your mind. Indeed, the very fidelity which, through the grace of God, you have hitherto displayed, will probably expose you to a larger measure of assaults from this quarter than would, under other circumstances, have fallen to your share. Professions of religion may be expected to be made with a view of

conciliating your regard: and in some cases an irreverent and disrespectful boldness may take occasion, from your very condescension, to show itself; similar to that which the Apostle refers to when he charges servants not to despise their masters, because they are brethren.

You have hitherto seen religion as it exists in a Wilberforce, and a Babington; but you will now have to behold it with many sad mixtures of human infirmity. Sometimes it will require a great degree of charity to admit its existence at all; as when it shall appear connected with disingenuousness and duplicity. And, where its existence cannot well be doubted, it will often be found to operate to a far less extent than might be reasonably expected. Its effects are very gradual; it does not leaven the whole lump at once; it will not immediately give wisdom to one who is naturally weak, or prudence to one of a sanguine temperament, or meekness to one who is naturally bold and forward. The very circumstance of its operating powerfully on the human mind will frequently occasion it to produce an unfavourable course of action, where the judgment is not sufficiently enlightened to decide between apparently opposite and conflicting duties. All this, and far more, you will now have to see, to feel, to regulate, to correct: and, after all your labours, you will have little else from man than a comment on that proverb (to which you are already no stranger) *bene facere, et male audire regium est.*

Nor will you be without trials even from some of your dearest friends: for piety is not always attended with discretion: and you may be sometimes urged to things which, though desirable in themselves, are not expedient: and if you will not see with their eyes, they may manifest, in a way painful to your feelings, their disappointment and chagrin; and constrain you to seek your comfort in the testimony of your own conscience, and in the approbation of your God.

As for the offence that will be taken at the most wise and prudent exercise of your own discretion, by the men of this world, you have already shown that you are well armed on that side; but on the other sides the assaults have not yet been made, nor the necessity for armour been experienced. But I trust that "as your day is, so will your strength be;" and that the same high principle which has guided you hitherto, of acting to God only, will still serve, like the mariner's compass, to conduct you through all the difficulties and dangers of your course. My prayers, such as they are, will, I hope, be incessant for you, that God may guide you by his counsel, and strengthen you by his grace, and make you long a blessing to the world, and give you to see abundant fruits of all your labours. It was with prayers to this effect that I first received the tidings of your appointment; and I doubt not but that similar petitions are, and will continue to be, offered for you by all "who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity."

Forgive, my dear sir, this free communication of my sentiments, and believe me,

With most respectful and most affectionate regard,

Your obedient servant,

C. Simeon.

The following is Dr. Ryder's reply :—

Lutterworth, May 31, 1815.

My dear Sir,—Your truly valuable letter only reached me this morning. I hope and desire to undertake the awful office about probably to be committed to my charge, with the exact views which you recommend, and with the expectations which your unusual degree of experience in these matters enables you to lay before me. Persevere, my dear sir, in your prayers for your friend about to be so severely tried. Pray that I may ever have inward peace—peace by the blood of the Cross, applied by the power of the Holy Spirit, and that I may be enabled to spread the knowledge of it; and then all will be well.

Domestic calamities, united with grief for my approaching departure from those I have so long loved, and fears on account of my approaching connexion with those whom I do not know—these things, with an immense load of business, almost weigh me down, but *Sursum corda.* I shall treasure up your written counsel, and hope to have it often confirmed by personal intercourse.

Believe me, dear sir,
With cordial respect and regard,
Your sincere friend,
and O ! that I may ever say, Brother in Christ, H. Ryder.

His consecration took place at the Archiepiscopal Chapel of Lambeth, on July 30, 1815. On this occasion Archbishop Sutton was assisted by Howley, Bishop of London, and King, Bishop of Rochester.

I must now advance to a brief mention of my privilege of personal intercourse. This commenced in 1824. In the summer of that year I attended my father to Wells, to the charge of which diocese he was then called. I found Bishop Ryder, who had recently been translated from the See of Gloucester to that of Lichfield, in residence as Dean of Wells. His high reputation as a prelate, and his character for zeal and piety, were not unknown to me. I had heard of his faithful advocacy of the Gospel—of the boldness with which he had appeared at Cambridge as an advocate of the truths of which Simeon there was the well-known champion—and of the enlightened zeal with which he had administered the See of Gloucester. I knew that when nearly all the prelates of our Church viewed with suspicion the noble societies which were labouring to propagate the Gospel at home and abroad, and had in consequence withheld their patronage from them, he had avowed his conviction of their worth, and had availed himself of frequent opportunities of giving them his support. It required no common firmness to adopt a course from which at that time his brethren had stood apart: but when the cause of Christ required, all inferior considerations vanished. Therefore, when I knew that I should meet him at Wells, I was full of happy anticipations. But I

was not prepared for the combination of excellences which then charmed me. He received me with a sweetness and winning condescension which instantly told me that I was in the presence of a friend. His manners indicated the amiability of his heart, for though he never laid aside the dignity which belonged to the Episcopal office, his gentleness and humility seemed to remove all distance. While I reverenced him as a bishop, and revered him as a father, I felt that I could always converse with him as with a brother.

During his residence in Wells, he was indefatigable as a preacher. He always occupied the cathedral pulpit on the mornings of Sunday. It is superfluous to say that large congregations flocked to hear him. There was something in his appearance in the pulpit which at once proclaimed that he felt his responsibility as an ambassador for Christ. Simplicity and earnestness, and anxiety for the good of souls, and devotedness to his high calling, were his pre-eminent characteristics. His predominant desire seemed to be that every sermon should so clearly state the Gospel-scheme that no hearer should depart without clear intelligence of the way of salvation. He scarcely ever concluded without earnest appeals to hearts and consciences. Eternity alone will show how hallowed were these opportunities in the cathedral of Wells. But his sermons on each Sunday were not limited to the cathedral. He established an evening lecture in the grand old parish church of St. Cuthbert. He seemed to have especial delight in addressing the crowds who there thronged to hear him. His anxiety for souls led him also to seek opportunities of preaching on days of the week. He had decanal connection with the parishes of Wedmore and Mark. In one of these he endeavoured to be a preacher every week. Moreover, he seldom refused an invitation to carry the truths of the Gospel to other parishes in the county. I have returned late in the evening with him from such occasions; and in winter mornings, before the dawn of day, I have set out with him that he might discharge similar work. Though he had all the duties of the episcopal office to fulfil, he laboured as a preacher as if preaching was his sole employ. He was indeed "a workman who needed not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth."

He was always zealous in promoting the interests of the societies which, as has been already stated, were especially dear to him. He was ready to endure great inconvenience to attend their meetings in various places. These efforts were great proof of his firmness and sincerity, as he had often to encounter the opposition of too many of the clergy. Great has been my pain when I have witnessed the unbecoming conduct to which he was not infrequently exposed. But he realized that he was moving

in the path of Christian duty, and I never knew his meekness or his patience to desert him.

Amid all his labours, which were indeed incessant and immense, he exercised very large hospitality. The Deanery seemed ever open to receive the visits of persons distinguished for Christian excellence. At his table he had the happy art of casting off all semblance of care, and I have known him diffuse most lively and cheerful entertainment when I well knew that his heart was heavy with many anxieties. It was his delight to show attention to those whom he believed to be truly religious. Thus, I have known him, with disregard of self, hasten to refresh Mrs. Hannah More with his visits. These efforts to give pleasure were among his distinguishing characteristics. I have scarcely known a man of whom it could be said with greater truth, that he lived above all personal considerations.

In the year 1827, Bishop Tomline, of Winchester, died suddenly at Kingston Lacy, the seat of Mr. Bankes. At that time Viscount Goderich was the Premier, and with very little delay, the bishopric of Winchester was offered to Bishop Sumner, who, at that time, was presiding over the see of Llandaff. There was a general expectation that the vacant preferment would be offered to Bishop Ryder. His acknowledged excellences and his thoroughly established character seemed to give him a commanding claim. Shortly after the arrangements for Winchester had been completed, I met Bishop Ryder in the company of many of his friends. The recent translation was named. There was a disposition to give utterance to disappointment, but the Bishop with eager haste checked all such notice, and warmly called upon us to be devoutly thankful that a prelate, though much younger in years, who had given such proof of piety, zeal, and administrative power, had been selected. Thus the Bishop's disinterested feelings were manifested. He had, in truth, heeded the apostolic injunction, "In lowliness of mind let each esteem others better than themselves."

He was by no means indifferent to the responsibilities which belonged to him as a member of the House of Lords. I remember with what anxiety he thoroughly weighed the provisions of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill. He condescended to discuss the conflicting arguments with me; and I am persuaded that the vote which he was led to give in opposition to almost all his friends at Wells, while it gave him great pain, was most conscientious.

But the time of my happy intercourse with this most delightful of men was soon brought to a conclusion. It was not long before he discovered that the labours of the large diocese of Lichfield, and the time which he was compelled to pass in London, left

scarcely any interval for the Deanery of Wells. He felt, therefore, that he must retire from scenes so long endeared to him. He resolved to take in exchange for the Deanery a prebendal stall at Westminster. He hoped that he might combine the duties of that stall with his parliamentary residence in London, and he told me, with evident satisfaction, that he would thus be able to preach the Gospel to the large congregations at the Abbey. He did not, perhaps, sufficiently reflect, that by adding these labours to his residence in London he denied himself any period of repose. His friends soon perceived that malady was invading his frame, and that his valuable life might find an early close.

I have received a tender account of his last appearance in the chapter at Westminster. His weakness now gave alarm, and his medical advisers urged him to seek the seaside. He took, however, lively interest in the disposal of one of the livings belonging to the chapter, and he resolved, though scarcely equal to the effort, personally to express his wishes. When this business was concluded, he rose to thank the canons and to retire. When he left the chapter-room, there was a pause of sorrow. His brethren felt that they would see his face no more, and the senior, not remarkable for tender feelings, burst into tears. Here was evident proof how Bishop Ryder won hearts.

He shortly after removed to Hastings. Ardent were the hopes entertained by his devoted relatives and friends that his malady might be arrested, and the life so precious might yet be prolonged. But it was not to be so. The time was at hand for him to be admitted to the inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for them who are kept by the power of God through faith unto eternal life. His own feelings at this solemn time are thus expressed:—

> I am under good and attentive medical care, thank God: and good hopes are given of my ultimate recovery: but I sometimes doubt, and wish to leave all in his hands who knows what is best for me and mine. When any of my friends and clergy inquire after me, pray tell them so, and beg their prayers. I hope, I humbly and earnestly desire, to be found only in Him who must be all my righteousness and all my strength: and in whom alone, whatever I may appear before men, I must, after all, be justified and saved, before God.

He breathed his last on March 31, 1836.

Deep was the feeling throughout Wells, when the cathedral bell announced that he, who was so dear to the inhabitants, had brought his earthly career to an end. Tender was the allusion made to this event from the pulpit of St. Cuthbert's. Deep, too, was the feeling which pervaded his bereaved diocese. Tears were shed when congregations were informed that he who was so

loved and honoured had passed to his eternal rest. As appropriate tokens of attachment, memorial churches were erected at Birmingham and Derby, to transmit his beloved name to succeeding times. There was an expression of regret that his remains did not rest in the Cathedral Church of his diocese; but in that church a monument of exquisite sculpture was erected by his friends, and the following epitaph records how truly he was valued and beloved:—

To the Memory of the

Honourable and Right Reverend

HENRY RYDER, D.D.,

Successively Bishop of Gloucester, and of Lichfield and Coventry,

This monument is erected in testimony of affectionate respect by many who revered and loved him.

His unsparing self-devotion to the duties of his high office, his unaffected humility, his Christian simplicity, his expansive charity, his fervent and cheerful piety, endeared him to his friends, and conciliated universal regard.

Constrained by the love of Christ, he strove to extend the means of worshipping and serving Him, both at home and abroad, and to diffuse the light of the Gospel among Jews and Gentiles.

As a preacher, affectionate, faithful, earnest, persuasive, practical: as a bishop, paternal, vigilant, apt to teach, given to hospitality, mild and forbearing, yet when duty called, inflexible.

He exhibited in his daily walk and conversation a bright example to the flock over which the Holy Ghost had made him overseer.

In meek reliance on the grace and intercession of the Redeemer, he lived, he laboured, he died, entering into his rest in the fifty-ninth year of his age, and twenty-first of his Episcopate, March the thirty-first, One Thousand Eight Hundred and Thirty-Six, at Hastings, where his mortal remains are deposited.

At the risk of seeming to retread ground already traversed, and of marring the sequence of continuous narrative, I would adjoin a brief postscript. It supplies proof that the memory of the great and good survives the effacing touch of time.

In the year 1862 I removed from Wells to Gloucester. Here the affection which had always lived in my heart was charmingly revived. I found that Bishop Ryder's memory was here dear to those who had known and loved him as their bishop. A few of the aged inhabitants held him in vivid recollection and told with delight of his works among them. I heard of the Magdalen Asylum, the aged matron of which never wearied in speaking of his encouraging visits. Christ Church was pointed out as built by his efforts, to perpetuate the preaching of the Gospel; and to this day there is remem-

brance of his frequent ministrations at the Church of St. Michael. He preached his farewell sermons in Gloucester on February 29, 1824. This year was remarkable as containing five Sundays in the month of February. The same has occurred this year: and the present rector of St. Michael's, taking advantage of the occasion, read to his congregation the sermon preached in that church by the beloved bishop fifty-six years ago. An aged member of the congregation was present on each occasion. Marked attention pervaded the audience. A solemn feeling seemed to say, that the Bishop, though long since dead, still speaketh.

England's Church boasts indeed of a grand chain of illustrious rulers. We have had prelates of glittering talent, of gigantic powers of intellect, of multiplicity of gifts, of vast stores of learning, of stirring eloquence, of indefatigable industry, of winning meekness, of retiring humility; but since the days of the saintly Leighton, we can scarcely point to one in whom Christian worth shone with more lovely lustre than in the beloved Henry Ryder. But while we thus do honour to the memory of one to whom honour is justly due, we fully recognize that all his excellence was the free gift of God, who thus sanctified him and made him a blessing to his generation.

Before the pen is laid aside, a concluding thought seems to claim utterance. The study of the memoirs of worthies in the Christian faith is undoubtedly a profitable exercise. But there is a memoir always open for our inspection which should not be neglected. Our own lives are a relation of God's unfailing dealings with us. They record a series of interpositions, deliverances, mercies—which should be inscribed deeply on our hearts. If we learn much by contemplating his goodness and truth to those who have preceded us, may we not learn more by inward perception, and by the current of ever-flowing experiences? It is a good lesson to perceive how prayers have been answered in the case of others. Should we be indifferent to the realization of like truthfulness to ourselves? Shall we marvel at interpositions which have raised others from the lowest depths, and made them more than conquerors when apparently in extremest need? and shall we turn with indifference from instances as real in the catalogue of our own mercies? The Psalmist bids his soul to forget not all God's benefits. Let us be wise, and strive to treasure up this wondrous history of his dealing with ourselves. We may be low and obscure in the estimate of others: but high is our position if we can realize that our names are written in heaven, and that God is dealing with us as with His children, as heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ.

HENRY LAW.

ART. II.—ARCHBISHOP FITZ RALPH OF ARMAGH.

A PRECURSOR OF THE REFORMATION.

JUST as the drops come before the shower, so we find that there were many isolated attempts at Reformation long before the great movement of the sixteenth century. Even before Wickliffe, both in England and Ireland, there were some protestants against the errors and enormities favoured by the Roman See in the name of religion. Amongst these, one of the most remarkable, yet least known at the present day, is Richard Fitz Ralph, Archbishop of Armagh. By his piety and reforming zeal the name Armachanus was as well known in his time, throughout the whole Christian world, as it was two centuries later by the learning of Archbishop Ussher. Of the six great primates of Armagh—Patrick, Apostle of Ireland, Malachy, the friend of Bernard, Fitz Ralph, Ussher, Boulter, Beresford—he is by no means the least worthy of notice. With Malachy he may well be compared: both were reformers, but in different directions. He will be seen to have well earned the character given of him by John Foxe:—"He was a man worthy, for his Christian zeal, of immortal commendation."

Fitz Ralph lived in the reign of King Edward III. This reign, extending over exactly half a century (1327–1377), was one of the most brilliant epochs of our national history. The importance of the political affairs of the time has no doubt obscured the view of ecclesiastical events and leaders, and to a great extent caused the suppression of many important details. Whether Fitz Ralph was born in Devonshire or at Dundalk in Ireland is a matter of dispute. He was brought up at the University of Oxford, under the tuition of the celebrated John Bakenthorpe, commonly called, in the schools, the "Resolute Doctor." He made such advances in his studies that he was commended to Edward III., by whose favour he was rapidly promoted. He became Chancellor or Commissary of the University in 1333, Chancellor of Lincoln in the next year, Archdeacon of Chester in 1336, and the year after Dean of Lichfield. We know little more concerning the earlier portion of his life. Henry de Burghersh, Bishop of Lincoln, sometime Lord Treasurer and Lord Chancellor of England, one of the most eminent prelates of that century, was his diocesan during the

time that he was Chancellor or Commissary of Oxford. With another eminent prelate he was intimately connected. He made one of a company of learned men who met together in the house of Richard Aungerville, or De Bury, Bishop of Durham, the friend and correspondent of Petrarch, one of the most remarkable characters of the day. We are told of him that he was—

A man so singularly learned, and so devoted to literature, that he kept transcribers, binders, and illuminators in his palaces; and expended the whole of his ample income in purchasing scarce and curious manuscripts, for which purpose he employed agents, not only in England, but in Italy, France, and Germany. Besides the fixed libraries which he had formed in his several palaces, the floor of his common apartment was so covered with books, that those who entered were in danger of trampling on them. By the favour of Edward III. he gained access to the libraries of the principal monasteries, where he shook off the dust from various volumes (all MSS. as must necessarily be the case at that period), preserved in chests and presses, which had not been opened for many ages; and while Chancellor (Sept. 28, 1335) and Treasurer (1337) of England, instead of the usual presents or new year's gift appendant to his office, he chose to receive those perquisites in books.

Though the bishop was actively engaged in political affairs, being ambassador to France and to the Low Countries, and away as long as nine years at a time, he never lost his love for books and bookish men. Old John Stow says that he so delighted in books that he had more, as was thought, than all the bishops of England besides. I cannot refrain from quoting the exact words in which Stow describes the eminent men whom De Bury had gathered around him :—

He greatly delighted in the company of clearkes, and hadde alwayes many of them in his family, among whom were Thomas Bradwardine, afterwards archbishoppe of Canterbury, Richard Fitz Ralph, archbishoppe of Armacham, Walter Burley, John Manditt, Robert Holcot, Richard Kilwington, all of them doctors of divinitie, Richard Wentworth or Beniworth, byshoppe of London, and Walter Segrave, byshoppe of Chichester. Every day at his table he was accustomed to have some reading; and after dinner daily he would have some disputation with his private clearkes, and other of his house, except some urgent cause hadde let him. At other times hee was occupied, either in service of God, or at his books.

This eminent prelate was the most determined bookworm of the good old times, and he seems to have infused into his friend Fitz Ralph his own love of books. His opinion of books well deserves to be borne in mind: "These are teachers who instruct without rod or ferula, without severe expressions, or anger, without food or money. When we come to them, they are not

asleep; when we enquire for them they do not secrete themselves; when we mistake them, they do not complain; if we are ignorant, they do not despise us." He died in 1345, at his palace at Auckland, two years before Fitz Ralph was appointed to Armagh. We can well suppose that Richard must have been a man much appreciated for his learning when he was able to gain the friendship and companionship of such a person as Richard de Bury, Bishop of Durham.

Walter Burley or Burleigh, known as the "Perspicuous Doctor," the great pupil and opponent of the celebrated Duns Scotus, also deserves some notice. His mind was engaged upon all the then known branches of knowledge, but metaphysics and theology seem to have occupied the chief place in his attention, and with him, no doubt, Fitz Ralph must often have delighted to engage in the abstruse but useless disputations of the schools, before "the Lord taught him, and brought him out of the profound vanities of Aristotle's subtilty, to the study of the Scriptures of God."

Theology, too, was well represented in that learned company in the person of Thomas Bradwardine, called the "Profound Doctor," afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, but only for one short week. He was a student and expounder of the doctrines of Augustine, and his great work, "De Causa Dei," advanced notions which would in modern times be called extreme Calvinism. He was a man "whose firmness of character was only surpassed by his unpretending modesty," and "who, though his name does not appear in the calendar, was in very truth a saint."

If we cannot easily get a full and distinct view of Fitz Ralph himself, we can at least see him reflected in the character and tastes of his chosen companions. Books, metaphysics and theology, represented by De Bury, Burleigh, and Bradwardine, seem from the few notices that we have of him, all and equally to have occupied his attention; and, no doubt, had his lot in after-life been favourable to such studies, he would have been as eminent in all as these were in each. His love of books never forsook him, and when in remote Armagh he had his chaplains at Oxford searching for books.

It is little wonder that just at this period we should have but meagre notices of ecclesiastical affairs. On the 26th of August, 1346, the French were defeated at Crecy, and on the 12th of October the Scots were repulsed at Neville's Cross. In the following year Fitz Ralph was advanced by Clement VI. to the See of Armagh, and was consecrated at Exeter by John de Grandison, Bishop of Exeter, and others, on the 8th of July, just about three weeks before the surrender of Calais. Amidst these stirring events Fitz Ralph began his primacy.

At Armagh he found himself in the midst of a long-standing controversy with the See of Dublin as to the primacy of the kingdom. Armagh was admittedly the more ancient See, and in Celtic times had unquestioned supremacy, as being the chair of St. Patrick; but in consequence of the English invasion, the See of Dublin became at once a position of great importance. Always filled by able English politicians, who had great influence with the rulers of the Pale, it soon surpassed in power the older See, venerated by those who came now to be termed the "mere Irish." In 1337 an attempt was made to gain the formal primacy, for when David, Archbishop of Armagh, was summoned to attend a Parliament, and when "he made procession in St. Mary's near Dublin, he was hindered by the Archbishop of Dublin and clergy, because he would have the cross carried before him, which they would not permit." Thus there was the same dispute as to precedence, *De jaculatione crucis*, in Ireland, that existed years before in England between York and Canterbury. In 1348, after the appointment of Fitz Ralph, the King took the part of Dublin, and wrote to Cardinal Andomar urging that Dublin should be exempted from any subjection to Armagh.

The new Archbishop, however, was not the man to be easily imposed upon without some attempt to assert his rights, and he showed the same fearlessness and independence in this as he afterwards did in matters of much greater weight. Having probably gained over the King, he next year (1349) triumphantly entered Dublin with his cross borne erect before him. The Lord Justice, fearing that the public assertion of his rights would lead to a breach of the peace, hastily sent him back to Drogheda. The King now issued his commands, no doubt for the sake of peace, that he should not raise his cross in the Province of Dublin; and again urged Cardinal Andomar to use his influence with the Pope to have the question set at rest, and to have the claims of the prelates finally adjusted. This, however, was not decided until after Fitz Ralph's death, in the time of Innocent VI., when it was determined that "each of them should be a primate; but for distinction of style the Primate of Armagh should entitle himself Primate of all Ireland; and the Metropolitan of Dublin should inscribe himself Primate of Ireland: like Canterbury and York in England, the first of which writes himself Primate of all England, the other Primate of England." Thus the old Celtic See retained its pre-eminence; one solitary and nominal success in the long struggle between the native and the invader, between Celtic and Latin Christianity.

We have but few notices of Fitz Ralph's work in the Irish records. In 1351 he is noticed as having preached a sermon in English at Coleraine, the only entry of the kind in the Irish

annals. About this time he obtained a license from the king to buy up livings in the hands of aliens; and, in pursuance of this authority, he purchased from a French monastery the patronage of Donaghadee and Derryaghy, two well-known parishes in the diocese of Down and Connor, which continued from that time until the passing of the Irish Church Act in the presentation of the Archbishops of Armagh. These are the only local notices we have of him, but they are characteristic. We see special notice of his preaching, and we see, too, how he exercised his care that parishes should not be supplied by foreigners, but be in the hands of the native bishops.

Soon, however, matters of much more importance engaged the attention of the sturdy Primate. A dispute with the Prior of the Convent of St. Peter and St. Paul at Armagh involved him in the great controversy then going on, throughout the whole Western Church, between the parochial clergy and the Mendicant Friars.

The four orders of Franciscans (Grey Friars), Dominicans (Black Friars), Carmelites (White Friars), and Augustins (Austin Friars), were called Begging Friars. They claimed the right of entering any diocese or parish, and, under special license of the Pope, hearing confession, selling indulgences, begging for their convents, and administering the sacraments. It will be seen at once that such claims were greatly to the prejudice of the rights of the bishops and parochial clergy, as well as a very serious injury to the cause of religion and morals; because the people were thus drawn from the care of the parochial clergy by the specious promises and claims of the friars, and, worst of all, those who by crime and wicked courses were under the ban of the parish clergy were readily received by the friars and obtained absolution from them. In the pages of Chaucer, who about this time was coming into note, we have pictures, living sketches, of the parson and the friar. In the prologue to the "Canterbury Tales" he draws the friar, he who—

> —Knew well the taverns in every town.
> He was the beste beggar in all his house.
> For though a widow hadde but a shoe,
> Yet would he have a farthing e'er he went.
> For there was he not like a cloisterer,
> With threadbare cope, as is a poor scholar,
> But he was like a master or a pope,
> Of double worsted was his semi-cope.

See, too, how he draws the pardoner, that is, the friar with license from the Pope to sell indulgences—the same that roused the spirit of Luther:—

His wallet lay before him in his lap,
Brimful of pardon come from Rome, all hot.
He had a cross of laton full of stones,
And in a glass he hadde pigges bones.
And with these relics, whenne that he found
A poore parson dwelling up inland,
Upon a day he gat him more monaie
Than that the parson got in monthes twaie.
And thus with feigned flattering and japes,
He made the parson and the people his apes.

Very different is the picture Chaucer draws of the parochial clergy: witness his description of the parson:—

Rich he was of holy thought and work.
He was also a learned man, a clerk,
That Christes gospel truely would he preach.
His parishens devoutly would he teach.
Wide was his parish, and houses far asunder,
But he ne left naught for no rain or thunder.
This noble ensample to his sheep he gave
That first he wraught, and then he taught.
—Christes lore, and his apostles twelve
He taught, but first he follow'd it himselve.

There seems to have been at this time a growing dissatisfaction at the teaching and practices of the Mendicant Orders. This feeling appears to have been general, and by no means confined to the secular clergy. There is strong evidence of it in the work called "Piers Ploughman's Vision," written probably in the year 1352, a work which does not appear to have had its origin in an ecclesiastical source:

I found there friars
All the four orders,
Preaching the people
For profit of themselve
Glossed the Gospel
As them good liked,
There preached a pardoner,
As he a priest were;
Brought forth a bull
With many bishops' seals,
And said he himself might
Assoilen them all,
Of falsehood, of fasting,
Of avowes y-broken.
Lewed men loved it well,
And liked his words;
Comen up kneeling
To kissen his bulls.

It would indeed appear that the same vigour and independence of the national mind so strikingly displayed in the political world was being manifested also in religious matters. The attitude of King Edward with regard to the ecclesiastical scandals of the day was, no doubt, a consequence of as well as an encouragement of the popular feeling. The Pope claimed the right not only of appointing to vacant benefices, but of appointing before the vacancy occurred, and meanwhile taking a portion of the income for his nominee. In 1343, the King wrote protesting against such appointments, and in 1350 the Statute of Provisors was passed to put an end to this scandal. Such a course could not fail to encourage others to speak out boldly against the abuses of the Church of Rome.

Fitz Ralph took the part of the parochial clergy, and, no doubt encouraged by the general feeling, attacked the friars with great vigour and severity. He was led to denounce the whole system as unscriptural, and as opposed to the mind of Christ. Having come to this conclusion, he maintained it fearlessly before people and Pope. Being in London on business, in 1357, he found certain doctors disputing about the begging of our Saviour Christ. By special request he preached seven or eight sermons to the people at Paul's Cross, and maintained certain propositions, amongst them the following :—

> That our Lord Jesus Christ in his human conversation was always poor, not that that He loved poverty, or did covet to be poor;
> That He did never beg; that He did never teach to beg;
> That, on the contrary, He held that men ought to be without necessity to beg, and that there was neither wisdom nor holiness for any man to become a mendicant.

For these propositions he was cited by the friars to appear before the Pope, and appeals were laid against him to the number of sixteen. He was supported in the struggle by the bishops and clergy of England, and they subscribed money to forward the cause. He went to Avignon; four cardinals were appointed to hear the appeal. On the 13th of November, 1357, he addressed the Pope and cardinals. He was admittedly successful in his vindication of himself and his propositions; but, as the unknown monk who wrote the "Chronicon Angliæ," published by the Master of the Rolls, says, "*Proh dolor*, alas! the English clergy backed out of their promises" of money; and, the friars having plenty of money, the cause was decided against him. It is well known that at the Papal Court of those days the longest purse had the best case. Many things he suffered at the hands of the friars: attempts were made to apprehend him; the coasts were watched for him; he fell, too, into the hands of thieves, and lost his money, but it was wonderfully restored to

him. These things he recounts in a prayer, the beginning of which is given by Foxe:—

To Thee be praise, and glory, and thanksgiving, O Jesu, most holy, most powerful, most amiable, who hast said, I am the way, the truth, and the life;—a way without deviation—truth without cloud, and life without end. Thou hast shown me the way; Thou hast taught me the truth; and Thou hast promised me the life. Thou wast my way in exile; Thou was my truth in counsel; and Thou wilt be my life in reward.

We see in these words a beautiful and simple faith, expressed in the elaborate and scholastic manner of the time.

His argument against the friars, addressed to the Pope, has been several times published. It is entitled, Defensorium Curatorum; or, Defence of the Parochial Clergy. In it he supports his charges at length, and gives some curious examples, drawn from his own experience, of the injury done by the friars. He says—

In mine own diocese of Armagh I have as good as two thousand under me, who, by the censure of excommunication every year denounced against wilful murderers, common thieves, burners of men's houses, and such like malefactors, stand accursed; of all which number, notwithstanding, scarcely fourteen there be who come to me, or to any about me, for their absolution. And yet all they receive the sacrament as others do, and all because they feign themselves to be absolved, by none other than the friars.

He alleges against the friars that, on account of the privileges granted to them by the Popes, "divers young men as well in universities as in their fathers' houses, are craftily allured by the friars, their confessors, to enter their orders; from whence also they cannot get out when they would, to the great grief of their parents and the no less repentance of the young men themselves." He tells of "a certain substantial Englishman being with him at his inn in Rome, who, having a son at the University of Oxford who was enticed by the friars to enter into their order, could by no means afterwards release him; but when his father and his mother would come unto him, they could not be suffered to speak with him but under the friars' custody; whereas the Scripture plainly commandeth that whoso stealeth any man and selleth him (Exod. xxi.) shall be put to death; and, for the same cause, the father was compelled to come up to Rome to seek remedy for his son. And thus may it appear what damage and detriments come by these friars unto the common people."

He next shows the injury done to the universities.

Laymen, seeing their children thus stolen from them in the universities by the friars, do refuse therefore to send them to their

studies; rather willing to keep them at home to their occupation, or to follow the plough, than so to be circumvented and defeated of their sons at the university "as by daily experience," he saith, "doth manifestly appear." For whereas in my time there were in the University of Oxford thirty thousand students, now are there not to be found six thousand; the occasion of which so great decay is to be ascribed to no other cause but to this circumvention only of the friars aforementioned.

Fitz Ralph, no doubt disappointed and disheartened by the success of the friars at the Papal Court, was about making his way back to Ireland when he died at Avignon on the 16th of November, 1360; not without grave suspicion that he died of poison administered by his enemies, the friars.

It would seem that his death put an end to the strife between the secular clergy as a body and the Mendicants. Henry of Marlboro' in his "Chronicle" says, "Richard Archbishop of Armagh dyed at this time at the Pope's Court, and Richard Kilminton dyed in England, therefore the controversie ceased between the clergie and the orders of Begging Friars.

Others helped in the good work. We find that John de Trevisa, Vicar of Berkeley and Canon of Westbury, the church of which Wickliffe was also a canon, published in English "A Translation of a Latin Sermon of Radulf or Fitz Rauf, Archbishop of Armagh, Nov. 8th, 1357, against Mendicant Friars." Fitz Ralph is said to have written eighteen distinct treatises on theological and other subjects.

As might be expected, very different opinions have been held with regard to Fitz Ralph and his work. A certain cardinal, when he heard of his death, exclaimed that the same day a mighty pillar of Christ's Church had fallen. Cardinal Bellarmine, on the other hand, ranks him among heretics, or bordering on them. "He was thought to have offended by the exuberance of his knowledge." Capgrave, in his "Chronicle," says of him:—"In Oxenforth he held straunge opiniones, which Wiclef meyntened aftirward more venemously." No wonder his opinions seemed "straunge," for the same writer speaks of Wickliffe as "the orgon of the devel, the enmy of the cherch, the confusion of men, the ydol of heresie." Wickliffe says of him in his "Trialogue:"—"Armachanus boldly published his conclusions at Avignon before Innocent and his assembly of Cardinals, and defended them by word and pen even to the death."[1]

[1] The opinion expressed above by Capgrave as to the similarity of the views held by Fitz Ralph and Wickliffe, has been that held by every writer until very recently. It was constantly maintained that Wickliffe was animated by the example of Fitz Ralph, and continued the struggle in which he had been engaged. Since the appearance of Dr. Peter Lorimer's translation of Lechler's work, the latest and best on John

About ten years after his decease his bones were brought over to Dundalk by Stephen de Valle, Bishop of Meath. There he was long venerated under the name of St. Richard of Dundalk. In a Synod held in Drogheda on the 20th of June, 1545, it was ordained that the festival of St. Richard, Archbishop of Armagh, should be celebrated with nine lessons *in crastino Johannis et Pauli.* The proceedings were begun for his canonization, but were never concluded. No doubt it was found upon inquiry that he was a "sore saint" for the Pope. He was, however, indeed canonized in the grateful memory of his people. In Dundalk there was a fountain dedicated to him, to which all the neighbourhood flocked, thinking that whoever drank of its waters should be free from fever. There was preserved his shrine, and also his ring, endowed, as it was supposed, with many virtues. His day was celebrated with great devotion. A couplet has been preserved which lets us see how the common people regarded him—

> Many a man I see, and many a mile I walk,
> But never saw I holier man than Richard of Dundalk.

At the year 1377, it is noted by the old chronicler of St. Albans before mentioned, that by many miracles and wonders at his tomb, God vindicated Master Fitz Ralf, "at which the friars, it is said, are badly content."

Wickliffe and Trevisa are both celebrated for the part they took in furnishing the people of England with the Holy Scriptures in their own mother tongue. It would appear that Fitz Ralph attempted to do the same for the native Irish. It is said that he possessed a copy of the New Testament in Irish, and that it was made by himself, According to the information of Bale, quoted by Archbishop Ussher, this copy was concealed by him in a certain wall of his church, with the following note: "When this book is found, truth will be revealed to the world or Christ shortly appear." The book was found when the church of Armagh was being repaired in the year 1530. Foxe tells us he credibly heard of certain old Irish Bibles translated long since into the Irish tongue, which, if it be true, it is not other like but to be the doing of this Armachanus; and he adds that the fact was testified by "certain Englishmen which are yet alive and have seen it."

Wickliffe, it is necessary, in deference to the opinions of the learned writer and editor, to modify any positive statements as to the connection between the work of Fitz Ralph and that of Wickliffe. I feel, however, that there is still something to be said for the uniform testimony of all early writers who have alluded to the subject, that Wickliffe continued the struggle begun by Fitz Ralph. It is at least certain that Wickliffe was acquainted with Fitz Ralph's labours and held him in high estimation.

Whether Archbishop Fitz Ralph translated the New Testament into Irish or not, there can be no doubt as to the estimation in which he held the Holy Scriptures. Nothing is more remarkable than the use he makes of his Bible in the "Defensorium Curatorum." On every point his great appeal is "to the law and to the testimony," to the teaching and practice of our Lord Jesus Christ. Of him it is well said by the St. Albans chronicler, *Constat veraciter, quod erat probatissimus scriba in regno cælorum*, "A right well-approved scribe in the kingdom of heaven."

Richard Fitz Ralph, Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of Ireland, has no monument: his burial-place is almost forgotten; but whilst his "Defensorium Curatorum" exists, he will be venerated as a bishop, a Christian, and a man: as a bishop, for the watchful care of his flock against friar and Pope; as a Christian, for his simple faith and excellent knowledge of the Scriptures; and as a man, not merely for his learning, but because in an age of heroes he was remarkable for his stubborn independence, undaunted courage, and constancy even unto the death—a man indeed "worthy of his Christian zeal of immortal commendation."

CHARLES SCOTT.

NOTE.—The following list of authorities, which refer to this obscure period and are quoted above, may be useful to the inquirer:—Rymer's *Fœdera*; Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, Cattley's ed.; *Defensorium Curatorum* in Brown's *Fasciculus*; Capgrave's *Chronicle* and *Chronicon Angliae* in Rolls Series; Reeves' *Down and Connor*; Mant's *Church of Ireland*; Townsend's *Biblical Literature*; Cave's *Historia Literaria*; Stuart's *Armagh*; Monck Mason's *Religion of the Ancient Irish Saints*; and the indispensable *Notes and Queries*.

ART. III.—ON EDUCATIONAL MISSIONS IN INDIA.

1. *Life of Alexander Duff, D.D., LL.D.* By GEORGE SMITH, C.I.E., LL.D., &c. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 1879.
2. *Life of John Wilson, D.D., F.R.S.* By GEORGE SMITH, C.I.E., LL.D., &c. Second Edition. London: Murray. 1879.
3. *Memoir of Geo. Ed. Lynch Cotton, D.D., Bishop of Calcutta, and Metropolitan.* London: Longmans. 1872.

BIOGRAPHY furnishes an agreeable means for imparting knowledge. A carefully compiled Blue-Book, teeming with facts, figures, and supporting documents, may be of rare value, but it wants that display of motives and principles necessary for the

correct and comprehensive appreciation of a great subject. Men turn with weariness from reports and returns, while they linger with delight over the pages enshrining the memories of great and good men. It is fortunate that, in attempting to discuss the place of educational missions in the dissemination of Christianity, we can approach the subject through a retrospect of the lives of champions foremost in maintaining the importance of this mode of inculcating Christian truth. Most assuredly the cause did not suffer in their hands.

But we are English Churchmen. What have we to do with

> our brethren of the north,
> (Seeing) Samaria finds her likeness there?

Surely it cannot be that amongst those

> Whose fathers sinned and who have lost the grace
> Which seals the holy apostolic line
> Israel has seers—to whom the word is nigh
> (From whom) that word runs forth and gladness gives?

Some may think so, but we feel assured that English Churchmen in general have perused with delight the lives of Dr. Duff and Dr. Wilson, recognizing in them faithful brethren in Christ and rejoicing greatly in their testification of the truth.

For ourselves, we believe in the "love of Christ overflowing bounds" of Churchmanship, and, in many practical matters, such as the conversion of the heathen to Christianity, effacing lines of demarcation. It is amongst the silliest of the many silly objections urged against Christian missions that our ecclesiastical differences at home are really hindrances to the effectual propagation of the Gospel in heathendom. Now and again native testimony to this effect is produced, just as Dr. Colenso paraded his Zulu, but this is merely a parrot cry caught up from English infidelity or ignorance. Very different was the feeling of the founders of the Church Missionary Society. They decreed it as a fundamental principle that "friendly intercourse shall be maintained with other Protestant societies engaged in the same benevolent design of propagating the Gospel of Jesus Christ." Accordingly they have never had the smallest misgiving about giving the right hand of fellowship to men of the stamp of Duff and Wilson, seeing the grace that was given unto them.

Dr. Smith has done his share well in the biographies prefixed to this article. It has been to him throughout a labour of love. There were marked differences in Dr. Duff and Dr. Wilson, but there is none in his admiration for them. He embalms the memories of both with all the resources at his disposal. The reader is left to judge between the fervent orator and the

profound orientalist. As they both followed their Lord and Master with equal fidelity, we too may be pardoned for leaving the question undetermined. Dr. Smith is enthusiastic in his support of their educational policy. He is disposed to attribute to it, if not all that has been wrought in India for the spread of the Gospel, yet all that is most important. Indeed, it would be impossible to state the case for it with more genuine conviction or under more favourable circumstances. Every student of Christian missions will gain light and knowledge from these most interesting volumes. He will understand what can be done in this particular department, when men are raised up of the calibre of Duff and Wilson. The churches of Scotland have sent forth other mighty men, some of whom have done many acts and been honourable, whom we have ourselves formerly known and prized highly, yet it is no derogation to them to say that they attained not to the first two. They may have been equal in the spirit of self-devotion and love for the Lord Jesus Christ, but they did not wield the same commanding influence, nor had they the same pre-eminent gifts.

As many reviews have already noticed these volumes, we do not detail afresh the chief incidents of the lives of these distinguished men. Both Duff and Wilson sprang, like so many eminent Scotchmen, from the ranks. By untiring devotion to the service of Christ, with a single eye to His glory, they attained the utmost elevation in the power of their fellow-countrymen to bestow. Never were honours more worthily awarded. It was mainly through the heroic efforts of these great men that Scotland was aroused to a consciousness that, as God had given them light, it was their duty to communicate it to those who were sitting in darkness. When we peruse the struggles of the Indian Evangelists to waken up manses and presbyteries and kirk sessions and general assemblies, we feel that their home work was little behind their foreign work. If neither of them had ever converted a native of India, they would still have been means of incalculable blessing. Again, these biographies prove indisputably that men of the highest natural powers, who could have won fame and wealth in any public career, cheerfully consecrated all their abilities to unwearied missionary toil, turning their "blind eye, like Nelson," to all offers of earthly advancement, but proving themselves, by loyal and disinterested service, most invaluable denizens and upholders of our Indian empire.[1] The craze that missionaries

[1] Lord Elphinstone, when he quitted India, declared that to no man was he so indebted (and this was all through the Indian Mutiny) for public and private services as to Dr. Wilson, on whom he could not prevail to accept so much as the value of a shoe-latchet. "Let them send me the

are, like the conies, but a feeble folk, is not yet wholly dispelled. The great men commemorated in these volumes were statesmen, scholars, orators, philanthropists, but, above and beyond all—missionaries. The world usually reverses this collocation. Furthermore, if there are any who, unlike the late Lord Lawrence, think that the natives of India are hostile to those who undertake openly and avowedly to do "Christian things in a Christian way," we once more recommend the perusal of these lives. No men ever set themselves more deliberately and unweariedly to undermine Hindu superstition than did these Scotch missionaries. In season and out of season, in Calcutta and Bombay, in native states almost beyond the reach of English power, in out-of-the-way villages, they (Dr. Wilson especially) proclaimed Christ as the Saviour of a lost world. Yet, although many of their proceedings must have been distasteful, particularly when successes in conversion crowned their efforts, few were more popular with the native community, or received more genuine tokens of their regard. When parents brought their children to the schools of the Scotch missionaries there was no kind of disguise as to what the tenor of the teaching would be. Still, the risk was run; nor were the Hindus so ungenerous as to quarrel with those who had turned the hearts of their children from the worship of dumb idols to the service of the living and true God. In educational matters, as in all other things, honesty is the best policy. Again, the lives of Wilson and Duff are most instructive in exhibiting the pertinacious manner in which English infidelity battles against Christianity in India. It is in reality the most formidable enemy that educational missions have to encounter; it is with the help of European and American agency that Satan now fights for the retention of his strongholds.

The great work to which Wilson and Duff consecrated all their noble powers was mainly, although not quite exclusively, the inculcation of Christianity through the medium of education. This method had not been previously neglected by missionaries belonging to other churches. But it received such magnificent development in the hands of the Church of Scotland that it has been, not unnaturally, identified with it. Its missionaries were the grandest exponents of the system; so much so, that they gave a most powerful impulse to all educational effort, including that of Government. "Education saturated with the Bible" was the means which they deliberately adopted for exploding and tearing up Hindu superstition from its lowest depths. It was their

---

Christian," was the demand of Hyder Ali, when Madras was in danger, "he will not deceive me." With his catechist Sattyanâdan, Schwartz went to Seringapatam: strange ambassadors from England in an hour of peril to her empire!

impression that as "against the Brahminized Hindus the prevailing missionary method (of preaching and personal intercourse) had failed, both in immediate results and in self-developing power." Still, it is acknowledged that the non-Brahminized tribes in the south had been evangelized by these usual means. How great and extensive these successes have been need not be chronicled here. It was, however, with Brahminism that the Scotch missionaries, Duff especially, prepared to grapple. His programme was "to teach every variety of useful knowledge, first in elementary forms, and, as the pupils advanced, in the higher branches, which might ultimately embrace the most advanced and improved studies in history, civil and sacred, sound literature, logic, mental and moral philosophy after the Baconian method, mathematics in all departments, with natural history, natural philosophy and higher sciences." These in Calcutta were to be taught through the medium of English and in inseparable combination with the Christian faith and its doctrines, precepts, and evidences with a view to the practical regulation of life and conduct." The scheme was glorious; it was, moreover, no fanciful ideal. It was not a splendid failure like Bishop's College, of which a Church of England missionary, who had shared the dream, said, "Sure I am that, if sainted spirits can weep, Bishop Middleton is now weeping in heaven over the idol of his heart." The Scotch institutions were instinct with life of the highest kind. No one who ever listened to the exhortations of Duff in Calcutta, or to the impassioned addresses of John Anderson in Madras, could refrain from exclaiming

"Fervet opus, redolentque thymo fragrantia mella."

Nor were they without admirable results. Many highly intelligent and accomplished natives, under the influence of this teaching, discarded their ancestral superstitions. Pointing to the institutions, they could say that when the Lord writeth up the people it will be made mention that "these men were born there." Multitudes, too, were shaken out of their ancient beliefs, though they did not openly embrace Christianity. Many of these converts were precisely from those classes which Duff sought to influence. In spite of themselves, Koolin Brahmins became Christians. The effect produced upon the European antagonists of Christianity in India was marked. It is Christian charity not to reproduce the names of some conspicuous men among these assailants, one of whom, when castigated by Duff in a pamphlet worthy of Junius, "was anxious to challenge the missionary to fight a duel!" The result was that, as is stated in "Bishop Cotton's Life," "Calcutta presented the nearest parallel which the Christian Church has ever seen to what

Alexandria was in the second and third centuries." To this remark we shall have occasion to revert again.

The fact, however, must not be ignored, that there has been considerable divergence of opinion as to whether educational missions are the most genuine and the most legitimate means of propagating Christianity. Dr. Smith alludes repeatedly to this divergence, but it is to depreciate it. It would be unfair either to him or to Dr. Duff to say that they do not value what is ordinarily termed preaching the Gospel to the heathen; but certainly both consider the educational as the more excellent way. And yet one would not have to go very far to find testimony of another character. Dr. Wilson was himself eminent as an educationist, yet in his memorable speech when, as President, he was opening the Allahabad Conference, he declared emphatically, "Preaching . . . . is the instrument which can be most generally used in India; and it should be employed with reference to every class of the people to whom we can find access, from the prince on the throne to the sage and pilgrim at the sacred tirtha, to the peasant in the field and to the beggar on the heap of ashes. While the intercommunion of different classes of Indian society is so limited, and where readers are comparatively so few, an extensive and varied ministration by the voice of the living preacher, or herald, is most desirable and needful:"—

> To no part of my missionary labours, continued now for nearly forty-four years, do I look back with more interest than to my lengthened tour in the provinces of the Maharashtra, Gujarát, Bérár, Rájpootana, Sindh and Central India, &c. During their continuance I gained access to all classes of the people. . . . . A considerable number of the converts of the mission to which I belong I came first in contact with during these itinerations.[1]

It would be easy to accumulate evidence of a similar description, but we will only add one more testimony, that of another missionary of the Free Church, the Rev. W. Miller. "Missionary education," he says, "is not and cannot be a substitute for the simple proclamation of a crucified Redeemer. . . . . It is not the kind of effort in which the man of the most devoted, most apostolic spirit will find his fittest sphere."

Obviously there is a discrepancy between these views and those so unhesitatingly urged both by Dr. Duff and his biographer. They do not, however, proceed from the moderatism of the Established Church, from home theorists, or even "the pious conductors of other evangelizing measures," but from those associated with Dr. Duff himself in his mighty work.

---

[1] Report of the General Missionary Conference at Allahabad, 1872–3.

In the half-century which has elapsed since Dr. Duff began his labours, there has sprung up a change of circumstances in India emphatically deserving the most serious consideration of the whole Christian Church. Previous to the era of Dr. Duff, the action of Government in the matter of education had been feeble and desultory. It had inclined in the direction of learned orientalism[1] rather than of vernacular or English teaching. The beneficial instruction of the masses, so far as it was attempted at all, was mostly in the hands of missionaries. There had always been a system of native education attempted by the people themselves, but it was most limited in extent;[2] deplorably mismanaged through the inefficiency of native schoolmasters, it had little regard to anything beyond the most ordinary business of life. It was a compound of barbarous discipline and ignorant routine. To Dr. Duff and the Scotch missionaries is largely due the wonderful impetus given to rational education and the direction in which it developed itself. The school of orientalists had to yield to those who were determined that India should have access to the riches of Western science and learning through that which is becoming the imperial tongue of the world.

The result has been extensive dissemination among the more intelligent classes in India of far more correct ideas, especially in scientific matters, than ever could have been gathered from native teachers. These ideas are, of course, utterly subversive of a religious system which is intimately bound up with the most monstrous figments that have ever degraded the human intellect. So far, we cannot wonder that Dr. Duff was filled with enthusiasm at the triumph of his great attempt at the emancipation of the intelligence of India from barbarous superstition. Although not altogether blind to contingent evils, he was reluctant to anticipate them. He had great and well-merited confidence in himself and in the colleagues with whom he was surrounded. In one battle-field he swept all before him; but, like Parthians, the enemy only yielded to form again on another, for a fresh and dangerous attack. Originally native

---

[1] The system of education pursued in the Madrasseh founded by Warren Hastings was "precisely the same as the one which was in vogue in Europe during the darkest ages, and productive of the same results."—Evidence of Principal Lee's "Report on Public Instruction," 1858, pp. 11, 12.

[2] In 1835, according to Mr. Adam's report on existing vernacular schools in Bengal, 92¼ out of every hundred children of school-going age (six millions) were destitute of all kinds and degrees of instruction. Twenty-two years elapsed before this was remedied. Nothing was done for Upper India, save by the missionaries, till Lord Dalhousie's Government.—*Life of Duff*, vol. i. p. 226.

superstition had found auxiliaries in European infidelity; so the strength of the opposition to sound and healing knowledge arose in European infidelity once more. This important fact should never be lost sight of. Dr. Smith claims, with considerable justice, the substantial authorship of the celebrated Educational Despatch of 1854 for Dr. Duff and Mr. Marshman. The purport of this, the great educational charter of the people of India, was that there should be—

Government inspectors of secular instruction; universities on the model of that of London, but with professorships in physical science; secondary schools, English and Anglo-vernacular, in every city and county; primary and indigenous schools carefully improved; grants in aid of all; like university degrees to all who work up to certain uniform standards; normal schools, schoolbooks, scholarships, public appointments; medical, engineering, and art colleges; and, finally, female schools. As to religion, Lords Halifax and Northbrook put into the mouth of the directors sentiments similar to those which Lord Derby afterwards expressed on behalf of the Queen in the Proclamation of 1858: "The Bible is, we understand, placed in the libraries of the colleges and schools, and the pupils are able freely to consult it. This is as it should be, and, moreover, we have no desire to prevent or to discourage any explanations which the pupils may, of their own free will, ask from their masters on the subject of the Christian religion, provided that such information be given out of school hours." But of this voluntary instruction "no notice shall be taken by the inspectors in their periodical visits."

This is probably as much as could be expected from a Government ruling over a vast heathen population and not seeking conversion to its religion by bribery, by violence, or any other kind of unworthy inducement. Had it been honourably and consistently carried out, it would have satisfied the longings of Christian philanthropists; it would also, we believe, have been satisfactory to the more right-minded of the native population. But what has been the actual working? Dr. Smith replies:—

So long as he (Dr. Duff) remained in Calcutta, he secured fair-play for the liberal and self-developing principles of the Education Despatch in 1854. When he and Dr. Wilson ceased to influence affairs and rulers, the public instruction of India began to fall back into the bureaucratic, anti-moral, and politically dangerous system from which Lord Halifax thought he had for ever rescued it. In all the presidencies great state departments of secular educationalists have been formed, which are permanent compared with the governments they influence, and are powerful from their control of the press. Every year recently has seen the design of Parliament and the Crown —of both the Whig and the Conservative Ministries in 1854 to 1860— farther and farther departed from, as it is expressed in this keynote of the great Despatch: "We confidently expect that the introduction of

the system of grants in aid will very largely increase the number of schools of a superior order; and we hope that, before long, sufficient provision may be found to exist in many parts of the country for the education of the middle and higher classes independent of the Government institutions, which may then be closed." The departure of the local governments from this healthy principle grieved Dr. Duff even in his dying hours, because of all its consequences in undiluted secularism, amounting, in the case of individual officials in Bengal and Bombay, to the propagation of atheism more subtle than that which he had overthrown in 1830.

From 1860 to the present hour this system has been steadily pursued, "of giving a high English education without religion," a system which, in his own fervid but truthful language, Dr. Duff denounced as "blind and suicidal." When his strong hand upon the helm was torn away by death, the vessel speedily drifted upon dangerous rocks. The hoarse sound of impending destruction is now only too audible. Dr. Smith is right in his observation that the blame of this rests equally upon both Whig and Conservative Ministries, but the recent Governor-General and some of his advisers sounded an alarm. To Sir George Campbell praise is also due for having made some efforts to reduce the expenditure in colleges for the wealthy classes within more narrow limits.

We now proceed to point out wherein the present danger both to the stability of our Indian empire and to the progress of Christianity consists; furthermore, we would at least try to indicate how it should be met.

Upon the duty and advantage of communicating sound rudimentary instruction to the masses of India as to all the other millions of the human race there is probably no difference of opinion, except among those who prefer darkness to light. In this number we have no wish to be confounded. If this instruction could be religious as well as secular, we would prefer it; but if the exigencies of the case render the teaching of religion by Government an impossibility, secular teaching is better than none. Nor can there be any sufficient objection to granting university degrees to all coming up to a sufficient standard, irrespective of their religious creeds. From this properly follows the consequence that they can be employed in the service of the State, which has always been the case. The point really in dispute is, whether Government should maintain an expensive system of colleges for the education of the wealthier classes at a nominal cost, or leave it to voluntary effort to make provision.

Now, unquestionably considerable benefits have resulted to many from this college education. When there was comparative ignorance of the value and mode of attaining high education, an

impulse might fairly have been given to it through State intervention in the first instance. But there are weighty and preponderating arguments on the other side. It is unquestionable that youths are trained in these colleges quite able to pay for their own education, and that instead of elevating the *élite* of the lower classes the education of the superior classes tends only to subjugate these latter more hopelessly to the former. Dr. Dyson, late Principal of the Cathedral Mission College in Calcutta, affirms that the "native educational officers are, to a man, of the higher castes, and have no sympathy with the lower orders." It is also a fact that, from the undue stimulus that has been given, the supply of educated natives now exceeds the demand for them. They will not dig; to beg they would not be ashamed, but the beggars are too numerous. A most highly discontented class is thus multiplied. Thousands of educated men are being thrown upon the country for whom there is no possible means of providing, all considering that they have a claim to posts under Government. Long ago Dr. Duff remarked upon "the enormous influence for good or for evil that a single able and well-educated man may exercise in Christian India, where the millions are in a state of dense but inflammable ignorance." We are scattering them by thousands over the country.[1] Most justly did he characterize this as a "tremendous experiment for the State to undertake." Still we fanatically persevere. Vernacular education of the masses is stinted to find the means of profuse expenditure upon these high class institutions. When the Despatch of 1854 was promulgated, these colleges were only to be temporary. Even then Dr. Duff maintained that the native community had acquired sufficient experience and aptitude to carry on the management of the necessary preparatory seminaries.

[1] The *Calcutta Inquirer* first drew my attention to the evil of a merely intellectual and scientific education, apart from the necessity of a right direction being given to it. . . . . Krishna Mohun Banirjea was the editor of that newspaper. He had been educated partly, I believe, in one of the Government institutions at Calcutta. He was a sceptic and also a most thorough Radical. . . . . In that paper he preserved, for a very considerable time, a strain of invective against the Government which it was perfectly painful to read. Almost suddenly there was a remarkable change. He then sounded to his countrymen and to the Government the alarm on the danger of imparting a merely intellectual education, as inevitably leading a large mass of the population into a state of hostility to the Government. He gives his own experience, and that of a vast number of native friends of his own, in proof of it. . . . . His scepticism had been shaken (by Dr. Duff). He embraced the Christian truth, and his Radicalism and opposition to the Government were thrown to the winds, and he then declared his conviction that both politically and morally the Government would do well not to exclude Christianity from their schools. —Evidence of Lieut.-Col. W. Jacob, Bombay Artillery, before the House of Commons, Aug. 4, 1853. Compare "Life of Duff," vol. i. p. 153, &c.

How much more must this be the case now? But, as Dr. Smith truly asserts, the attitude of the educational department in India has been one of continual hostility to the Despatch of 1854. A multitude of vested interests has sprung up. A formidable danger has thus been created in India.

"I have been appalled," said the late Professor Henderson, "by discovering the extent to which atheistical and deistical writings, together with disaffection to the British Government, have spread and are spreading among those who have been educated in Government schools or are now in the service of Government. The direction of the Government system of education is rapidly falling into the hands of astute Brahmins, ... while the European gentlemen nominally at the head of the system know nothing of the under-currents which pervade the whole. The testimony of Mr. Gubbins is:—"Too frequently the Hindu scholar leaves the Government school an infidel; too frequently he repays the liberal instruction of Government with disloyalty and disaffection." According to a more recent witness, Professor Monier Williams, the result of the present mistaken system of Government education "floods India with conceited and half-educated persons who despise and neglect their own languages and their own political and religious systems without becoming good English scholars, good Christians, or good subjects of the Queen."

There have been admirable officers engaged in the Education Department who have discharged their duties with impartiality and advantage to the State; but there have also been unworthy Englishmen who have engaged actively in infidel propagandism, in some recent instances so offensively as to bring down upon themselves most justly merited official rebuke. Even in 1853 Mr. Marshman, in his evidence given before the House of Commons, distinctly stated that the Government had, while excluding Christianity from their colleges, placed in influential situations in them men "avowedly indifferent to Christianity, and some who openly avowed the principles of infidelity." These gentlemen, he added, if appealed to by the students "with regard to any of the principles of Christianity, would very likely give such an answer as would impair the value of those truths in the minds of the natives." It is difficult to avoid coming to the conclusion that, although there are some honourable exceptions, the secular training in our Government colleges, without the restraining and enlightening influence of Christianity, has been to raise up a large crop of flippant unbelievers in any creed, who have not really studied literature, philosophy, or science, but have acquired a miscellaneous mass of imperfect knowledge of little use to them in life. At the same time, as a class, they are thoroughly disaffected to our rule. The opinion

of the late Governor-General of India is, that the over-education in the presidency of Bengal is of a kind which will not sufficiently ensure those who pursue it from making their object beneficial to themselves or their fellow creatures. In point of fact it consists too much in what Lord Bacon terms "cobwebs admirable for the fineness of thread and work, but of no substance or profit." In Bengal "vermiculate questions" are in high honour.

What is the corrective for this? Dr. Smith, an enthusiast in the cause of education, would answer unhesitatingly, "the Christian college." "This," he says, "stands alone in the breach which the rising flood-tide is threatening, while Church and State look on apathetically" (vol. i. p. 440). We wish we could put equal confidence in this with him. Even in the Christian college, under the most favourable circumstances, there are serious drawbacks. Dr. Duff himself would frankly have admitted that the main object of the students who thronged his halls was neither desire to understand Christianity nor to obtain education for its own sake. Their anxiety was to obtain lucrative stations under Government or in mercantile employment, to which English education was the passport. The lightnings of Dr. Duff's impassioned appeals had not merely to blast external superstition, but to penetrate the whole armour of sordid self-interest in which his pupils were clothed from head to foot. He had, too, in his earlier period, the field comparatively to himself. In the midst of all the "ologies" he could find space and time for assiduous inculcation of Christian truth, and his pupils had leisure to attend to him. The case is now very different. The standard of university requirement has been highly raised.[1] Consequently, the demands upon the teachers are much heavier; the minds of the taught, also, are more preoccupied. Even in 1853 Mr. Marshman, in the evidence already referred to, stated that "no inconsiderable number of the students who had received instruction in the missionary schools and have been regularly taught the Bible, have little reverence for it; and some of them are, I fear, quite as much opposed to the missionaries in after-life as the students of the Hindu college." When we remember the motives actuating them, this is not marvellous. Very recent evidence of a similar kind may be found in the statements of the Rev. R. Rajahgopaul,

[1] On this point Dr. Murray Mitchell made some important remarks in the *Monthly Record of the Free Church of Scotland*, 1871. He describes "the purely intellectual work as much increased," also the burden on the students preparing for university examinations as very heavy, but he would from the bottom of his heart deplore the abandoning of the colleges by missionary bodies. The strain is more severe now; the struggle more hopeless.

of the Free Church Mission, Madras.[1] While highly extolling the value of Christian education in missionary institutions, and producing instances of spiritual benefit resulting, he declares that the "case of the majority of those who go out of our mission institutions is sad in the extreme." He explains the reason of this. He then asserts that "the majority live false hypocritical lives. The struggle between their convictions and self-interest, between light and darkness, will be more easily understood than expressed. It tends to terrible searing of conscience, deadening of all high thoughts and aspirations, and as a final resort they sink into Deism or Neo-Vedantism." His witness is too true, also, that "a very small minority" are beneficially affected by the higher education even in missionary colleges. Probably even Dr. Duff or Dr. Wilson would now have found it a terrible strain on their gigantic powers to place Christianity first and foremost in the minds of their pupils, distracted as they now are. Again, it is not easy for any section of the Christian Church to recruit their staff with Duffs and Wilsons. As a fact, the struggle is a difficult one to maintain competent rivals to the Government professors, skilled proficients in their own departments of knowledge. It is no impeachment of the high attainments of missionaries to admit this. The Government professor in his way is *homo unius libri;* the missionary has to ply many trades. Occasionally men are found, such as Duff and Wilson, like Saul, from their shoulders and upward higher than Government professors, but they must be rare. Dr. Smith's theories and glowing periods must be corrected with these matter-of-fact considerations.

Most assuredly, therefore, it should be the object of all Christian philanthropists, without regard to party considerations, to exert themselves in the new Parliament to call attention to a very serious danger affecting both the internal tranquillity of our Indian empire and also the progress of the Gospel. While we would urge, in the interest of the millions of India, the wide extension of elementary education, and would retain the universities as examining bodies in the hands of the State, with also special schools for medicine, law, and civil engineering, so far as may be requisite, we must earnestly advocate "free trade" in the question of colleges. This might or might not be helped with grants in aid.[2] It is sometimes supposed that there would

[1] "The Attitude of Educated Natives towards their own Religion and Christianity," by the Rev. R. Rajahgopaul. Madras: Addison. 1879.

[2] At a meeting of the syndicate of the university I (Bishop Cotton, an old schoolmaster and enthusiast for educational policy) expressed my hope that in time all the Government colleges, except the professional colleges, might be abolished, and the money devoted to a great enlargement of the grant-in-aid system, and to the development of the univer-

be great risk in this. But this is very doubtful. Education has made progress in India, but there are few who value it so highly that they will found colleges. They will squander lacs of rupees on stupid idolatry, but that is a different matter. When Dr. Duff's institution was in its full career the orthodox Hindus in alarm undertook to get up an anti-missionary college, to be free of charge, where the Hindu Shastras should be taught instead of the Bible. Those who spent annually £20,000 or £30,000 in religious festivals, after a twelvemonth's canvassing, could not raise £3,000 for the college; eventually it never was established. Where and from whom has the money come for the Mohammedan institution at Allygurh which, with a great flourish of trumpets, was announced some time ago? Will the Brahmins sacrifice a portion of their endowments and diminish their troops of harlots in order to found professorships in colleges? If, however, we are mistaken in this opinion, the institution of such colleges must be met like any other difficulty. It would be less in this respect, that they would lack the scale of Government prestige, now ostentatiously lent to secularity and infidelity. For our own part, unless there were overpowering means in the treasury of missionary societies, and an ample supply of highly gifted men of no ordinary stamp, we much doubt the efficacy of the Christian college. It can at best be but a clumsy and a costly instrument for the dissemination of Christianity. Corrupt motives of personal aggrandizement too frequently attract the students to the feet of the missionary; the attention of the missionary professor is distracted; an undue portion of his energies must be expended upon secular work.

We assert once more, then, that in the new Parliament just assembled it should be the business of all who have the welfare of our empire in India at heart to urge, upon grounds of policy and honesty, that the Education Despatch of 1854 should be carried out in the spirit intended by its authors. Sufficient impetus has already been given to high English education. There should be systematic withdrawal from colleges where, at a ridiculously small rate of payment, wealthy natives qualify themselves for Government situations. If they care for rank, power, influence, a share in the Government of their country, they know now how to attain it, and should qualify themselves as Englishmen do for corresponding functions at home and abroad. If, by the reversal of the "blind suicidal policy" too long persevered in, a way can be made for Christian colleges in fair competition with other similar institutions established by

sity, as the two legitimate (because at once central and indirect) organs of Government education. One member announced his entire acquiescence: another said, 'The time has not yet come'" (1861).—*Life of Bishop Cotton*, p. 283.

native munificence, well and good. The balance among them all might be held impartially by Government, and the most worthy in due course advanced. In that case there might be wisdom in maintaining the Christian college as the antidote to the native foundation. But however this might be, what is the duty of the Christian Church? How are the funds at the disposal of missionary societies to be most effectively employed? What should be the aim and the business of the Christian missionary? Dr. Wilson at the Allahabad Conference referred to the example of St. Paul. At Philippi Paul spoke "unto the women" by the river side. He "reasoned out of the Scriptures," in the synagogues at Thessalonica and Corinth, concerning Christ. He disputed with the Jews and others in the market at Athens, and delivered a remarkable discourse before the Areopagus at Athens. "Preaching," as Dr. Wilson observes, "in the senses just referred to, is the instrumentality which can be most generally used in India." Is it not also that which should be used? Confessedly the means for the evangelization of India are limited and inadequate. Should they not be concentrated on that which, so far as we can gather from the New Testament, is the one work of the heralds of the Cross, at any rate until churches are gathered out which should develop themselves as other churches have done? Even the splendid successes of Dr. Duff and kindred spirits under circumstances far more favourable than are now available should not confuse by their glamour. The failures, such as those of Bishop's College, are pitiable even to think of. Allusion has already been made to Bishop Cotton's statement, that Calcutta, under the influence of Dr. Duff's system, was much in the condition of Alexandria in the third century. Dr. Smith seems disposed to endorse this.[1] We think it was. But what says Canon Robertson upon this point? "In this period we find that Christianity and heathen philosophy, in preparing for a continuation of their struggle, adopt something of each other's armour;[2] and Alexandria—a city of which the intellectual character in connection with the origin of Gnosticism becomes the chief seat both of philosophical Christianity and reformed Paganism." Clement, who succeeded Pantænus in the catechetical school, held that "all learning may be sanctified and turned to good; that the cultivation of it is necessary in order to confute the sophistries of false philosophy." A study of the history of the catechetical school in Alexandria shows that while it flourished it was a very doubtful gain to Christianity. The history of the Brahma Somaj, corresponding in many points with the Neo-Platonism taught by Ammonius, once a Christian, in antagonism to the

[1] "Life of Duff," vol. i. p. 459. [2] 1 Sam. xvii. 38, 39.

catechetical school, is most striking. In this Alexandrian Neo-Platonism the Gospel found "the most subtle and formidable of its adversaries." It had strong attractions for disputatious persons rejoicing in the controversies of Christians with pagans, of orthodox with heterodox; but did it increase faith?

But Dr. Smith maintains, on the high authority of Mr. Burnell, that Brahminism remains untouched by missionary effort in South India to the present day. He holds, also, that the first fact forced on Dr. Duff was that, as against the Brahminism of Hindus, the prevailing missionary method (*i.e.*, preaching in chapels, in streets and villages; also, of course, in conversation and by tract and Bible distribution) had failed both in immediate results and self-developing power. This proves more than Dr. Duff would have cared to urge. It certainly is not in accordance with Dr. Wilson's experience. Some consideration may not be amiss. Now, it may be admitted as perfectly true that hitherto little impression has been made upon Brahminized Hinduism, which, of course, comprises the whole priesthood of India and all under their influence—generally speaking, the upper and dominant classes of the country as contrasted with the lower and subject races. But was it otherwise in the earliest annals of Christianity? The sign of the Lord Jesus Christ was "the poor have the Gospel preached to them." The experience of St. Paul was that "not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, were called." Have we reason to believe that it is or will be otherwise in the nineteenth century? "Have any of the rulers believed on Him?" is no new taunt in the history of Christianity. We might, too, ask whether what Dr. Smith aptly terms and condemns the "filtration process" of education from above to below is likely to be efficacious in the work of evangelization. It would be a reversal of the progress of the Gospel (unless we adduce such cases as the forcible conversions of Clovis and Charlemagne) if purely heathen nations are not permeated by it rather from below than from above, by the plain and simple preaching of the Gospel rather than by any more complicated machinery.

How, then, is Christianity to be successfully inculcated in India? We know of no other weapon than the "sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God." It was wielded fearlessly and ably by Dr. Duff and his compeers after their fashion. They arose and smote with it till their hands clave unto it. But can this be done now? On this point we have great doubts. Unless a speedy and efficacious remedy can be applied, we see nothing for it but reversion to the appointed Gospel means which are for all times and adapted to all circumstances. Colleges, like other human devices, may or may not occasionally be convenient methods for helping forward the Gospel, but "preaching," using

the term in its widest sense, never fails. "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." Beautiful are the feet of them that preach the Gospel of peace and bring glad tidings of good things. These tidings may be accepted by multitudes in one day, or may be brought home to individual souls intent upon the Scriptures. They may sink deep into the hearts of simple women, or, as in the case of Justin Martyr, may come home with power from some unknown teacher after all forms of philosophy have been tried in succession and in vain. In all cases, alike out of the Prophets and the New Testament, through the medium of prayer "the gates of light are opened." They yield to no other touch. It is with extreme reluctance, and contrary to our hopes, that we have come to the conclusion that it is useless for missionary bodies, unless there is a change of Government policy, to struggle against the overwhelming influence of Government wielding the resources of the empire. The "blind suicidal policy" now in full operation cannot be resisted by their efforts. If redress cannot be obtained by the force of public opinion in England, we can only conclude that the check which the college system in India has confessedly experienced after its brilliant outset has been providentially ordered to throw the churches of God back more exclusively upon His own appointed means of salvation. It was the dictum of the late Rev. H. Venn that missionary societies have in view "the conversion of adults and not the education of the heathen masses. "Not by might nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts." Preaching may be apparently foolishness; it may seem to be utterly in vain. Yet the seed is the Word of God. There is profound spiritual import in the parable of the sower, more than we can ever probably fathom, who scattered so much of it in such unpromising places and with no kind of results. Yet is not the function of the missionary the function of the sower? All we know is, that God's Word doth not return to Him void; that it accomplishes that which He pleases: and that it prospers in that whereto He sends it. The end cometh when the "Gospel of the Kingdom has been preached in all the world for a witness unto the nations."

GEORGE KNOX.

ART. IV.—RICHARD WALDO SIBTHORP.

Richard Waldo Sibthorp; a Biography told chiefly in his own Correspondence. With Appendix, containing Fragments of his Earlier Teaching. By the Rev. J. FOWLER, M.A., Chaplain-Warden of St. Anne's Bede House Charity, Lincoln. Skeffington and Son. 1880.

FEW and far between are those who can recall the early days of Richard Waldo Sibthorp's ministry in the Church of England, when he took rank among the most popular of the Evangelical clergy. He died at Nottingham last year at the ripe age of 86, having spent the last thirteen years of his life as a Roman Catholic priest in that town. Thus he was scarcely known, except by name, to the Churchmen of this generation. Mr. Fowler's biography, however, will be read with deep interest by all who study the workings of the human mind in matters of religion. Mr. Fowler has executed a very difficult task ably and conscientiously. But notwithstanding all the light which his book casts upon the problem of Sibthorp's strange career, it will still remain an unanswered question in the minds of many how it was that Sibthorp became a Romanist, and how it was that, having become a Romanist, he assumed and maintained a position so inconsistent with the spirit and character of the corrupt Church of his adoption. We can hardly resist the impression, indeed, that, had he not been a clergyman of good family connections, of popular talents, and of independent fortune, he would never have been admitted to Roman orders, or, at any rate, that he would not have been allowed to exercise his ministry a second time, when, after more than twenty years of separation, he again sought reconciliation with Rome. Mr. Fowler, viewing his subject from the standpoint of a decided High Churchman, thinks that Mr. Sibthorp's instability is traceable to his not having been properly instructed in Church principles in early life. He grew up to regard the Church of England, we read, merely as "the Establishment," and not as his spiritual mother to whom he owed dutiful allegiance. He was saturated with the anti-Popish literature which was current in those days, but he was never well grounded in the independent claims of the Church of England as a primitive branch of the Catholic Church. It may be admitted that Lincolnshire squires of the type to which his father, Colonel Humphry Sibthorp, belonged, did not usually take high views of the spiritual character and functions of the

Church of Christ; and that Lincolnshire afforded, at the beginning of the present century, but few examples of fervent piety among the upper classes within the pale of the English Church. But we doubt whether that Church, in whatever light it might have been presented to him, could ever have satisfied Mr. Sibthorp's mind. When a mere boy he was once found "kneeling at his prayers before a crucifix; and William Wilberforce, a friend of the family, is reported to have said to Colonel Humphry (with some other words of warning), 'That boy will become a Roman Catholic.'" Colonel Humphry certainly committed a grave mistake in receiving under his roof the Rev. Abbé Beaumont, a learned French priest, an exile, whom he met with when travelling in Germany. For although Richard "was but an infant at the time of the Abbé's stay at the Hall," it appears that "some years later, during his school vacations, he studied French under this distinguished professor;" and Mr. Fowler thinks it highly probable that the youth instituted mental contrasts between the saintly life of his tutor and the worldliness of the fox-hunting clergy in the neighbourhood of Canwick. Richard, it is true, "always denied" that the Abbé had been "in any way the cause of his Roman proclivities," but such was not the Colonel's opinion.

Richard's schooldays, in a private school at Eltham, in Kent, and at Westminster School, passed uneventfully. But in 1811, when a demy at Magdalen College, Oxford, "he used to attend the Roman Catholic chapel at St. Clement's surreptitiously;" and in the October term of that year, "he suddenly disappeared from Oxford, neither the college authorities nor the members of his family knowing for some time the place of his concealment." He spent two days at Wolverhampton with Bishop Milner, the author of that mischievous book, "The End of Controversy;" and from this place he wrote to his father: "If you or my mother wish to see me, you shall instantly;" "an offer of which Colonel Humphry took advantage on the moment, and sent his eldest son, Coningsby, with a detective, to bring home the wanderer." A correspondence which ensued between Colonel Humphry and Dr. Routh, the President of Magdalen, shows that the young man was duly penitent. In January, 1812, the restored demy wrote a letter of apology to Dr. Routh, in which he says:

> Allow me to assure you of the total change in my opinions, and of the entire eradication of every error in religion that I had suffered to take root in my mind; and, as I cannot recall what is past, permit me to hope that a steady continuance in the doctrines of the Church of England, in which I was first made a Christian, may prove the sincerity of my return to it.

Mr. Fowler observes, however, that "his feelings *at the time* are perhaps better described in his own words thus: 'I fled to

Bishop Milner in 1811, and was brought back a prisoner, sighing for St. Clement's.'"

In 1815, only four years after this flirtation with Rome, Richard Sibthorp began his clerical career as a decided Evangelical.[1] He was ordained by Dr. Tomline, Bishop of Lincoln; and he was successively curate of two Lincolnshire villages (Waddington and Harmston) in 1815; curate of St. Mary's at Hull, under the Rev. John Scott,[2] son of the Commentator, in 1817; vicar of Tattershall, in Lincolnshire, in 1819; minister in charge of Percy Chapel, St. Pancras, in 1825; assistant minister at St. John's, Bedford Row, with the Rev. Baptist Noel, in 1826; and incumbent of St. James', Ryde, in the Isle of Wight, in 1830. During the first five-and-twenty years of his ministry he seems to have enjoyed unbounded popularity as a preacher, accompanied by many tokens of spiritual success in the conversion of the careless and the building up of true Christians.

One still meets (says Mr. Fowler) with old persons, gentle as well as simple, who tell how that Richard Sibthorp had not merely crowds of admirers, but that among these were not a few individual souls whom he was the means of bringing back to God. . . . . Obligations are freely acknowledged by the individuals themselves of the benefit derived from some never-to-be-forgotten sermon, the subject of which has been their soul's comfort and stay during half a century of temptation.

Testimonies of the value of his ministry, from no mean judges, appear in this book. The venerable Vicar of Islington, referring to Sibthorp's sermons at St. John's, writes: "I remember well going to hear him when a young man. His sermons were always most able and full of thought." During the interval between his leaving London and his acceptance of the church at Ryde it appears that he resided at Oxford on his fellowship. Mr. Gladstone was then an undergraduate, and he furnishes the following reminiscences:—

In the years 1829 and 1830 I used to be invited by a Mr. Hanbury, then a gentleman commoner of St. Mary's Hall, to prayer meetings in his rooms, at which I have, if memory does not deceive me, met Mr. Sibthorp. I used frequently in summer to walk out from Oxford to

[1] Concerning his spiritual state from 1811 to 1815 little seems to be known. He was biassed, says Mr. Fowler, "towards the views of the more serious clergy," and he flung "himself on the crest of the rising wave of the Evangelical movement." It was his mother's wish that he should labour "under highly Evangelical guidance."

[2] "His popularity in the neighbourhood of Lincoln made rapid strides both among devout Churchmen and not less certainly with the religious Dissenters. 'The common people heard him gladly;' not so the Scribes and Pharisees of that time." . . . . "Wherever he preached the crowds followed; and one good vicar objected on this very account: 'such a throng of people' he said, 'made the church dirty.'"

a small chapel [Kennington Church] under Bagley Wood, to hear him preach in the evenings to a purely peasant congregation. . . . . I may mention an anecdote not without interest. For some purpose Mr. Sibthorp preached on a Sunday morning to the crowded congregation who attended the parish church of St. Ebbe's, under Mr. Bulteel. I heard the sermon, an Evangelical sermon of a genial type. Mr. Bulteel himself preached in the afternoon; and I well remember hearing at the time that he rebuked the error of saying that Christ died for all men, as in the morning his "brother Sibthorp" had mistakenly taught them.

I have nothing more of the Oxford Sibthorp than a soothing general recollection, a venerable visual image in the mind's eye, and a moral certainty that the preaching was, at the least, of singular grace and charm, which drew me again and again to walk some miles out of Oxford, where preaching was abundant, and *good* preaching was to be had.

It was during his ministry at Ryde, 1830–1841, that Mr. Sibthorp reached the height of his reputation and usefulness, and gradually underwent that downward and backward change of sentiment which led to his first formal secession to Rome. His preaching there exercised great influence, not only over the inhabitants of the Isle of Wight, but also over the many visitors who came annually to Ryde. His eloquence in the pulpit gained additional force from his assiduity in pastoral visitation and the consistent holiness of his life. "One speaks of his preaching as a real 'ministration of the Spirit,' it was so wonderfully set forth;" adding, however, that his own holy "walk and conversation" was, perhaps, even "more profitable than his preaching." "I was certainly much impressed with his earnestness and clearness," writes a clergyman, "in setting forth Gospel truth; and consider that I owe more to him than to any human teacher for what I hope I know of Evangelical religion." Mr. Fowler thinks that the year 1837 may be fixed on as being the time when the sad change began. A venerable friend of Mr. Sibthorp, who took a house at Ryde in order to have the benefit of his preaching, writes as follows:—

As regards Mr. Sibthorp's change of views, which led ultimately to his joining the Church of Rome, I do not feel competent to say much. They came upon him, I think, very gradually. Those who attended his Friday evening meetings were privy to his changing sentiments before they were made public from the pulpit. The first notice that I can remember of it was in his advocating very earnestly the unity of the Church, and insisting upon its necessity. "For how," said he, "could an Epistle be sent to the Church in Manchester? to whom could it be addressed?" I feel sure he had no idea that these views would lead him to Rome, for once, when he was maintaining some of them, I said to him, "If, sir, you honestly hold these views, they must lead you to Rome." He smiled and said, "You are much mistaken. I believe from prophecy that Romanism is to make head again, and that

this (the Puseyite) party is raised up to put it down."[1] With his adoption of these views he began an expensive adornment of his church, and the establishment of a surpliced choir, &c. &c.

About this time, also, he began to grope his way towards the fundamental error of Romanism—namely, that the Gospel of Christ is a republication of the Mosaic law. While engaged in a series of lectures on the Levitical law and institutions, he persuaded himself that "the Church under the Old Testament was a close type of the Church under the new." Accordingly, as might be expected, he was brought to the conclusion that "the Catholic Church, in communion with the see of Rome, stood forth the close and perfect antitype of the Church under the Old Testament." Secession was of course inevitable. How it came to pass Dr. Bloxam, his attached friend, thus narrates:—

About the middle of October, 1841, Mr. Sibthorp came suddenly to Oxford, and told me that he wished to consult Dr. Wiseman respecting a member of his congregation who was already, or was about to become, a seceder from the Church of England to that of Rome; and begged me to write and ask Dr. Wiseman to give him an audience. I did so, little suspecting what the result would be. The answer came, dated St. Mary's College (Oscott), festival of St. Peter Alcant (19th October), 1841. "Rev. and Dear Sir,—I shall be most happy to receive Mr. Sibthorp on the day you mention." Mr. Sibthorp went to Oscott, and returned to Oxford in a few days, looking worn and agitated, and no longer a member of the Church of England.

After hastily winding up his affairs at Ryde, he returned to Oscott to study for orders in the Roman Church. The eagerness with which he was welcomed by his new friends is shown by the rapidity of his promotion to orders. Having been received in October, 1841, by Bishop (afterwards Cardinal) Wiseman, he was ordained acolyth in December of the same year, and sub-deacon, deacon, and priest in the year following. But though outwardly a member of the Church of Rome, he was far too much of a Protestant to satisfy his co-religionists. When ordained in 1842 he was attached to the Cathedral Church of St. Chad's, Birmingham. An old friend who lived at Edgbaston at the time writes:—

He refused to live with the clergy, and took a small house, and spent his time chiefly in visiting the poor. He preached a great deal (taking into the pulpit with him a pocket Bible), and generally without a trace of Romanism; and he joined in few ceremonies. He was spoken of as the "spoilt convert," to retain whom much must be conceded.

[1] Mr. Fowler quotes from Mr. Gladstone's sketch of the Evangelical movement (in the *British Quarterly Review*, July, 1879) as to the "secret affinities which connected the Evangelical and the Oxford schools." Upon this point, we may remind our readers, Canon Garbett made some remarks in THE CHURCHMAN, October, 1879.

It is evident that he failed to find in Romanism the peace and contentment which he longed for. "The mental disquiet continued; and, to the dismay of his Roman Catholic friends, he finally left Edgbaston in June, 1843, and bought a cottage near St. Helen's (Isle of Wight), at which place and at Springfield he lived for about eighteen months." His rupture with Rome soon followed, and in a letter to the President of Magdalen, dated October 2, 1843, he expresses his regret for the step which he had hastily taken in joining the Church of Rome, and declares that he "verily regards" her as "an adulteress." In a letter addressed to the Rev. E. Bickersteth about the same time he says: "The conviction I am come to, after most painful deliberation, is that the Church of Rome is the harlot and Babylon in the Apocalypse. I believe her to be an adulteress, and idolatrous church, especially as it respects Mariolatry." Commenting on these assertions, Mr. Fowler says:—

> The almost arrogance of the *liberum arbitrium* which he allows himself is astonishing and unintelligible in a person of his childlike humility; till one recollects (what we have all along insisted on) that having at no time really recognized in the Church of England his *spiritual mother*, he had been, during his most active years of Christian growth, under influences which presented Christianity too much under the aspect of individualism, private judgment being the sole court of appeal.

After three years of retirement, Mr. Sibthorp sought from Bishop Sumner re-admission to the functions of a clergyman of the Church of England in the diocese of Winchester, but withdrew his application in consequence of that prelate's natural hesitation to admit him without some guarantee of his soundness in the faith.[1] At length, however, in December, 1847, the Bishop of Lincoln (Dr. Kaye) informed him that he was "at liberty to officiate and preach in the English Church as previous to his quitting her for that of Rome." The city of Lincoln thereupon became his place of abode, and he continued in Lincoln seventeen years. At the request of Bishop Kaye "he undertook the morning duty at St. Peter's-at-Arches, and for a short time added to this the single evening service at St. Martin's. His old popularity at once revived, and not a few citizens still remain under the spell of particular sermons preached by him." But his great work at Lincoln was the founding and endowing of St. Anne's Bede-House Charity," in memory of his mother. The objects of the charity "were to

[1] Bishop Sumner had heard that Mr. Sibthorp was in the habit of frequenting Roman Catholic services; his informant was a Roman Catholic priest. Dr. Bloxam, Fellow of Magdalen (now Vicar of Beeding, Sussex) mentions that Mr. Sibthorp did attend mass more than once.

be poor honest Lincolnshire folks (thirteen women and one man), communicants of the Church of England, and natives or twenty years residents in Lincoln" and the neighbourhood. To this undertaking he devoted the greater part of his fortune. The Bede-houses were completed in 1848, and the chapel was consecrated by Bishop Jackson in 1854. After alluding to the beauty of this chapel, Mr. Fowler proceeds :—

> But if the chapel was much, the chaplain himself was more. No one who ever attended a service there, conducted by Richard Sibthorp, could easily forget it. His marvellous reverence showed a man surrounded, indeed, by others, yet alone with God. It was not merely recollectedness, it was *absorption*. He breathed an atmosphere of prayer which attracted into it the colder devotional feelings of his fellow-worshippers. It was indeed a privilege to hear him pray our beautiful liturgy. . . . . But some came chiefly to hear the sermon, and they, too, had their reward. The fire of his youthful eloquence may be said, at least after 1858, to have died out. His sun in this respect had gone down, or was kept permanently under cloud; but there remained the soft tender lovely after-glow,—the pensive pleading persuasive style so well adapted for those among whom he ministered.

Nevertheless, Mr. Sibthorp was not happy at Lincoln, though "he seemed outwardly happy." He had known "Rome experimentally. He had seen her errors and excesses, and he had recoiled from them. But he had also tasted the sweets of her attractiveness—to him, rightly or wrongly, they *were* sweets—and the savour of these clung to his devout heart." But the chief cause of his unsettled state of mind while at Lincoln is best described in his own language :—

> I am actually an ordained priest (and this my last ordination) of the Roman Church, with all her obligations on me; excommunicate, not actually but virtually, every time that I officiate at the Holy Table in the Church of England; before God engaged to read her offices daily, an engagement not sunk into a mere verbal declaration, as that in the Prayer-book, but carried out to the letter by every one in her priesthood, the Pope himself not excepted.[1]

Thus it came to pass that in January, 1865, when he was seventy-two years of age, Mr. Sibthorp was received again, and for the last time, into the Church of Rome.

The final sphere of his labours in which, old as he was, he ministered for thirteen years, was the Roman Catholic cathedral of St. Barnabas, Nottingham. In that town he died. His

[1] From his constitutional tendencies, says Mr. Fowler in one passage, Mr. Sibthorp was always "prone to a religion of *fear*." Again, he says (p. 95), Mr. Sibthorp "lived and moved alone." At Lincoln "his morbid feelings greatly increased."

strange vacillation continued to the end; for when on his deathbed he received the Romish rite of extreme unction, and yet, by his own desire, he was buried in Lincoln cemetery, and the burial service of the Church of England was read over his grave by Mr. Fowler, who succeeded him as chaplain of St. Anne's.

Ably and faithfully as Mr. Fowler has executed his task, the devout reader will put the highest value on that part of this biography which sets forth the correspondence of Sibthorp. Half the volume consists of letters which he wrote during the years spent at Nottingham. These letters—written mostly to correspondents of "thoroughly Evangelical principles"—shine in the beauty of holiness. They show that, amid the melancholy and distracting changes of religious belief through which the writer passed, his heart was right with God. They bear out his own words, "I only want to get to Jesus." Few who read them will hesitate to concur with Bishop Jackson, who, on hearing the tidings of his last secession, wrote thus: "Well, in whichever communion, Richard Sibthorp will live and die a simple loving disciple of the Lord Jesus, and a saint of God."

It would be a pleasant task to dwell at large upon the testimony which these letters bear to the fervent piety of the writer; but we wish rather to regard them as illustrating the peculiar and exceptional character of Mr. Sibthorp's Romanism.

On a perusal of the letters, and indeed of this biography throughout, one thing that strikes us very forcibly is Mr. Sibthorp's utter lack of sympathy with the common type of a pervert to Rome from the Church of England, and with the Ritualistic party in general.

> The only persons [says Mr. Fowler] whom he met at Oscott (before or after his ordination) of whom he allowed himself to speak at all disparagingly, were the "verts," as they have been called, who soon began to arrive from Oxford. He marvelled at these men coming fresh from the profession of Anglican beliefs, but more Roman than the Romans themselves. They came prepared to teach, he thought, rather than to learn. His own mood was quite other than this. It was not the Rome of controversy which *he* sought; it was not the Rome of functions and ceremonies which was dear to him, but Rome appealing to his devotional instincts and drawing his soul nearer to God.

Writing to his friend Dr. Bloxam, he thus speaks of the vestments:—

> Copes and chasubles seem to be getting all at once into high favour. Nurse Gamp would have gloried in this fashion, and have enlarged her umbrella to protect the folds of her investiture. At York the exhibition of church decorative dress created quite a sensation, and

helped to send divers Protestant clergy to attend high mass at our chapel, to see, I suppose, how they looked on living shoulders and not on wooden frames.[1]

A second remarkable feature in Mr. Sibthorp's Romanism is, that he never showed any desire to make proselytes. At the time of his first secession a lady said to him, "Now you are in the Roman Catholic Church, I suppose you would wish us to follow you?" "No," he replied, "if you find peace where you are, do not leave your Church." The truth is, that Mr. Sibthorp's conception of the Church continued to the last to be Protestant rather than Romish. The correspondence furnishes abundant evidence that he held fast the distinction between visible churches and the mystical body of Christ, and that he recognized in all who loved his Lord members of the one true Church. Thus, in a letter to Mr. Fowler he writes:—

Our blessed Lord did not overlook or put out of sight the distinction of the Jews and the Samaritans; but he even seemed to love to elevate the latter out of the prejudices against them, by his frequent introduction of them in his parables, &c. And I can say truly that a Wesleyan, or Baptist, or Independent, who loves Christ in his heart and life, is as dear to me as a Roman cardinal or an Anglican bishop, though I don't put out of my mind the differences by which one and another are separated, or look on them as immaterial.[2]

A third point to be noticed is the respect and affection with which Mr. Sibthorp regarded the Church of England, not only as a true Church, but as the Established Church of this land.[3] In a letter to Dr. Bloxam he writes:—

I believe the existence of the monarchy, constitution, and welfare of England, is dependent on the continued Church Establishment. I care not who hears me say so. I am quite alive to the defects of that Established Church; but I am also alive to her excellencies. And I will not coquette with any who are seeking, overtly or covertly, to overthrow her. She is a national and grand—not faultless—but still a very valuable witness to Christ and Christianity. . . . . And

[1] Concerning the notorious Mr. Tooth, he writes: "Foolish Church of England! to be tearing her own bowels while beasts of prey are waiting to feed on them. I refer to such men as Tooth."

[2] To Dr. Bloxam he writes: "Whatever makes us cherish union with Jesus cannot but be a blessing. It is on this account I so much value the writings of Baldwin Brown (an eminent Nonconformist minister). They are, in my poor experience, helps to this, in the beautiful view they give of God as our Father in Christ. I am not at all ashamed or afraid to seek and get good from Dissenters."

[3] In a letter to an old Ryde friend Mr. Sibthorp says: "Democratic fancies have, I fear, sunk deep into our manufacturing and even agricultural districts. The Nonconformists, ignoring the better principles of a past generation, . . . are madly intent on pulling down the Established Church."

the High Church clergy are fools if they do not see that in positive clear Church-conservatism is their own security.[1]

A fourth peculiarity to be noticed in Mr. Sibthorp's Romanism is that he encouraged the members of his flock at Nottingham to read the Scriptures. He writes thus: "Catholics, frightened by the Protestant abuse of the reading of the Bible, don't read it at all, comparatively. I warn against this error, and give away the Douay New Testament; and many value it much." And again, alluding to his last literary undertaking, on which he was then engaged—namely, "Daily Bread; being Morning Meditations for a Year, for the use of Catholic Christians"—he writes: "The little publication I am preparing gives me some work for the mind. I mean it as a sort of daily bread. I want to lead our Catholic people into some knowledge of, and reflection on, Scripture truth; and not to be content with saying over the rosary and being present at mass and benediction: but to cultivate that knowledge of which St. Paul so marvellously instructs us in 1 Cor. ii."

The last peculiarity which we shall mention in Mr. Sibthorp's Romanism, as clearly manifested in these letters, is his grave divergence from the Church of Rome on the subject of purgatory and the intermediate state. The catechism of the Council of Trent declares purgatory "to be a *place*, not merely a state, of suffering — not merely, therefore, of internal suffering, but also of external inflictions. The same catechism also tells us that it is a fire, *ignis purgatorius*, so called to distinguish it from the eternal fire or Gehenna, the place of punishment of damned spirits."[2] Had Mr. Sibthorp been in harmony with Rome on this subject, he could not have written as he did with respect to the many deaths of friends, "heretics" be it remembered, mentioned throughout this correspondence. For example, in a letter of condolence addressed to the sister of Dr. Maurice, he says:—

I don't suppose that I am forgotten by him, and I do not forget him.

[1] The following extract will be interesting in its bearing on the present movement to remove the Bishops from the House of Lords:—"I consider the Ritual party in the Anglican Church to be infatuated men, wrenching, if it be permitted them, the Anglican Church to pieces, and trying to foist upon her much to which she is repugnant altogether. And I too much desire her good to take part with those who, without designing it, are imperilling her. As all states, governments, and kingdoms are of God's appointment, and under the rule of Christ, so Christianity should superintend and influence all that such states, governments, and kingdoms do. Therefore, I would have the heads of Christ's Church in Parliament. If the Church of England is disestablished, this their voice in State matters is silenced; as to which position of things, I say, God forbid it!"

[2] "Philpott's Letters to Butler," p. 60.

If we are both members of the Lord's body, as I sometimes—not always—hope that I am, we still meet in Him, and continually; but the evils that affect and disease me do not and cannot touch him: Milman's beautiful hymn applies to him—

> "Brother, thou art gone before,
> And thy saintly soul hath flown
> Where tears are wiped from every eye,
> And sorrow is unknown."

Is it so? Then we need not mourn for him. But we need to magnify that Saviour to whose dying love for us all this grace and blessedness are owing.

In like manner he writes of Dr. Jeremie, late Dean of Lincoln, as being "while I write, in a close intercourse with the blessed loving Saviour;" of Mr. Quilter as having "entered into *rest*;" and of another old friend as having, "at the ripe age of eighty-two, passed beyond the porch into the building, the 'house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.'"

With such sentiments as these we are not surprised to learn that Mr. Sibthorp's life at Nottingham was to a great extent separate and solitary. The clergy of the Church of England, not unnaturally, stood aloof from him, while the growing Ultramontanism of his own communion,[1] which received so great an impulse from the promulgation of the dogma of infallibility in 1870, caused a widening breach of sentiment and sympathy between himself and his co-religionists. The last letter which we shall quote is also the last which Mr. Sibthorp addressed to his frequent correspondent, Dr. Bloxam:—

I wish to express to you my entire and decided disapproval of Dr. Newman's last step, "the Cardinal's hat." Oh! it is a very sad step. I don't mince the matter. You may let him know it. "Whatever you do, do not be tempted to leave your present position," is the closing advice of your old friend. I see how the wind blows, but do not blow with it. Grace be with you.

Mr. Fowler's comment on this letter is so weighty that we give it in full:—

"Whatever you do, do not be tempted to leave your present position!" These are the strongest words which Mr. Sibthorp ever used on this subject. And they show most touchingly that the disillusion was—shall we not say it?—complete. That which he had sought, and fancied he had found, in Rome, fails him at the last. For in truth the Rome he had loved, and so persistently sought after, was really no

[1] He objected strongly to popular Mariolatry, finding Cardinal Manning's arguments unsound, "that Catholics don't put the Blessed Virgin on an equality with Christ, because they teach their children to say, 'Jesus Mary.' Who does not see that one name must be pronounced first? And it would be monstrous to put Mary first."

more. Even post-Tridentine Rome had passed away, and given place to the Rome of the Vatican dogma. And now Vaticanism hangs like a cloud over his dying hours, and, as regards churches and systems, he feels every prop and stay falling away from him. To accept all that he understood by Ultramontanism would have cost him his soul; but he finds that, without such an article in his creed, he must be content to die, as he had lived, apart, and without much active sympathy. And yet, perhaps, we ought not to feel surprised at such a result. The Ultramontanes teach that without the absolute prostration of private judgment and opinion before the decisions most recently arrived at by the Roman Court and the Roman Pontiff, there is, to say the least, great peril as regards salvation. Mr. Sibthorp never did believe this, and yet, led by liturgical and devotional preferences, he had deliberately chosen to be a Roman Catholic. Now, then, he has to learn, even at the gates of death, that Rome was not the place for such converts. And hence he who, during life, had refused to make proselytes, appears now, at death, warning his oldest friend against a step which, now at all events, *he* seems to repent of.

The perusal of this painfully interesting biography will lead many to magnify the grace of God which prevented and followed his true-hearted but erring servant amid his repeated wanderings from the truth; but such will also sorrowfully reflect how much more happy, how much more useful he might have been, had he adhered to that pure faith of the Gospel which he preached in the days of his early ministry.

Art. V.—THE JESUITS AND THEIR ASSAILANTS.

1. *Die verderbliche Moral der Jesuiten.* O. Andrea. Ruhrort. 1865.
2. *Doctrina Moralis Jesuitarum.* Celle. 1873.
3. *Der Jesuiten-Orden.* J. Huber. Berlin. 1873.
4. *The Jesuits.* W. C. Cartwright. (Articles in the *Quarterly Review.* 1874.)
5. *Remarks on a Late Assailant of the Society of Jesus.* London: Burns & Oates. 1875.
6. *Discours devant la Chambre des Députés.* P. Bert. Paris. 1879.

THE expulsion of the Jesuits from Germany in consequence of the Falk Laws, and the more recent action of the French Government in the same direction, offer very instructive material to the student of ecclesiastical history. Examining, one by one, the various counts in the indictment against the Society of Jesus, and eliminating those which do not survive the test of dis-

passionate analysis, two charges of importance alone remain, namely:—

I. That the Jesuits are actively opposed to the existing system of political and religious equality.

II. That they have never abandoned the relaxed moral principles so long identified with their teachings.

With the former of these topics we do not propose to deal. It has been sufficiently demonstrated that there is perfect solidarity between the Society of Jesus and the rest of the Roman Catholic Church upon the questions of toleration and religious education. Both base their claim for a share in public teaching upon the principle of liberty, and both admit that they would reject the same plea should they ever obtain the upper hand.[1] Nothing can be more candid than this confession. Accordingly, if opposition to religious equality and the "principles of the Revolution" is to be suppressed, that suppression must logically embrace the whole body of opponents and not a part only. But an examination of the polemical literature of the controversy, and especially of the speeches of M. Paul Bert before the Chamber of Deputies last year, and of M. Ferry before the Senate, makes it abundantly manifest that the real point of conflict is upon the old battle-field of Pascal and Arnauld. If any doctrine is *distinctly Jesuitical*, according to popular opinion, it is that lax morality and hyper-ingenious casuistry which have procured for the names of Bauny, Sanchez, Escobar, and Lessius, so unenviable an immortality. And if a *catena* can be proved to exist from these writers to Moullet and Gury in modern times, is there not ample reason for separate action against a Society which, so far from disavowing these individual teachers, numbers them among its brightest ornaments?

The literature of this controversy is already so vast that it makes a library by itself, and yet hardly one of the writers has succeeded in approaching it from a completely scientific standpoint.[2] Such an attempt, in Germany or France, at the present time, it would perhaps be unreasonable to expect. But in England, where the name of Jesuit no longer carries with it

[1] Or, as M. Veuillot epigrammatically put it: "We claim liberty *from* you, because it is your principle; and we should refuse it *to* you, because it is not ours." That the Roman Church utterly rejects the notion of any compromise with modern culture was made clear in the *Syllabus* of 1864: "Anathema to whomsoever shall say that the Pope can and may reconcile himself with progress, Liberalism, and modern civilization." The action of the Vatican Council in no way abandoned this position.

[2] Reuchlin, in his "Pascal's Leben" (Tüb. 1840), and "Geschichte von Port-Royal" (Hamb. 1839), left nothing to be desired in impartiality of spirit. But the omission of a due examination of early casuistical literature militated against the accuracy of his conclusions.

terror and apprehension, the time seems ripe for a sober examination of the two following questions:—

(*a.*) Whether the Jesuits were really the founders of lax morality?

(*b.*) What is the nature and value of the pleas urged in behalf of their casuists?

All who are acquainted with the history of moral philosophy are aware that not only the germs, but the distinct statement of the doctrine of Probability, are contained in the writings of the Schoolmen.[1] Scholastic philosophy, indeed, brought the casuistical method with it inevitably. It was obviously necessary to contrive some solution to reconcile or account for the innumerable discrepancies between the *dicta* of confessors. The Pope could not possibly regulate all cases of conscience, nor could he provide books which could anticipate them. Accordingly, when A and B gave conflicting decisions about the moral quality of the same action under the same circumstances, it was declared that, since each of these decisions was *probable*, according to the judgment of its author, it might safely be followed by others in practice. And if once a basis of moral heteronomy be admitted, it is impossible to refute the logic of this consequence.

The first writer of eminence who expressly lays down the principle of Probability is Cardinal Antonino, a distinguished writer of the fifteenth century, canonized by his Church, and always regarded as one of the highest authorities on questions of morals.[2] He points out, in the introduction to his treatise upon the Conscience, that differences had prevailed in the *dicta* of the greatest teachers, even concerning matters necessary to salvation.[3]

---

[1] Perhaps the best *résumé* will be found in Wuttke's "Handbuch der Christlichen Sittenlehre" (Berlin, 1861), vol. i. The scholastic treatment of ethics is but scantily noticed in most English textbooks.

[2] S. Antonino (de Forciglione), born 1389 at Florence, died 1459. Archbishop of Florence, 1445. Took part in the Council of 1458. Canonized under Pope Adrian VI., in 1523. Of his many works a small popular treatise on Confession, known as the *Defecerunt*, from the first word, was published repeatedly in Latin and Italian. A larger *Summa*, in 4 vols. folio, appeared in 1478, and the whole of his works were reprinted in the last century by Mamachi and Remadellu, at Florence (8 vols. in folio, 1741).

[3] Among numerous instances he mentions the following: "B. Thomas *in IV.* (that is, in his Commentary upon the fourth book of Lombard's *Sentences*) holds that it is not needful for one who has lapsed into mortal sin to make confession forthwith, except in certain most rare cases, and Richardus agrees with him. But Hugo de S. Victor and B. Bonaventura hold the opposite opinion. Now the sanctity and learning of all these teachers are known to the Church: and the opinion of neither side is condemned. *Yet that of B. Thomas is more commonly followed, although it seems less secure.* And so innumerable examples may be cited."—Antonin. *Summa Summarum*, pars i. tit. 3, c. 10, *de Conscientia*, sec. 10.

It is obvious that such a principle as this, and the practical consequences deducible from it, are identical with the more elaborated system to be found in the later Jesuit authors. Nouet, when replying to Pascal's "Lettres Provinciales" in 1657, had no difficulty in showing one flaw in the indictment—viz., in the accusation of having invented the doctrine of Probability.

"All men know," he wrote, "that there are moral maxims of two sorts: firstly, those concerning which all Casuists are agreed, because they are made certain either by the distinct voice of Scripture or the universal consent of the Church; secondly, those on which the opinion of writers is divided, and which can only be called *probable*. . . . . As to the latter, it is permitted to every one to select out of conflicting decisions that which pleases him best (*celle qui luy plaist davantage*), provided that it is really probable, that is, if it includes the following four notes established by Suarez.[1] Firstly, it must not run counter to any truth universally accepted in the Church. Secondly, it must be in agreement with common sense. Thirdly, it must be based upon some good authority (*appuyée d'une authorité sans reproche*). Fourthly, if it has not the approval of the majority of doctors, it must not be an opinion generally abandoned."[2]

It may be remarked, in passing, that Nouet's definition is of that which passes, technically, by the name of *Probabiliorismus*, and that the *dicta* of Escobar, Bauny, and others, whom he defended, could hardly stand the test of the four "notes." But on the main and fundamental question he is not only at one with Aquinas and Antonino, but even with so vigorous an anti-Jesuit as Jacques de Sainte-Beuve,[3] as will be seen from the following decisions:—

CAS. 166: R. "It is beyond all doubt that . . . one may follow a merely probable opinion in what concerns only human law."

CAS. 27: Q. "May absolution be given to a penitent who has a probable opinion? R. The Confessor must absolve a penitent who adduces an opinion not in his (the Confessor's) judgment absolutely untenable."

It may excite wonder that the Jesuits themselves, instead of making futile charges of inaccuracy against their assailants, did not more often resort to this obvious and decisive defence. As a matter of fact, the only writer who systematically attempted it, De Moya (under the pseudonym of Amadeus Guimenius, in 1680), was promptly censured and silenced both by the Sorbonne

[1] He refers to Suarez, disp. xii. *de bon. et malit.* sec. 6.

[2] "Vingtième Imposture," p. 12. These pamphlets, now very rare, are sometimes to be met with bound up with the 8vo edition of the "Provinciales," of which a specimen may be seen in the British Museum.

[3] Who was deprived of his chair of theology, and inhibited from preaching, in 1657, on account of his opposition to the censure of Arnauld. His "Résolutions de Plusieurs Cas de Conscience" were reprinted in 1705.

and at Rome.[1] The Church of Rome had begun to feel the real power of public opinion, and seemed not averse to allow the Society of Jesus to act as scapegoat, while continuing to benefit by the same system. And the Jesuits themselves, partly by *esprit de corps*, partly from a sort of vanity in their exaggerations of scholastic subtlety, were equally disposed to face the attack, and to claim sole proprietorship in the new morality.

Protestant controversialists, with one exception, were misled by this, and by their own scanty knowledge of the earlier development. Only Du Moulin, in his famous treatise upon the "Traditions of the Church," went directly to the fountainhead, and it will be seen that he censured precisely those laxities in the ancients which Pascal, a generation later, denounced in the writings of the Jesuits.[2]

It being clear, then, that the germ of nearly all Jesuit teaching is to be found in the pages of earlier writers, it remains to be seen whether the Society confined itself to a mere development of these existing principles, or whether they contributed any independent factors of their own to which the term "Jesuitical" can be legitimately applied. Hundreds of passages from Bauny, Escobar, and others, have been repeatedly quoted, which revolt the moral sense more than anything which could be adduced from writers of any other school. But, upon analysis, the decisions in question are resolved into simple propositions based upon an abundance of what is called authority in the Roman Church. It is not difficult, indeed, to understand the process by which the callousness and almost cynicism was acquired in dealing with delicate and painful topics. There is an unconscious as well as a conscious prurience, which induces men who lead retired lives to affect and seek knowledge in such subjects. And it is reasonable as well as charitable to suppose that many of these writers had no more unworthy motive than vanity in executing these dialectical *tours de force*. It was like a contest between mariners who should most nearly sail against the wind, or nearer to dangerous rocks without shipwreck. And it must be confessed that shipwreck, in the sense of a Papal condemnation, was by no means an exceptional catastrophe.[3]

[1] See Guimenius ad Innocent. xi. Pont. Max. Romæ, 1680, fol.; also "Avis à l'auteur d'un libelle," Paris, 1689. The censured doctrines will be found in the Abbé Boileau's "Recueil de diverses pièces."

[2] For instance, he quotes from Aquinas and Antonino the very same *dictum* with regard to restitution of immoral gains which Lessius reproduced. (See Thom. Summ. ii. 2. qu. 32, n. 7; and Antonin. p. ii. tit. 2, c. 5.) And from Navarre the doctrine that a man may be counselled to commit a small sin to avoid a greater one. (Navarre, lib. iii. *Consil de voto*, cons. 36, n. 2). This pernicious maxim was repeated by Vasquez.

[3] Notably by Alexander VII. in 1660, though no casuists were mentioned

One class of decisions, however, must be left solely to the discredit of the Society, as being the outcome of a principle which was never admitted by any other body. This was in morally and theologically legalizing the gulf of caste between the *noblesse* and the peasants, thus borrowing the prejudices of society, and placing them in a setting of religious sanction.[1] The same error is seen in the virtual condonation of duelling which excited the indignation of Pascal.

Although, as has been seen, the real foundation of Jesuit laxity was so little understood that even a Jeremy Taylor, in his "Ductor Dubitantium," repeatedly blames the effect while approving the cause, yet the moral sense of mankind from the very first had risen in revolt. Passing over the onslaughts of Antoine Arnauld the elder (1594), Etienne Pasquier, in his "Catéchisme des Jésuites" (1602), and Saint-Ayran's annihilating criticism of Garasse (1626), the first exhaustive and direct attack upon the ethical teaching of the Jesuits was in the anonymous volume published in 1644 with the title, "La Théologie Morale des Jésuites." This work was compiled, there can be little doubt, by the recluses of Port Royal, Arnauld very probably acting as editor. It is remarkable that no literary critic of recent times has noticed that the "Théologie Morale" furnished Pascal not only with the materials, but even with the arrangement of them, in the "Provincial Letters."[2] All the topics in controversy, Probability, Direction of Intention, Equivocation, with their practical applications, were illustrated by a long series of quotation from Jesuit writers. A large portion of the concluding part of the work dealt with the theories broached by Cellot (in his "De Hierarchia") and the English Jesuits on the subject of the authority of bishops, to which Pascal only cursorily alludes. The war was continued throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in a series of campaigns in which the Jesuits, after the first victories over Arnauld, continuously lost ground. We have already noticed the two Bulls in which their relaxed doctrines were censured by Alexander VII. and Innocent XI., although no names were

by name, and Innocent X. in 1679; not to mention the decisions in the cases of Palafox and Tournon, and the *coup d'état* of 1773.

[1] Garasse, for instance, laid down the following doctrine:—

"When a gentleman strikes a peasant, this is a sin of anger which does not come into consideration (*qui n'entre pas en considération*). But if a peasant or a man of low extraction (*un homme de néant*) should have the audacity to strike a gentleman, the offence can only be expiated by his death."—*Somme*, livre ii. p. 194.

[2] Pascal appears to have also derived his amusing quotations from the *Imago primi sæculi* from Saci's "Enluminures," as well as some effective points drawn from the admissions of Petau in his treatise "Sur la Pénitence Publique."

directly specified. Not even the strong dislike to the Jansenists entertained by Louis XIV. could counteract the pressure of public opinion and the tacit hostility of the Gallicans. In 1667 Perrault compiled, or rather re-edited, the quotations of Arnauld and Pascal, under the title, "Morale des Jésuites, extraite fidèlement de leurs livres;" and a still more bulky collection was published from 1669 to 1694, in eight large volumes, chiefly by Arnauld, who thus carried on the war from his exile. Even this was eclipsed, in the following century, by the vast collection known as the "Recueil des Assertions," drawn up by order of the Parliament from 1759 to 1762. Simultaneously with these onslaughts appeared the "Apologies" of Daniel (1690) and Cerutti (1762). The restoration of the Jesuits in 1815 was accompanied by a resumption of hostilities, in which the publication, by the historian K. H. von Lang, of the "Amores Marelli," was perhaps the most significant episode.[1]

Coming to recent times, it remains to notice the crusade of MM. Libri, Quinet, Michelet, and Lerminier, in 1843, partly in lectures, partly in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. Almost at the same time appeared the attacks of Ellendorf and Wild in Germany, and of Gioberti in Italy. The apologetic history of Crétineau-Joly can hardly be said to have carried off the honours of war, reserved for Ravignan on a later occasion. The German *Culturkampf* (1873–?) brought forth Huber's History of the Jesuits, together with a republication of the most damaging quotations from ancient and modern casuists, under the title "Doctrina Moralis Jesuitarum" (1874). Even in England a wave of the same current was felt in the joust, more literary than theological, between Mr. Cartwright and his brilliant although anonymous opponent.[2] But in all, or nearly all, of these works, the reader is fatigued by an iteration of the same quotations, often, obviously, from second or third hand, on the one side, and by apologies, irrelevant or self-contradictory, on the other. The assailants do not go to the root of the matter by examining the principles out of which the laxity of the Casuists was derived; the defenders, with some bright and conspicuous exceptions, instead of boldly pleading the authority of Aquinas, Antonino, Navarre, and Carlo Borromeo, prefer to urge pleas which do not deserve the name of arguments. The Abbé

[1] It was a Report, found in the Munich Archives, originally furnished by the Jesuit Superior, and therefore evidence of unexceptionable character. It appears that the miserable culprit persuaded his victims by aid of the casuistical plea: *licere ista omnia, modo absit consensus in voluptatem.*

[2] The articles, which originally appeared in the *Month*, were published separately afterwards. The felicity of the motto, *De secta hac notum est nobis quod ubique ei contradicitur*, is remarkable.

Maynard, for instance, declared that Escobar and his colleagues dealt merely with a totally imaginary state of society, or a state of nature.[1] It is hardly possible to receive such an assertion seriously. For what does it amount to? A man living in the seventeenth century (let us suppose) had an enemy who was slandering him. He wanted to know how he should act. Hearing that a certain Father Amico had published a very popular book of morals, he purchases it, reads in it that he may justifiably kill his adversary, and follows the advice.[2] Surely such a person would have had a right to complain if, upon appealing for justification to his mentor, he was suddenly informed that all this elaborate machinery of rules and distinctions had nothing to do with the actual world and society! We may safely conclude that if Escobar had announced this on the title-page of his books, Pascal would not have criticised its *thirty-sixth* edition.

This fact alone disproves another plea sometimes advanced—namely, that the errors of the Casuists were simply the paradoxes of a few obscure writers. Escobar's treatise, it has been mentioned, had reached its 36th edition in 1651.[3] The "Aphorisms" of Emanuel Sa, and the "Medulla" of Busembaum, were even more eagerly read. The treatises of Laymann, Filliucci, Caramuel, Bauny, Amico, Lessius and Diana, had all been repeatedly reprinted. The notorious treatise of Sanchez *De Matrimonio* was to be found everywhere, and had received the express sanction of Pope Clement VIII., who called it "*the most complete and perfect treatise upon its subject.*"[4] It is alleged, also, on behalf of these writers (as it has been urged recently, in similar cases even by writers of the Church of England), that their works were only intended for confessors, and that there can be no more evil in treating fully upon the circumstances of sin than in furnishing similar details in a treatise of medical jurisprudence. But, in the first place, it may be remarked that this plea simply begs the question as to whether there is the intimate analogy here implied between medicine and theology—*i.e.*, whether a corrupt heart is as helpless without a human surgeon

---

[1] "Pascal, sa vie et son œuvre." Paris, 1850.

[2] "Cursus Theolog." v. disp. 36, sect. 5, n. 118 (p. 544, ed. Douai, 1640).

[3] The full title of this edition is as follows: "Liber Theologiæ Moralis, viginti-quatuor Soc. Jesu doctoribus reseratus: quem R. P. Antonius de Escobar et Mendoza, ejusdem Sociætatis socius, in examen Confessariorum digessit. Post 32 editiones hispanicas et 3 lugdunenses editio novissima." Bruss. 1651. 8vo.

[4] "Tous le reçurent avec admiration et reconnaissance, comme une source merveilleuse de doctrine; tous répétèrent avec Clément VIII. qu'il n'y avait aucun ouvrage sur cette matière si achevé et si parfait." —Maynard, *Notice des auteurs Jésuites citès dans les Provinciales*, in his ed. of the L. Pr. ii. 467.

as a broken leg? In the second place, it must be asserted that very many of these books were written in the vernacular, and expressly for the public. The official approbation of Escobar states its fitness *publicis usibus*. And an equally notorious treatise by Tamburini, "Methodus Confessionis," has upon its title-page the words, "*tam pro confessariis quam pro pœnitentibus*."

But no excuses of this sort, however ingeniously or indignantly they may be urged, can avail to clear the Jesuits from the accusation of having published books dangerous to morality. We have shown that they were only carrying out, with logical exactitude, the premises laid down by their predecessors. But they had no right to be logical, or rather that is no excuse, if these conclusions from Roman principles led to the results which Bossuet, in the Assembly of 1700, described as "monstrous errors," and which two Popes anathematized, after the moral sense of mankind had already pronounced sentence. And sincerity of purpose is no defence for a book, though it may partially screen its author. Every writer of this class has pleaded that he wished to benefit mankind by laying bare social sores, and has indignatly denounced his critics. Even the vilest of erotic scribblers have said the same. Who can gainsay them? The motive may have been the purest, but the effect of the book upon the public mind has to be judged apart, and by this standard alone the Casuists must stand or fall.

It has been abundantly demonstrated that some of the most dangerous maxims are still published in works bearing episcopal approbations, and are taught in French seminaries. M. Paul Bert established his case in a series of speeches likely to outlive the controversy which gave them birth, and which only suffered from the absence of any opponent in the *Chambre des Députés* capable of entering the lists against him.[1] The orators of the Right and Right Centre only contributed, by their exclamations and interruptions, to enhance the overwhelming effect of the arguments brought to bear in favour of the Bill. M. Bert had only to remind them that the Jesuits had been expelled from the country by the *Ancien Régime*, and excluded from a share in secondary education even under Charles X., in order to refute the assertion that Republicans alone were hostile to the Society.[2] He could quote the authority of the Duc de Broglie, the friend and contemporary of Guizot, against that of his son and successor.

---

[1] The able speeches of MM. Dufaure and Jules Simon in the Senate against clause 7 of the Ferry Bill in no way traversed this portion of M. Bert's accusation, but rested solely upon the Constitutional argument.

[2] The latter measure was introduced by the Villèle Ministry, and was enthusiastically welcomed by public opinion at the time.

But it was in his quotations from the writings of Jesuit teachers, authorized by their Superiors, and actually used in the work of instruction, that he roused the feelings of his hearers and silenced his opponents. From the latter he could have desired no more efficient aid than by their first blank denials, and then their naïve exclamations that such writers must be insane, or could not be Jesuits.[1] M. Bert clearly proved that very many of the old enormities of Escobar and Bauny were at the present day in full authority, and his guarded quotations from current books of so-called devotion revealed even more startling aberrations from the rules of wisdom and true piety. A Bossuet or a Fénélon would have been horror-struck at the pernicious stuff which French priests are found to write, and French bishops to sanction, for the use of the young.

But even M. Bert's logic did not escape the old fallacy which we have demonstrated in the case of his predecessor. Although admitting that the whole hierarchy has not only accepted but boasts solidarity with the Jesuits, although he adduced passages as reprehensible from the works of non-Jesuit authors,[2] yet his whole argument culminated in a denunciation of the Society alone. He did not perceive that his facts pointed to a far different conclusion. He did not realise, nor did any other speaker on that occasion, that the evil, the symptoms of which he had so clearly enumerated, was no mere excresence which might be excised, but a radical and constitutional disease, and that its cause must be sought, not in the Society of Jesus, but in the whole system and principles of the Roman Catholic Church. It would be unjust to assert that reasons of party policy have caused the French Government to make a

---

[1] M. Paul Bert—"M. de la Bassetière me reproche d'habiller tout cela: je vais le lire tout nu. (Très-bien! très-bien à gauche.—Lisez! lisez!)

M. du Bodan (a Member of the Right)—"Ce n'est pas possible : il y a des dames dans les tribunes!

M. Paul Bert—Je le reconnais, et de là viennent toutes mes hésitations; mais avouez que c'est une situation étrange que de se trouver en présence d'un auditoire d'adultes, et de ne pas oser y lire ce qui est fait et écrit pour être lu par une jeune personne, M. du Bodau." (The book in question was "Méditations selon la Méthode de S. Ignace Sur la Vie et les Mystères de N.S.J.C." 4 vols. 1867.)

[2] Moullet, although often quoted as a Jesuit author, but was not a member of the Society, although he taught ethics at the College of Fribourg for some years. M. Paul Bert himself admitted "*que le monde Catholique tout entier s'est rallié aux idées, aux doctrines Jesuitiques*" (Discours, p. 66). But his conclusion—"*par conséquent, lorsque nous trouvons ces doctrines exprimées par un membre d'une congrégation quelconque on du clergé séculier, nous avons le droit de dire : ce sont des doctrines Jésuitiques !*"—is precisely the converse of that which history has proved.

distinction which they do not believe to exist. In politics, an empirical treatment which ignores all but patent facts is sometimes the highest justice, because least liable to the possibility of error. No doubt can be cast upon the strict legality, although possibly upon the expedience, of the final course by which, in accordance with laws constitutionally passed and never yet repealed, the members of unauthorised Congregations have been expelled. The Jesuits share the condemnation of other illegal associations. If they have met with more severe treatment than the main body, it is simply the result of their self-chosen policy and of their more avowed hostility to the established Government. But while recognising that the cry for liberty comes with an ill grace from those who have always thwarted it, the student must feel that, in principle, no difference either of teaching or practice can be attributed solely to the Society of Jesus. Its members have only carried to inexorable conclusions the premises of the whole Church. A Jesuit is simply a logical Romanist.

JOHN DE SOYRES.

ART VI.—REMARKS UPON A SERMON

Preached before the University, and published in "The Cambridge Chronicle," on the Right Use and Interpretation of Scripture.

WE all, I suppose, recognise the right and the duty—the right in respect to his fellow-men, and the duty in respect to God—of every individual to exercise his own independent judgment in the interpretation of Scripture; and therefore we ought not to harshly condemn, nor attempt to authoritatively silence, any one because his opinions appear to us erroneous and dangerous. But while every one is justified in forming and defending his own interpretation of a passage of Holy Writ, no one, when propounding what he knows to be contrary to the doctrine of many who are highly esteemed in the Church, is justified in charging those who differ from him with ignorance, or prejudice, or party spirit. Yet this is by no means uncommon with men of a certain theological, philosophical, and critical school, who frequently speak and write upon subjects of controversy in an arrogant tone, as though they only had understanding, and it were folly to contend with them. I have myself heard the modern notion, that the last twenty-seven chapters of the prophetical book which bears his name were not written by Isaiah the son of Amoz, spoken of by one of that school as admitting of no reasonable doubt, whereas he must have known

that theologians, certainly as learned and as competent to judge as himself, considered the arguments for the genuineness of those chapters in no degree invalidated by the objections which had been brought against it.

But a more painful instance, which recently came under my observation, is furnished by two sermons which were preached, in the spring of this year, before the University of Cambridge, and afterwards published in *The Cambridge Chronicle*. The fervent eloquence and evident sincerity of the preacher have justly gained for him a great influence, especially over the young; and therefore it is the more important that he should refrain from unduly exciting their feelings and warping their judgment by such passionate declamation and unwarrantable invectives as characterise these sermons. The professed object of the preacher, as described by him in the former of the two, to which alone I shall refer in this Paper, was to lead his hearers "to the impartial, unbiassed, fearless, truthful, and, above all, wise and loving study of the Holy Scriptures, by pointing out not only some of the follies, but some of the deadly evils, which have resulted from a neglect of the warning (2 Pet. iii. 16, a part of his text) that it is possible to wrest them to perdition." In accordance with the peculiar method proposed by him for promoting such a study of the Sacred Volume, the bulk of this first sermon is occupied with the description and denunciation of such errors and evils. Among them he mentions the assuming every precept of the Mosaic dispensation to be binding upon the Church under the Christian dispensation, the holding up "as a moral example the deed of Jael," and the "giving strange typical significance to the aberrations of Samson," which, he says, was "to violate every rule of tenable criticism; to introduce into religion a monstrous casuistry; to crush the very life out of an intelligent and honest faith."

One would hardly suppose that these or similar errors were so prevalent at the present day as to call for special condemnation. But the preacher seems to think they are; for he has taken occasion, from the mention of them, to observe that "the method of treating all Scripture as if every word of it were equally divine, though disclaimed in words, is pursued in fact alike by the learned and by the ignorant;" and that we "may see whole commentaries written, even in these days, upon the tacit assumption that Scripture is a talisman 'equipollent in all its parts,' of which even the most incompetent tacitly claim the power of infallible interpretation."

Now, upon this passage, without entering into the question of the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, I would remark that the *written record*, which constitutes the *Scriptures*, may be all "equally divine," and yet not be "equipollent in all its parts;"

i.e., one book may not be of the same value with another, nor all the commandments given by God to his people in one age be binding upon his people in a subsequent age. I would remark, also, that the spirit which it breathes is hardly in accord with that in which he desires that his hearers should study the Scriptures. But another and yet greater fault which I find with it is its misrepresentation—not, of course, intentional, but still obvious and unjustifiable misrepresentation—of "his brethren in the Church of God." Can the preacher mention any commentators who assume the Scripture to be such a "talisman?" Can he adduce any instance of "most incompetent" expositors who may justly be charged with claiming "the power of infallible interpretation?" He professes, and I doubt not sincerely, a willingness to devote his life to make known the truths of the Bible, and "to help to clear its interpretation from centuries of error;" but, if he would succeed herein, he must address himself to the task in a different spirit, and must avoid the vituperative tone which he has here adopted, and which pervades his whole sermon.

Having given a most vivid description of "the deadly evils" which "false claims [for the Scriptures] of infallible literalism" have done to mankind in resistance to the progress of science and civil liberty, in the support of slavery, in the usurped dominion of the Bishop of Rome, and in the persecution and burning of so called heretics and witches, he addresses the most solemn and earnest warnings to young clergymen and candidates for the ministry against falling into the errors of "Churches and sects and parties," and being misled by "the masses of traditional systems which crowd the commentaries upon the Bible. "If," he asks in one passage, "*corruptio optimi pessima*, ought we not to deplore, with all our hearts, the misuse of that book (the Bible) to the serious injury of mankind? Ought we not to strive, with all our hearts, that we, in our generation, may not be of the number of those who so abuse the light of heaven, as therewith to lead astray the souls of men?" "In the name of Christ"—this is his appeal in another passage—"in the name of all that He taught, in the name of all for whom He died, I do esteem it a matter of extreme importance that you should early be put on your guard against courses which have been so dangerous to mankind." What these courses are he indicates afterwards, telling them that,

> By Pharisaic hardness, by obstinate prejudice, by stiff-necked and unwarrantable dogmatism, by ignorant presumption which leads men to rush at once into anathemas of every opinion not their own, they may, indeed, gain earthly success, and become the idols of a party, and go about, as others do, slandering others as heretics, and saying of their brethren and their betters that they are "dangerous" and "pernicious" and "do not preach Christ."

Again, in a subsequent passage, he says that they must not think—

> It is saying Lord, Lord, which will save them. They may boast their familiarity with his name; they may claim to have preached nothing but Him crucified; but the cloak of Evangelical or of Churchman will not hide the sins of the Pharisee, nor will the iteration of angry shibboleths about the Divinity of the Saviour excuse the habitual violation of his new commandment. If they use texts as a goad to theologic hatred, and a hindrance to human thought, the whole spirit of the Scripture will rise up in the day of judgment against them, and condemn them for the wrong which they inflict from their idolatry of its letter.

Now, although "incredible harm" may have been "done to mankind" in past ages, and there may be danger of equal harm being done in the present age, by the misinterpretation and wrongful use of Scripture, it seems unlikely that the preacher's graphic and soul-stirring descriptions of the evils which he enumerates should be any protection against future errors. But, however this may be, I would ask whether his use of such language as "Pharisaic hardness," "obstinate prejudice," "stiff-necked and unwarrantable dogmatism," and "ignorant presumption," will be conducive to the cultivation of that temper of mind with which he would have his readers and hearers study the Scriptures? The proverb, "physician heal thyself," is suggested by the manner in which fierce invectives and earnest exhortations to a loving spirit are strangely mingled together.

I am constrained to express my painful conviction that the tone of this sermon, however just many of the remarks and eloquent many passages in it, is not suited to promote the object which the preacher desired—"the impartial, unbiassed, fearless, truthful, and, above all, *wise* and *loving* study of the Holy Scriptures;" but that, on the contrary, it cannot fail to confirm prejudices and provoke and embitter controversy. It was, I know, listened to with much indignation by many members of the congregation to which it was addressed. In reading it one can scarcely help feeling that it was dictated by a soreness of spirit in the preacher himself, and that, when he told his youthful hearers that, if they were "men enough to stand alone," if they dared to "run counter to popular opinion in the cause of truth," if they ever had the "courage to smite the hoary head of inveterate abuse," then they must "expect to share hatred and opposition with all the saints of God," he was thinking of himself, and of a controversy in which he had recently been engaged.

Upon the question involved in that controversy I forbear making any remark, except that there is no assumption of infallibility, no uncharitableness, no want of a loving spirit, necessarily

shown in holding, and contending for with an earnestness equal to his own, an opinion contrary to that of the preacher. The question is simply one of interpretation. Do the Scriptures, rightly understood, teach this or that doctrine? Surely this may be discussed by two opponents without any bitterness on either side; and the one who holds the opposite opinion, if he conscientiously believes the preacher's interpretation likely to endanger the salvation of his fellow-men, may, without any breach of charity—nay, being constrained by the love of souls, must—declare his conviction, and warn men of the risk they are incurring. It is altogether a false assumption of the preacher that the love and charity which he so highly commends belong exclusively to him, and to those who agree with him, and that "the conceit of a usurped infallibility," the intolerance, and "the slandering of others," which he so strongly condemns, are characteristic only of such as differ from him.

There are some other thoughts suggested by this sermon. While "the perversion of isolated texts" (of which, by the bye, that of a portion of his own text, "the letter killeth," by the preacher himself, is a curious instance), "the use of the letter of Scripture to murder its spirit," and "the strangling of its eternal principles by the misappropriation of its chance (?) expressions," against which the preacher earnestly warns us, have doubtless led to many, and may lead to many more, grievous evils; it is to be remembered that they do not constitute the only class of misinterpretations of Scripture which have caused "incredible harm" to mankind; nor are they, as appears to me, the class against which the youth of our country, and in particular our younger clergy and students for the ministry, require to be especially cautioned at the present day. If there is a danger of perverting Scripture by laying too much stress upon the letter, there is also a danger of perverting it by keeping out of sight, or glossing over, its most plain and positive statements. If there be, as the preacher alleges, a "peril of following the mass of theologians" who have degraded "Scripture into a wrangling-ground for sectarian differences," and "split it up into missiles to be used in fierce battle against our brethren in the Church of Christ," there is also a peril of following others, who, thinking themselves to be wise above what is written, "concerning the faith have made shipwreck." That we may be preserved from both of these dangers it is needful for us to study the Scriptures with a sincere desire to understand them, with a willingness to receive the doctrine which they contain, with an earnest endeavour to put aside all prejudices, with a humble consciousness of our liability to error, and with continual earnest prayer for the enlightening influence of the Holy Spirit. Whosoever thus studies

them may confidently trust that he shall be preserved from all dangerous errors on the one side and on the other; and he will learn—while surely established himself in "the faith which was once for all committed to the saints," and ready, when occasion requires, to contend earnestly for it—to put away "all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking," and speak the truth in love.

In making these remarks I have been actuated by no unfriendly feeling towards the writer of the sermon to which they refer, but by a deep conviction of the injury done to truth and charity in the Church by the tone he has adopted in it. I the more lament this, because his intellectual power, his eloquence, his earnestness of purpose, and, I may add, his generous impulses, would, if exercised with more self-restraint, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, enable him to render most valuable service in promoting the progress of pure religion, and restraining ungodliness and vice throughout the land. If this Paper come under his eye, and anything I have said in it give him causeless pain, I shall willingly express to him my regret.

CHARLES PERRY (Bishop).

The Canonry, Llandaff.

Review.

The Supernatural in Nature; a Verification by Free Use of Science. By JOSEPH WILLIAM REYNOLDS, President of Sion College, and Vicar of St. Stephen's, Spitalfields. Second Edition. London: C. Kegan Paul & Co. 1880.

THIS is a second edition of a book which was published anonymously in the first instance. The demand for a second edition, and the appendage of the author's name to the title-page show that the book has acquired a certain amount of popularity and a not inconsiderable circulation. If the statement be true, that at a recent ordination in the Diocese of London a copy of this work was presented to each one of the candidates, the Bishop of London must be considered to have put the seal of his approval to it, and with a work of such pretensions as this, and of such considerable bulk, it is not to be supposed that he would have adopted this step without careful personal perusal and examination. Yet we have heard of cases where readers have found it impossible to complete the perusal of the book, still less to master its contents. For ourselves we confess to have found it very difficult fairly to appraise its value. At first we were disposed to think very highly of it; then followed a second stage, in which we were equally disposed to lay it down without completing the perusal of it. This weariness arose from its excessive discursiveness, what we may venture to call the garrulousness of its style, and the total want of that *lucidus ordo* which enables a reader clearly to apprehend an author's object, and to follow his process of thought. It is easy enough to read the successive chapters, or studies, as they are called, if the reader be

content to pass lightly on from topic to topic; but if he desires to harmonise what he reads with what goes before and follows after—to know exactly to what the argument points, and to trace its meaning link by link—then to study this book as it needs to be studied is one of the most difficult tasks we can remember to have undertaken. So we laid it down, and then took it up again, and thus entered on a third stage of opinion in regard to it of a more complimentary character. The final conclusion is, that the work contains a large amount of very valuable matter; that it exhibits wide information and considerable ability; but that to make it generally useful, it needs to be sternly condensed, to be, to a great degree, reconstructed, and above all to have its argument drawn more precisely to a point, as a skilful workman takes a blunt and rusty weapon, gives it edge, and makes it fit for the sharp conflict of actual war.

Thus much of the literary character of the book, and of this only. Of the substance of it more needs to be said. The question whether it can be accepted as a safe guide on the points in controversy between so-called science and religion is by no means to be easily answered. It is part of the defects of the book that the precise object and argument of the author must rather be gathered from the title and from reflection on its contents, than from any definite statement of the author himself. In one respect Mr. Reynolds' book resembles the work of Professor Duns, and constitutes an exposition of the grounds on which the Divine authority of the Christian revelation may safely be defended in the face of modern scientific discovery, so that the Christian position may not be weakened by statements which are untenable, and which only lay the apologist open to the charge of ignorance. In this aspect the volume under review contains a great deal well deserving the most serious and careful consideration. This, however, scarcely appears to be the direct and conscious object of the author. He fights under the motto of "*Verbum Dei manet in æternum.*" It is his pious purpose to vindicate the Word of God against the attacks of scientists, and especially against that philosophy which would eliminate the Deity out of His own world, and reduce all the operations of nature to the action of material agents controlled by that blind thing, uniform and invariable law. Pseudo-science labours to get rid of the supernatural in the works of God in order that it may get rid of the supernatural element in His Word. The two must evidently stand together. If the supernatural exists anywhere, it must, in the nature of things, exist everywhere. If there be a God in one part of the world, there must be a God in all parts of it. It is impossible, with any success, to deny the miraculous in revelation so long as the miraculous is admitted to survive in creation and providence. Accordingly, modern scientists deny the supernatural altogether. Mr. Reynolds reverses the argument. He seeks to prove the supernatural to exist in nature—that is, in the creation, constitution, and continued preservation of material things—by showing that nothing less than Divine intelligence and force can explain the marvellous facts which modern physical science has brought within our knowledge. If this be established, the miraculous in revelation is no more than a simple and inevitable corollary of the conclusion which nature teaches.

It is really a grand argument, not simply defensive, but aggressive in its own nature. It retorts the attack of science back upon itself, and carries the war into the chosen strongholds of the opponent. To this purpose, after certain preliminary discussions, the author proceeds to consider the Mosaic account of the creation in the light of modern science, not as the Mosaic history has been ignorantly interpreted by jealous but ill-informed apologists, but as the author considers that it ought to be interpreted, and as known facts require us to interpret it. From this point of view he reviews the various stages of the Mosaic narrative in their orders:—the

original condition of the globe, without form and void; the Creative Word that called it into order and beauty; the creative days; light, the firmament, the habitation of life, the creation of plants, the sun, fishes, reptiles and birds, creeping things, and man himself. In the course of these discussions we find—on the side turned towards modern unbelief—a great deal of acute and vigorous argument, and a vast array of scientific facts of the highest imaginable interest. As a repertory of information on the subjects named in their scientific relations, Mr. Reynolds' work is of great value, and a rich storehouse of information for those who are incompetent to enter, for themselves, into the specialities of modern physical discovery. We know not how any devout mind can arise from the perusal of these chapters—as, for instance, the chapter on Light—without grander ideas than he possessed before of the majesty, power, and wisdom of God. It is from the minuteness of His creative operations, more signally than from their magnitude, that these attributes of God's working are most wonderfully brought within the comprehension of the human mind. When, for instance, we are told such facts as these, in regard to light—that no less than 458,000,000,000,000 vibrations of ether in a second are necessary in order to give us the consciousness of the lowest or red light, and 727,000,000,000,000 vibrations the consciousness of violet light; that the splendour of Sirius "is brought to us by medium of atomic shivers maintained during the past twenty-two years at the average rate of six hundred millions of millions of vibrations the second;" that the waves constituting light are so small that from forty to fifty thousand are required to occupy the breadth of an inch, and that trillions enter the eye in a few seconds; or, in regard to sound, that vibrations of ether, occuring between 16,000 and 30,000 times a minute, act on the ear as musical sounds; vibrations above 30,000 and below 458,000,000,000,000, act on the sense of heating as heat; and that vibrations from 458,000,000,000,000 up to 727,000,000,000,000 affect us as light;—the mind is oppressed with the vision opened to it of the wisdom and glory of God, and of the energy, unity, and diversity that equally characterise all His works.

There are speculations opened to the mind by these facts, so wonderful in their corroboration of the promises of God, that we are unwilling to pass them over altogether without a brief reference. The author does not speak of them, but that he is not insensible to them we should judge from the following words: "What a manifold undeveloped system of signs and images we have within us! We cannot but think that these wonderful potentialities are prophecy of a coming richness and fulness." It is most true. The human eye and ear, like the other organs of the body, are simply mechanical instruments and no more, by means of which the living spirit within is brought into contact with the material outside world; they are, moreover, instruments made to act within a strictly limited range. The ear can only catch vibrations which range from 16 to 30,000 in a second. The eye only receives undulations varying from 458,000,000,000,000 to 727,000,000,000,000. But can any one suppose, for a moment, that there are not vibrations below and above these limits?—but they overpass the mechanical capacity of the ear and the eye. The fact suggests the possibility of there being sights and sounds on every side of us, such as the Bible actually declares to be the case in the angelic beings who minister to us below, and yet the ear cannot hear nor the eye see them, not because they are themselves beyond the natural possibilities of sound and sight, but solely because of the mechanical limitations that at present restrict the action of our senses. Suppose that, in another and a higher state, these limitations should be removed, what a world would break upon our knowledge in an instant!—strange, but magnificent as the sights and sounds revealed to the Apostle in the Apocalypse! Such thoughts rebuke the false spirituality that would despise the body and would omit

its redeemed and resurrection power from its calculations of the world to come.

Our readers will now understand the meaning of our reference to the deeply interesting facts which this book places within the reach of the non-scientific reader. But another question remains to be answered. How far is the position of the author himself a safe one, not only towards science but, what is infinitely more important, towards revelation. Can his views be accepted as to the interpretation of the Mosaic record and as to the laws of its reconciliation with the conclusions of modern physical science? If they are not safe, the official circulation of the work amongst young clergymen is a very serious matter. To this vital question we found it exceedingly difficult to give an answer, simply because we find it difficult to ascertain what precise position is maintained by the author. Here, where the utmost accuracy of statement is required, we find great ambiguity. His propositions are not formulated, and therefore remain obscure. We are not prepared to say that his teaching is safe, neither are we prepared to say that it is unsafe, because we are not sure what his meaning is, and we might do him great injustice by unconscious misrepresentation. For instance, as to the six days of the Mosaic creation, Mr. Reynolds argues at considerable length that they cannot mean the literal days of twenty-four hours each. But all this elaborate argument is surplusage. We do not know any writer of recent times who has maintained such a view. It has been given up long since under the irrefragable force of facts. Nor do we know any one who mantains that the various strata of the earth were made all at once, so that the organic remains of which they are full were created also just as they are—the mere sham and pretence of life that never had existence. It is needless to argue against a notion so highly dishonourable to God. But the principal question on which we should be glad to have an enlightened view is, whether the six days are to be considered simply as optical days—parts of a vision in which the process of creation was divinely revealed to the mental eye of Moses—or whether they are to be regarded as vast geological periods, immeasurable to us in their duration, and definite only in the order of their sequence. Either of these views, or both—for they are entirely consistent with each other—maintains the idea of successive creative acts in all its fulness and integrity. But such a series of acts the author appears to us, we hope inaccurately, to give up as inconsistent with science. Thus he writes:—

"This difficulty, fairly met, establishes the verity of the symbolism. The word 'day' is not used in two different senses. As the day of toil to man, so is the day of rest; and as the day of work to God, so is the day of repose. The true difficuly is—creation is continuous, no break exists anywhere; processes now in operation perpetuate the primeval operation, 'Deus operatur semper, et quietus est.' God's life is all Sabbath and no Sabbath. The Mosaic account implies a cessation and change in world-developement, there not having been any such change; consequently Gen. ii. 23 is only *ἀνθρώπινος λόγος*, adapted to early unphilosophical conceptions. Human labour in producing is a symbol of the Divine act in creating; man's repose is a figure of Godly rest. How long did it take God to create the world? Not so long, in the Divine lifetime, as a week is in man's lifetime. Grand as is the universe, vast as are its operations, many and various the inhabitants, the whole must be regarded by man as not so great a task to God as a week's work to himself. The days are all the same and are all symbolical. Suppose that Moses meant for six successive Divine days, in which moments are years, God's hand worked; on the seventh Divine day—not yet concluded (Heb. v. 3–9)—He began to rest. Let all holy men as made in God's image, observe God's rule. Would not such a meaning

add greatly to the force of the Divine command? It is a moral measure for all time, and the keynote of Providential arrangements. It is a peculiar majesty, specially suited to the grandeur of a creation revealed by the growth of science; and the withholding of a true interpretation until now, affords proof of original inspiration. The sanctity and safety of the Sabbath are not shaken, but assured; built on truthful, not erroneous interpretation." (Pp. 149–150.)

We have quoted freely, that our readers may see both the author's strength and his weakness. He is firm and distinct in the truth he desires to maintain, such as the perpetual authority of the Lord's day, but obscure as to the grounds on which he bases it. What are we to understand by the assertions "creation is continuous—no break occurs anywhere?" "the Mosaic account implies a cessation and change in world-developement, there not having been any such change." The words appear to us to assert the principle maintained by Professor Bonney, in the "Manual of Geology" prepared for the Christian Knowledge Society, and which excited just alarm among the members of that body. We do not say that Mr. Reynolds is unsound; we only say that, if he is sound, he has not expressed his meaning with sufficient clearness and accuracy. The same uncertainty hangs over all his views of creation, amid much that is of high value. Creation, in the popular sense of the word, he appears to repudiate, and to substitute evolution in its place. "Science represents this operation as an evolution, in accordance with discernible physical laws," but Scripture reveals that these laws exist and act by a "Divine power, inherent in the cosmos." Even so, the idea of true creation is not got rid of. If all things have been developed by inherent power from an original monad, who made that monad and endowed it with its wonderful capacity of development? We are justly told that the original germ of all life in its form of protoplasm or bioplasm is the same in all cases, but is differentiated in the process of development into plants, irrational animals, and man. What energy is it that acts with such wondrous unity of plan, and yet such an endless diversity of detail? It is God, and He alone. This is the reply of the author, and he makes it and reiterates it over and over again. We delight to do him the fullest justice here. We think that he is often obscure in his reasoning, but here there is no uncertainty, no obscurity, no hesitation. From end to end of this volume the Divine name echoes like a voice from heaven. The name of God resounds from every page, as the great primal all-pervading Will and force from which all things proceed, and on which they depend. We wish that we had space to quote some of the eloquent passages in which Mr. Reynolds devoutly reiterates and emphasises this great conclusion. But we must be content with giving the following brief extract:—

"We would know how matter, if created, was created, unless by Deity; and if not created, how the eternity of its existence is more comprehensible than the Christian's belief—that matter, and all other phenomena, are manifestations of the great Unknown? If the many thousand impulses of energy do not proceed from hidden energy, science belies its own teaching." (P. 258.)

CORRIGENDA.

Article *Veni Creator* in CHURCHMAN, No. 11—August.

Page 359, line 7 from bottom of the page,
for "O highest gift, O God most High,"
read "O highest gift of God most High."
Page 361, line 4, *for* "Eternal of Spirit," *read* "Eternal Spirit."

Short Notices.

Clear the Way. Hindrances to Missionary Work considered. By E. T. Whately, Author of "Memoirs of Archbishop Whately," &c. Pp. 118. Shaw & Co.

Some chapter-headings of this practical work will explain its character: "Difficulties and Hindrances; Expecting Too Much; How to Begin; Language; Party Spirit; Guidance," &c. A portion of the book refers mainly to evangelistic work in France and other Roman Catholic countries. The old Irish war-cry, "Clear the way," gives the title to this admirable mingling of suggestion and exhortation.

Chronological Tables of English Literature. Compiled by Mrs. F. Landolphe. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. Bradford: T. Brear.

In twenty-three pages are clearly arranged, well printed lists of authors and of periods; complete enough, probably, for students generally. It has been desired to give a bird's-eye view of the currents of thought during the great periods of the national life; and the work is well done.

Sevenfold Blessing. Perfect Salvation through the Blood of Christ. By the Rev. James Gosset Tanner, M.A., Vicar of Emanuel Church, Maida Hill. Pp. 128. Shaw & Co. 1880.

The seven chapters in this book are headed: Peace, Redemption, Forgiveness, Justification, Sanctification, Access to God, and Victory. Several passages here and there we have read with pleasure: there is a warmth and simplicity which can hardly fail to do good. Two or three phrases, however, which have met our eye are open to objection. In the chapter on Sanctification, for example, appears this sentence: "If you long to be holy, and if you want to prevail over your spiritual enemies, *just hand the matter over to Jesus*, who died to purchase your ransom, and who lives to bear you on His shoulders." (The italics are ours.) It is necessary, surely, to notice such Scriptures as 2 Peter i. 5. And while the author lays stress, as he is bound, on 1 Cor. i. 30, ἐν χ. Ιῃ. . . . τε καὶ ἁγιασμὸς, it would have been well to remark that in Heb. xii. 14 Christians are exhorted to *follow* (διώκω) τὸν ἁγιασμὸν.

Church Hymnal. By permission of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland. Set to appropriate Tunes under the Musical Editorship of Sir R. P. Stewart, Mus.D., Professor in the University of Dublin. Fifth Edition. Dublin: The Association for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 1880.

Many esteemed critics, we know, have given the Hymnal of the Church of Ireland a very good place in the first rank of hymn books; and, so far as we have examined it, we are able to endorse the warmest praises which have been bestowed upon it, whether in regard to its literary merits, good taste, and sound judgment, or its doctrinal excellences and freedom from sacerdotal errors. As Churchmen, we are glad to know that so admirable a selection is becoming more extensively used within the Church of England. With respect to the musical editing, Dr. Sir Robert Stewart deserves praise. He has done his work with skill. We hear from friends in whose churches the Hymnal has been tried for years, that the tunes have been carefully chosen and ably arranged. The edition before us is cheap and well printed. For use in the family circle we know no better book.

The Daily Round. Meditation, Prayer, and Praise, adapted to the Course of the Christian Year. Pp. 410. J. Whitaker. 1880.

One cannot but like this book, its language is so simple and so unmistakably sincere. The meditations and verses in some respects are a great improvement on dear good old Bogatsky. In tone and temper the whole seems excellent; fervent, spiritual, lowly, and practical; the Word of God is duly honoured. Here and there, however, we have noticed expressions which we ourselves should not employ. For example, on page 307 it is written—"I was cleansed in baptism, Christ has had restoring mercy ready when, through my own fault, I have again and again become unclean." Further, a clearer reference to "the full assurance of hope" is, in some passages, to be desired.

A Familiar History of Birds. By the late EDWARD STANLEY, D.D., F.R.S., Lord Bishop of Norwich. Pp. 420. Longmans, Green & Co. 1880.

A new edition of our old friend the "Familiar History of Birds" is really welcome. From a prefatory note we learn that the present edition has been carefully revised by a practical ornithologist of much experience; and, "where the advance of science has thrown fresh light on any point, the editor has made the necessary alteration." The volume is got up with taste, and is well illustrated: in every way it is attractive. From the chapter on Rooks we quote the following:—

It is scarcely necessary to name the wireworm as one of the greatest scourges to which farmers are exposed; and yet it is to the rooks chiefly, if not entirely, that they can look for a remedy. Cased in its hard shelly coat, it eats its way into the heart of the roots of corn, and is beyond the reach of weather, or the attacks of other insects or small birds, whose short and softer bills cannot penetrate the recesses of its secure retreat, buried some inches below the soil. The rook alone can do so.

A Practical Guide to the Duties of Churchwardens in the Execution of their Office. With Lists of Cases, Statutes, Canons, &c.; an Appendix and Index. Fourteenth edition. By C. G. PRIDEAUX, M.A., Q.C., Recorder of Bristol. Pp. 500. Shaw & Sons, Fetter Lane. 1880.

A work which has reached a fourteenth edition needs but brief notice. Dr. Prideaux's "Directions to Churchwardens," a celebrated book in its day, was made the basis of the present publication, which has had a large circulation, and in ecclesiastical circles is very well known. It contains a great amount of information clearly and concisely set forth. Here and there occurs a passage on which we feel inclined to make a protest. We are especially dissatisfied with the argument on a Churchwarden's duties as to "presenting" in regard to Baptismal Regeneration, and in the statement as to what Mr. Gorham's views really were.

The Sabbath made for Man. The Essay awarded an extra prize by the Adjudicators of the Lord's Day Observance Society. By the Rev. G. A. JACOB, D.D., late Head Master of Christ's Hospital. Pp. 96. S. W. Partridge.

We heartily recommend this essay, ably written, sound, and interesting. A good deal of information is given in a small space. We quote a single section, as follows:—

It is not without a significance worthy of our attention, that in Galatians iv. 10, "Ye observe days and months," &c., the unusual word παρατηρεῖσθε is found for "ye observe" in the original. This word, wherever it occurs elsewhere, either in the Septuagint or in the New Testament, is used in a *bad* sense, as when it is employed to describe the malicious watching of Jesus by the Pharisees, in Luke xiv. 1; xx. 20. So that the word being thus appropriated to an evil meaning in all other places in the Greek Scriptures, may with confidence be taken here to signify a *wrong or superstitious* observance—"Ye are superstitiously observing days." See this point well argued in "The Lord's Day in the Light of the New Testament," by the Right Hon. W. Brooke.

Art. VII.—THE MONTH.

ON the 27th of July, Ayoob Khan, advancing from Herat, inflicted a severe defeat on General Burrows. Ayoob's army, of about 12,000, were strong in artillery. Out of a force numbering 2,800, Indian and British, 1,000 were reported killed and missing. The disaster of Khusk-i-Nahud stands almost alone in the annals of British India. At present (August 20) little is known concerning subsequent events. Ayoob, after an unaccountable delay, has commenced the siege of Candahar. A large force, under General Roberts, is advancing from Cabul, and another force, under General Phayre, from Quetta, for the relief of Candahar. According to a convention arranged with Abdul Rahman, the new Ameer, before the disaster on the Helmund, Sir Donald Stewart has withdrawn all our troops from Cabul to Gandamak.

Dr. Tanner completed his forty days' fast.

Mr. Whymper, whose "Scrambles amongst the Alps" is the most charming book of the kind, has spent a week on Chimborazo, at a height of 16,000 ft., and afterwards reached the summit, 4000 ft. higher. He has also conquered Cotopaxi, 19,500 ft., with a thermometer 20 degrees below zero, a terrible wind and a hail-storm.

Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe, K.G., has passed away at the ripe old age of 92. Cousin to George Canning, the Prime Minister, Stratford Canning entered the diplomatic service in 1808.

At a meeting of the Additional Home Bishoprics' Endowment Fund, the Archbishop of Canterbury said he thought that the Bishopric of Newcastle would soon be founded. His Grace hoped that before long "we shall be able to congratulate Sir Richard Cross on the perfect completion of the whole of that scheme, for the arrangement of which, and the carrying it through Parliament, the whole Church of England feel so deeply indebted to him." The late Home Secretary, in a subsequent speech, said that he looked back to no period or act of his official life which gave him more pleasure.

In moving the Education estimates, Mr. Mundella made an able and interesting speech, one worthy of his reputation as an educationalist. The right hon. gentleman defended the special subjects.[1]

[1] "As soon as the special subjects were introduced," said the Vice-President, "schools began steadily to improve. It was said that

The serious illness of the Prime Minister, lung congestion with fever, called forth deep sympathy on all sides. It seems probable that Mr. Gladstone's recovery will be speedy and complete.

The Irish Disturbance Bill was thrown out on a second reading in the House of Lords by 282 to 51. Sixty-three Peers who are ordinarily counted as Liberals, including even Lord Sherbrooke (Mr. Lowe) and Lord Brabourne (Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen), voted against it. The lucid and exhaustive speech of Earl Cairns was in its way simply perfect.

Outrages have been committed in parts of Connaught, and some small bodies of troops have been ordered to Ireland.

The mission of Mr. Goschen to Constantinople does not seem, so far, a success. The Powers have not agreed to follow up the Collective Note with collective action. In regard to the naval demonstration which in some quarters was threatened, Lord Granville has preserved a diplomatic silence. So far as concerns Greece, France, it appears, is not likely to assist Mr. Gladstone's Government; and the Sultan may not be far wrong in supposing that Germany and Austria would also regret a violent re-opening of the Eastern Question.

The Burials Bill has been read a second time in the House of Commons, as was expected, by a very large majority.

At what is described as "the largest, and in many respects the most important synod ever held in Jamaica"—lay and clerical—the Rev. Enos Nuttall was elected Bishop.

Bishop Ryan, we have seen with pleasure, accepted the vacant post at Bournemouth, and the highly esteemed Rector of Stepney, the Rev. Joseph Bardsley, an able administrator, is going to the Vicarage of Bradford.

At the Canterbury Diocesan Conference, Canon Hoare pleaded for some lay representation in the deliberative bodies of the Church.

The death of the Rev. Edward Auriol did not come as a surprise upon his intimate friends. He had resigned his living, and his health had been for some time failing. Among Evan-

---

children only got a smattering of such subjects. But he was disposed to attribute a much higher value to what was called a 'smattering' of knowledge than many others were. He remembered that forty years ago one of his fellow-pupils, in a class where such a smattering was imparted on the subject of botany, began to take an enthusiastic interest in the subject, and had since risen to a position of the highest eminence. That gentleman was now secretary to the Royal Geographical Society and F.R.S. He referred to Mr. Bates, the author of "The Naturalist of the Amazon." Mr. Yorke, in an able speech, said that "it was very satisfactory to hear from the right hon. gentleman that if he found that the teaching of these ambitious and ornamental subjects interfered seriously with the teaching of the more solid but less interesting matter, he would not encourage it. What many persons felt was that it was not just to provide a high-class education at the expense of the State."

gelical Churchmen no man, probably, was more esteemed and respected: he wielded an immense influence, and has rendered great services to the Church. Shrewd, genial, tolerant, whole-hearted, a man of prayer, in the words of Mr. Billing,[1] "he seemed never to think of himself, and to the very last was he employed in the Master's work in his own quiet unobtrusive kindly way." A very touching narrative of his last interview with "dear Mr. Auriol," by Prebendary Cadman, appeared in the *Record*. Prebendary Auriol, we may add, and Prebendary Wright, were much interested in the success of THE CHURCHMAN.

At the afternoon service at St. Paul's on the 15th, Canon Liddon referred to the death by drowning, in Coniston Lake, of the Rev. Henry Wright:—

He said that the clergy and other authorities at that cathedral had had within the last two days special cause for mourning. Since Sunday last two of the prebendaries connected with the cathedral had been called to their last account. One of them, in the fulness of age, had been removed in the course of nature from amongst them. The other, in the prime of life and manhood, had been suddenly and sadly swept away beneath the waters of one of their northern lakes—prematurely removed from his ministerial work in this world, and, in a moment, taken away from his numerous and bereaved family.

From the Rev. Walter Abbott, Vicar of Paddington, a letter appeared in the *Record* on the following day:—

I am sure many of your readers will earnestly desire to receive some detailed information concerning the most distressing accident at Coniston, by which the Church on earth (and especially the Church Missionary Society[2]) has been deprived of one of her most consecrated sons, the Rev. Henry Wright. The last afternoon of his life I spent with him on the lake, in whose waters the next morning his gentle spirit was breathed away. There, though bearing traces of care and work, he was full of boyish fun, and joyous as he ever was, in the midst of his family. To-day he is gone.

God's thoughts are not our thoughts, neither are His ways our ways.

---

[1] The Rev. R. C. Billing: Letter in the *Record*.

[2] The *Record* well remarks:—Eight years ago he gave up his preferment at Nottingham in order to devote his voluntary efforts to the cause of the Church Missionary Society, filling the same post of Honorary Secretary which was filled for many years by the late Henry Venn, and it is no small compliment to Mr. Wright to say that there was every prospect of his proving with matured powers and larger experience a worthy successor of that sagacious and devoted saint. Mr. Wright was singularly simple in taste and single in heart, clear in principle, and generous in his judgments of men. He was a munificent donor to all good works, and spent his large fortune in doing good. His private acts of generous liberality will never be known in this world, so large yet so silent was the stream of his charity."

INDEX TO VOL. II.

END OF VOL. II.