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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

NOVEMBER, 1880.

ART. I.—THE DISESTABLISHED CHURCH OF IRELAND.

II. THE CONSTITUTION.

The Constitution of the Church of Ireland. Hodges, Foster & Co. Dublin. 1879.

THE financial operations of the Church of Ireland were last month considered in some detail; and it then appeared that the Churchmen of that island had contributed four millions of their own money, and worked out a system of finance which relieves, as far as possible, the uncertainty and caprice of Voluntaryism; while their English brethren were half persuaded that they had done nothing else than tear up their Prayer-Book. So harsh a misconception could scarcely have arisen but for the division of labour between the Representative Body and the General Synod—the former attending to our finances, all the year round, in the blissful privacy of a committee-room; while the latter, the Supreme Council of the Church, gathered annually under the shadow (or, should it be said, under the bull's-eye lantern?) of a reporters' gallery. The Diocesan Schemes also were quietly elaborated by a few experts, and then adopted in the synods of each diocese, of whose meetings no fame crossed the Channel. And while the General Synod itself dealt carefully with many unexciting questions, these evoked neither the heat nor the eloquence that moves a reporter's pencil and a reader's sympathy. Now, there are two proverbs which tell different stories of what will happen in such a case. Our unreported work did not profit by the principle, *omne ignotum pro magnifico:* the harder rule was applied, *de non apparentibus et de non existentibus eadem est ratio.* It was quietly assumed that no such work was done.

And yet our Supreme Council, at the very outset, had performed a remarkable task. It had framed a constitution for

the Church, which has its blemishes, like all things human, but has not broken down in any part, and is working more smoothly every year, as its capabilities are better understood. The nature of this constitution will best be explained by beginning at the ground, for from the very base upward its builders had to work. Every ecclesiastical corporation in the island was dissolved on the first of January, 1871, and the ecclesiastical law of Ireland ceased to exist, except in matrimonial causes. The jurisdiction of the archbishops and bishops was also swept away. But the existing law continued to bind the members of the Church of Ireland "for the time being . . . . in the same manner as if such members had mutually contracted and agreed to abide by and observe the same." Power was given to "the bishops, clergy, *and laity*, by representatives, *lay* and clerical," to meet in General Synod or Convention, and frame constitutions and regulations for the general management and good government of the Church. If this had not been done, if any Order had failed to meet the others in harmony, the Church would have died with its existing members.

The effect of Disestablishment.

One principle only we had here distinctly settled for us: organization was impossible unless the laity were duly represented "in General Synod or Convention." But no attempt was made to settle the question, Who were the laity of the Church of Ireland? She had to solve for herself the problem, how to grant the just rights of each Order, and of every individual, without allowing one to trample another down. The Christian laity had hitherto been represented, in theory, by the influence which the nation exerts in Parliament upon an Established Church. But practice and theory had removed farther and farther from each other, until at last, as regards Ireland, the British nation renounced all connection with the Church. And now it was necessary at the outset to settle the franchise and to define the influence of the lay vote.

The laity.

A vote is given to every male, of full age, who declares two facts in writing. He must be a member of the Church of Ireland. In addition, he must either be an accustomed member of the congregation of that church for which he claims a vote, or else a resident in its parish or district, or else an owner of landed or house property within its boundaries. But he may not vote as resident in the same parish within which he is registered as a member of the congregation of another church or chapel. The object of opening these three doors to the franchise is pretty plain. Members of a congregation have an obvious interest in the church in which they worship. And the other qualifications are a safeguard against excessive congregationalism. A clergyman might conceivably empty his church of all but his own

The electors.

partisans by eccentricities of conduct or of doctrine, without bringing himself under the lash of any specific law. Even from a country parish many persons might be driven (though perhaps the case has not arisen) to seek food in neighbouring pastures. Now, such a clergyman would be rewarded for his perversities by obtaining a list of voters entirely to his mind, were not all the Churchmen in his parish allowed to register themselves as residents. If the malcontents are in a minority, it will do them good to be convinced of this, and probably to be refuted as well as outvoted. If their admission can turn an election, the clergyman must be out of harmony with his natural constituents, and it is the essence of a representative scheme to disclose this fact however unpleasant it may be. And since, lastly, the holders of property should interest themselves in the spiritual welfare of their labourers and dependents, to foster this feeling they also are entrusted with a vote. The Synod of a diocese may require, as a further qualification, that the voter should subscribe to the church funds, and on this point the practice varies, according as it is felt to be more important to interest the poorest Churchman or to guard against intrusion by those who have no real claim to a vote. The persons thus registered are the voters at our Easter Vestries—the vestrymen of the Church of Ireland. At the General or Easter Vestry one churchwarden is elected, and the clergyman nominates another.

The Select Vestry.

Not more than twelve others are elected, to form, with the clergy and churchwardens, a Select Vestry, or committee of parochial administration. This Select Vestry is of the utmost importance to the well-being of every parish: it manages the church funds; it appoints the sexton, organist, and other minor officials; it attends to the repairs of the fabric, and provides the requisites for church service. A hostile Select Vestry could evidently make itself a sharp thorn in the side of a clergyman. Nor could any conceivable arrangement make an estranged parish comfortable under a voluntary system; while it is, perhaps, not entirely desirable that a rector should be quite happy while his parish is in convulsions. But it is much easier for a clergyman to carry with him twelve intelligent and representative men, who then become his advocates and interpreters with their constituents, than to explain everything to every one. In practice, the amount of friction between the clergy and their Select Vestries is infinitesimal. The writer has never heard of an act or word of intentional discourtesy at such a meeting, and nothing has done more to arouse and interest the laity than these committees, in which questions are asked and answered, and by which a clergyman, if he has any tact, makes himself and his policy clearly understood. He is chairman *ex officio*, and in his absence

his curate, and after him his churchwarden. The Easter Vestry, which nominates this board, also elects diocesan synodsmen to represent the parish, and once in three years it chooses three parochial nominators, whose functions will be explained hereafter.

The Diocesan Synod.

Into the Diocesan Synod are gathered all the working clergy of the diocese, from the highest dignitary to the deacon just ordained and licensed. To meet each of these, whether curate or incumbent, the parish sends two laymen, who must be communicants, and may hold office, as the Synod decides, for one year or for three. This Synod controls diocesan funds and endowments; it divides large parishes, joins small ones, and corrects inconvenient boundaries; it has a Court of Justice, which will be discussed presently; and it elects the bishop. Many of its duties are necessarily confided to a diocesan council or committee, for the Synod itself rarely meets oftener than once a year.

At this point we may pause to consider two objections.

The Communion.

It is complained that a person who habitually absents himself from the Lord's Table may be a registered "member of the Church of Ireland," and may even enter the Diocesan Synod, if he can declare that he is at all "a communicant," no definition of this somewhat vague phrase being given. There are many who would prefer to exclude from both positions all who had not received the Communion within certain dates. But whether or not the existing rules be approved, they were not moulded by indifference to the Lord's Supper, but by reverence for it. Irishmen could not easily forget the Test Act, and the risk was chosen rather of some failure in theoretical symmetry, than of tempting prominent parishioners to approach the Communion rails with any motive but the most sacred. There would be danger not only of profanation by the thoughtless, but of exciting morbid fears and self-suspicions in the heart of the sensitive and scrupulous.

The "two to one" vote, and the veto.

It is also occasionally urged that, both in the Diocesan and in the General Synod, the clergy may be overwhelmed by the double representation of the laity. But this is rendered impossible by the Vote by Orders, for when a difference of opinion between the clergy and the laity seems likely, a small number of either Order may demand a separate vote, and then the proposal can only be carried by obtaining a majority of each. There are unmistakable advantages in the larger representation of the laity, and especially in Diocesan Synods. In country parishes the squire, assuming that he is interested in the church, is almost certain to be elected: it is the second vote which sends a farmer to represent his class. In practice the lay attendance is so greatly reduced by various

causes, that the numbers are not at all disproportionate; and the effect of the present arrangement is to diffuse a sense of responsibility, and a considerable amount of information also, over the widest possible range.

In the General Synod the Vote by Orders is a highly conservative influence, for it makes innovation of any kind impossible without the consent of a majority of bishops, a second majority of the clergy, and a third majority of the laity; while a bare half of any one Order suffices to forbid the change.

The General Synod.

In the various Diocesan Synods 208 clergyman and 416 lay communicants of full age are triennially elected to constitute, with the bishops, the General Synod, the supreme authority of the Church. This assembly has "power to make all such regulations as shall be necessary for the order, good government, and efficiency of the Church of Ireland." But it has very carefully fenced its great powers against abuse. The Vote by Orders is a powerful check. An example of its self-control in small affairs is that it has forbidden itself to revise the boundaries of two dioceses, or to unite or subdivide them, without the consent of the Diocesan Synods and of the bishops who are interested. A striking and conspicuous example of the same spirit is that which guards the doctrine of the Church against corruption. No alteration can be made in the "articles, doctrines, rites, rubrics, or formularies of the Church," except under the following restrictions:—The change must be sanctioned by a resolution at one meeting of the Synod, where the resolution fails unless it is passed by a majority of the bishops and by two-thirds of the clergy and of the laity who vote. A year must intervene before this resolution can be made the basis of a Bill, which must then be read three times, and finally passed, as before, by a majority of bishops and two-thirds of each other Order. No change, great or small, in the doctrine or formularies of the Church of Ireland has been or can be made without undergoing this formidable process,[1] and obtaining these reiterated sanctions.

Two important subjects remain to be considered—Patronage and the Courts of Justice.

Patronage.

How shall a clergyman be appointed to a vacant parish? The congregational element in our Boards of Patronage has been perhaps more severely criticized than any other part of the constitution; but its bitterest enemies have been disposed, in the case of Bournemouth, to see the

[1] The only theoretical exceptions were, such revisions as disestablishment made necessary (*e.g.*, the "true religion *established* among us," and the oath at ordination), and unanimous recommendations of the Ritual Commission. But the procedure has actually been uniform in all cases.

matter in a very different light. To ignore, in a voluntary Church, the wishes of a parish, on which the incumbent must depend for maintenance, would indeed be impracticable, even if it were to be desired. Yet there was nothing attractive in the result (exhibited in certain Dissenting communities) of mass meetings where a minister was chosen by a show of hands. To canvass, to prophesy smooth things, to learn by rote a few glittering discourses, was the way to success where impulse prevailed, because no person was specially responsible for the result, nor entitled to make inquiries with authority. It was therefore arranged that the influence of the parish should not be exerted directly, but by three elected nominators, and that these should hold office for three years, to lessen the chance of their being appointed when a rector is failing, and with a view to some individual whom they would favour. But if the parish is deeply interested in the election, so is the whole diocese. Clergymen in obscure places should not be entirely forgotten: past services are a claim to advancement which local patrons might overlook: parishes with a tendency to extreme views should be checked by some influence which would prevent them from growing narrower and more one-sided still at every new appointment; and all these are matters of general concern. It was felt, too, that the clergy should have some voice in the sharing of promotion among themselves. The three parochial nominators, therefore, are met by one other layman and two clergymen, whom the Diocesan Synod has elected; and these six, with the bishop (who has a vote besides his casting vote), make the selection. Nor does this election interfere in any way with the bishop's inherent right of rejecting an unworthy nominee.

It is admitted on all hands that the working of this system is imperfect. Sometimes the diocesan nominators have failed to control the wishes of an ill-informed parish. Sometimes the parochial nominators have been chosen from a class which has little regard for learning or experience. Canvassing, private influences, and the preaching of trial sermons, have not been quite unheard-of.

The system would doubtless have been changed long ago if any other could be substituted of which the working would always and in every place be perfect. What is claimed for the present arrangement comes far short of this; yet it may be affirmed that if a parish will only choose its representatives with ordinary care, if the diocesan nominators will exercise their function with discretion and firmness, and if the bishop will make his legitimate influence felt, then the result, upon the whole, and with some possible modifications, will be equal to that of any other scheme which can easily be devised. It is pretty certain also that its operation is steadily improving. The

homely representatives of very backward places often show the utmost intelligence and earnestness in the search for a godly as well as a qualified incumbent. The diocesan nominators are learning by experience how to respect local wishes without submitting to local caprices. Many bishops have publicly declared that they find their influence under the new system to be as great as they could reasonably desire. We have no hope that a time will come when every one will be pleased, when defeated candidates will cease to cry out, or when their complaints will be always utterly without reason. But we do expect that the working of our Boards of Nomination will be far better than its uncompromising assailants predict.[1]

A bishop is elected by the Diocesan Synod, if two-thirds of each Order have agreed to vote for him; if not, two names at least must be sent to the Bench of Bishops, who select one of them.

We pass to the two Courts of Justice. In the Diocesan Court, the bishop or his commissary, with a barrister of ten years' standing for his chancellor or assessor, sits as judge. The clergy in Synod elect, as a kind of jury-panel, three clergymen, and the lay members, three laymen, to hold office for five years; and when a case arises for trial, one clergyman and one layman is summoned, in the order of rotation, to act with the bishop as judges of fact. Charges which concern doctrine must proceed either from the bishop (whose chancellor then tries the case) or from four male communicants, of full age, who have signified in writing their submission to the authority of the General Synod, and who give their bond for expenses not exceeding £50. In all cases there is an appeal to the superior Court; and whenever doctrine is involved, the diocesan authorities can only try the question of fact, while the deeper issue must go up unprejudiced. The Courts.

In the Court of the General Synod each archbishop sits in turn, and the archbishops select a bishop to be the second episcopal member of the Court. The General Synod elects a

[1] Since this paragraph was written, it has been pointed out by a very eminent authority that persons of the highest distinction would have failed to obtain recognition if the new system had prevailed in their day. It is a consideration that deserves great weight. But there are some considerations which weigh heavily in the other scale. One is, that other persons of the highest distinction were equally passed over under the old system. The other, and the chief one, is, that these would also have been passed over, for exactly the same reasons, under any other system of popular election. But popular election is inevitable in a Church where the people support their minister. The argument is unanswerable as against disestablishment, but when disestablishment has come we must submit to its consequences.

panel of ten lawyers of prescribed rank and standing, from which panel, in each case, three lay judges are chosen by ballot, and by these five the case is tried. Thus the episcopal element provides for theology, while the majority of trained lawyers prevents zeal for an opinion from interfering with legal rights. The decision of this Court is final, but it cannot sentence to deposition from the ministry without the concurrence of the archbishops, nor can a bishop be deposed, deprived, or removed from his see unless they assent.

If now the whole constitution be reviewed, it will be seen that two principles pervade it from end to end—the clearest recognition of the rights of every Churchman, and the utmost watchfulness against momentary impulses. In other words, no constitution could be devised for a voluntary Church at once more popular and less democratic. Every Churchman is free to vote for a diocesan synodsman, but the Legislative Assembly is only elected by voters who have themselves been thus selected. The interests and passions of each Order are checked by the veto of the others, and wherever one Order has misgivings, the presumption in favour of the *status quo* prevails. Above all, the revision of doctrine and the trial of offenders have been fenced around by safeguards the most jealous, against which it would seem to be impossible for any mere gust of passion or impulse of panic to prevail.

The clergy, presiding over every vestry and possessing a veto in the Synods, have more legislative influence than they ever enjoyed before. Formerly, indeed, they had none.

The bishops preside in the Courts of Law, in the Councils and Synods, and on the Boards of Nomination, where they hold the balance between the parish and the diocese. They constitute one-fifth of the Representative Body. They appoint, as usual, their deans and archdeacons. A bishop can send any decision of his Diocesan Synod into the General Synod for review; and in the General Synod itself the House of Bishops has an absolute veto. It does not appear that any arrangement could have preserved their influence more effectually. It is hard to see what more conservative constitution, short of despotism, could have been devised.

Nevertheless, we are supposed to have legislated against the Prayer-Book in a very reckless spirit. A final Article will therefore be devoted to the consideration of the revised Prayer-Book of the Church of Ireland.

G. A. CHADWICK.

Art. II.—THE RULE OF FAITH.

Canon of Scripture.

BY the word Canon (*κανών*) was meant originally, not a catalogue of the inspired writings, but the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, which were to be a rule or guide in public teaching: these sometimes, as in the Apostles' Creed, appear in short summaries, sometimes are referred to by individual writers (Irenæus, Tertullian, &c.), as well known and acknowledged by the churches. It is in this sense that St. Paul calls the measure of divine truth which the Philippian Church had attained to a Canon (Phil. iii. 16). Since this Canon of truth, whether inward in the heart or expressed in writing, derived all its validity from its presumed correspondence with what the Apostles had delivered orally; and since this latter, after the Apostles had departed from the scene of their earthly labours, could be found with certainty only in their own writings; it became a matter of vital moment to ascertain, with all care and diligence, what were these writings, which, when collected together, might for ever form an authentic record of Apostolic doctrine. The result of this pious labour is the volume of our New Testament, all the books of which we receive as they are commonly acknowledged. As regards the Old Testament, we accept the judgment of its proper historical guardians, and consequently exclude some of the books which the Council of Trent (Sess. iv., de can. ss.) admits, but which the Jews did not acknowledge as on a level with the others. The whole, as forming the standard of faith and morals, came to be called the Canon, and the writings contained in it, Canonical.

For the history of the formation of the Canon, or rather of the evidence to its existence from an early age (for the actual process of its formation is involved in obscurity), the reader is referred to works which treat expressly of the subject, such as Westcott on the Canon, and especially, on the Canon of the New Testament, Kirchhofer's excellent work. For our present purpose a mere sketch will be sufficient. And, to begin with the New Testament, we observe that from the first our present books are cited as *Scripture*—that is, as books *sui generis*, possessing an authority which belonged to no others; that they were publicly read in Christian assemblies as the Word of God; that catalogues were formed of them, of which thirteen, of a date previous to the fifth century, are extant, and which, though in some of them certain books are omitted, all agree in containing no other; and that the oldest version, the Peschito, contains these and no other books. Commentaries were written on them, and they were appealed to by heretics and unbelievers (with few exceptions), as well as by orthodox writers, as authentic records of the Christian religion.

Notwithstanding this general agreement as to what books were to be accounted Canonical, it is impossible to assign the particular time when the collection was made, or the persons who were engaged in it. No traces exist of this question having been formally discussed in any Council; that of Laodicea, A.D. 364, which has been improperly supposed to have fixed the Canon, merely giving a catalogue of the books already accepted. Unlike the books of the Old Testament, which were confined to a single nation, those of the New were addressed to churches scattered over the known world: time therefore was needed, both for a circulation of the books and for a general recognition of their authority. When to this we add the difficulties of transcription and communication, and the political disadvantages under which, for several centuries, Christianity laboured, preventing the assembling of any Council to determine this and similar questions, it cannot be matter of surprise that the Canon should only gradually have assumed its present form. One circumstance that must have retarded the work was the swarm of apocryphal writings which appeared soon after the Apostolic age, and which commonly laid claim to Apostolic origin. To sift the evidence for these spurious compositions must have been a work of no small difficulty; and it speaks highly for the diligence and judgment of the early Church, that none of them appear in the early catalogues, are quoted as Scripture by the early Fathers, or were read in the public assemblies of Christians.

The books which Eusebius, a writer of great research and impartiality, A.D. 315, calls ὁμολογουμένοι—that is, universally and without controversy admitted—are our present ones, with the exception of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that of St. James, the second of St. Peter, the second and third of St. John, and the Apocalypse; these latter, he says, were questioned by some, though received by the majority. They are just such as from their nature or contents we might expect to have been of tardier recognition. For either, like the Epistle to the Hebrews, those of St. James and St. Jude, and the Apocalypse, they do not expressly assert their Apostolic origin; or, like the second and third of St. John, they were addressed to individuals, not to churches, which evidently would render it more difficult to prove their genuineness. Whatever may be the deficiency of evidence in respect to these books, it must never be forgotten that it is comparative, and that those for which there is the least rest on testimony incomparably stronger than can be adduced for any apocryphal writing. Nor must it be forgotten that the very hesitation and reserve with which the disputed books were received adds weight to the judgment of the early Church, where it was unanimous. From the candidly expressed doubts of the three first centuries in regard to some books, we derive the same

benefit in estimating the claims of the rest as we do on the fact of our Lord's resurrection from the incredulity of St. Thomas.

Nevertheless, these disputed books cannot be placed exactly on a level with the rest. We admit them into the Canon as on the whole sufficiently attested, but we cannot now repair the disadvantage under which they labour, as having been not universally accepted by the ancient Church. The doubts which were then felt propagate themselves, unless additional evidence should come to light, which is not likely: *comparatively*, therefore, with the others, they occupy, as regards the external testimony, an inferior position. Hence they have been sometimes called Deutero-canonical. Chemnitz's remark deserves attention: "Ubi desunt primæ et veteris ecclesiæ firmæ et consentientes testificationes, sequens ecclesia, sicut non potest ex falsis facere vera, *ita nec ex dubiis potest certa facere*" (Exam. Conc. Trid. li. 22).

The Canon of the New Testament being established, that of the Old Testament to us Christians at once follows. For by our Lord and the Apostles our present books of it are quoted and classified, and no others. Amidst the censures which Christ directed against the Jews of that age, He never charged them with adding to or corrupting their Scriptures; by their traditions they frequently made "the Word of God of none effect," but the Word itself they left intact. Tradition points to the return from the Babylonish Captivity as the time when the task was undertaken of collecting the books of Scripture, which, through the destruction of the Temple, had become dispersed; and the same tradition makes Nehemiah and Ezra, especially the latter, principal agents in the prosecution of the task. To the collection thus formed, whether by Ezra or not, his own writings, together with those of Nehemiah and Malachi, which were written before Ezra's death, were added, and the Canon of the Old Testament thus completed. It was, with the exception of a few insignificant sects, acknowledged by the Jews throughout the world. Though a number of apocryphal writings, most of them of Alexandrian origin, appeared subsequently to the last of the Prophets, and some became incorporated in the LXX. translation, it does not appear that even in Egypt they ever obtained Canonical authority, and certainly not among the Jews of Palestine. It was, therefore, in disregard of the unanimous tradition of the appointed guardians of the Old Testament, as well as of the facts of history, that the Church of Rome pronounced, at the Council of Trent, that all the books contained in the Vulgate, apocryphal or otherwise, should, under pain of an anathema, be accounted as sacred and Canonical (Sess. iv. c. 1).

We now proceed to the properly dogmatical aspect of the question. On what grounds, let us ask, do we receive a book

as Canonical? The ultimate ground can be no other than our conviction that it is, or contains, the Word of God; in other words, that it is an authentic record, written under special inspiration of the Holy Spirit, of revealed religion, partially revealed under the Jewish, more fully under the Christian dispensation. This, however, only leads the way to the further question, How do we arrive at this conviction? The reply of the Romish Church is, that the authority of Scripture depends on the decision of the Church; or, in other words, that the canonicity, and therefore inspiration, of a book is to be admitted because the Church affirms it. It is true that this is not openly avowed in the decisions of the Council of Trent, but it is virtually assumed. For when the Council anathematizes all who do not receive as sacred and Canonical—*e.g.*, the books of Tobias, Judith, Wisdom, and the two books of the Maccabees—which notoriously never had a place in the Jewish Canon (*i.e.*, the original Hebrew), and were never unanimously accepted by the ancient Christian Church, but, on the contrary, were tacitly rejected by those Fathers who were acquainted with Hebrew, and who made the subject their special study (*e.g.*, Jerome, whose catalogue agrees with ours,[1] it is obvious that it really claims the power of fixing the Canon by its own plenary authority. It is only an accident how far the power may be exercised. The Council stops short at certain books which, no doubt, have been esteemed in theChurch; but the *principle* may be extended to any books, no matter what their contents or what the attestation they enjoy. For the principle is, that the existing Church of Rome is the final court of appeal to decide what books are to be esteemed Canonical and what not.

Against this principle the Reformed Churches protest. In the first place, whatever may be due to the authority of the Church in this matter, it is certainly not the existing Romish Church, nor the Romish Church of the sixteenth century, from which we receive the Canon; but from that early Church which makes no pretensions to be an independent infallible authority, but exercises its functions only in connexion with the facts of history. The Tridentine Fathers were in no better position to determine these questions than we are. But, in the next place, the Reformers denied that *any* Church, or even the Church Catholic, possesses the authority claimed. By them the function of the Church, in relation to Scripture, is defined to be "a keeper and a witness" thereof (Art. XX.): a keeper, inasmuch as to its custody the sacred records are committed, to be jealously

[1] The apocryphal books found an entrance into the LXX. version, and thence passed into the old Latin translation, from which they were received into the Vulgate.

guarded from addition, mutilation, or depravation ; and a witness, inasmuch as it is incumbent on the Church to hand down, from age to age, the chain of evidence which proves these books, and no others, to have been from the first acknowledged. So far, no doubt, it is, as a rule, the Church that first introduces her members to the knowledge of the Bible, and moreover accompanies this introduction with her own attestation to its supernatural origin and priceless value; but this is a very different thing from assuming a power to *make* a book Canonical by a simple authoritative decision. The Church, in this matter, discharges a function resembling that of the Samaritan woman in John iv., who invited her fellow-townsmen to come and see a man who had told her all that ever she did: she was the means, or occasion, of their becoming acquainted with the Messiah, but she did not make Him what He was, nor could she produce saving faith in them; they believed, when they did believe, not because of the woman's saying, but because they had heard Him themselves, and perceived that it was indeed the Christ (v. 42). The Scripture is never fully received on its proper grounds until a similar personal experience is wrought in its readers.

It must not be dissembled that the witness of the Church to the canonicity of a book comes to us with a great weight of authority (authority in the classical sense of the word "auctoritas"—viz., weight and prevailing moral influence), though not with that claimed for it by the Council of Trent; but it is important to point out wherein this authority lies. The nearness of the primitive Church to Apostolic times, its knowledge of the original Greek, the sources of evidence then accessible which now no longer exist, and other like *external* advantages over us, are no doubt of great moment; but they by no means exhaust the question. If they did, *any* body of historical testimony, say of heathen writers, possessing the same advantages, would be of equal value. The witness of the Church is valuable because it is that of the *Church*—that is, of the body which possesses by covenant promise the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, the same Divine Agent who inspired the books. The Church, therefore, of the Apostolic age had a spiritual perception and tact which, independently in a measure of external testimony, enabled it to discriminate between the genuine writings of the Apostles or Apostolic men and spurious compositions; and no other body but the Church could exercise this gift. It was by its exercise that such a writing as the Epistle to the Hebrews, of which the human author, the *auctor secundarius*, is doubtful, gained admittance into the Canon, while others bearing the names of eminent Apostles were rejected. Neither species of evidence produced its effect apart

from the other: the historical led to the internal, the internal confirmed the historical; a reciprocal action was constantly going on, the result of which was the final settlement of the Canon. This process of mutual confirmation is nothing but what also occurs in art and literature. For example—a picture known to be by Raphael commends itself at once to a cultivated taste; and a cultivated taste, without knowing the painter, assigns such a picture to the bloom, not to the decadence of the art. So a book written by an Apostle, in the exercise of his office as an inspired teacher, strikes a corresponding chord in the spiritual mind; and a spiritual mind, even if the name of the author be not certain, feels no hesitation in accepting the testimony of the early Church as to the Apostolic parentage of such a book.

And this internal evidence, or, as our older divines term it, the *testimonium Spiritus sancti* in Scripture, is ever repeating itself, and is as valid now as it was in the first century. For the presence of the Holy Ghost is not confined to any age of the Church; we also believe that we enjoy His gracious influences, and with them the power of discerning the voice of the Spirit in Scripture. Hence Protestant theologians are careful to distinguish between the external evidence which can only produce an historical faith (*fides humana*), and the witness of the Holy Ghost Himself in Scripture, on which, in the last resort, our conviction of its divine origin is founded, and which alone can produce a spiritual persuasion (*fides divina*). The Holy Spirit in the word and the Holy Spirit in the heart answer one to the other as sound and echo, or as voice to voice; Christians have the mind of Christ, and therefore know, as none else can, the things of the Spirit—that is, of Christ (John xvi. 14; 1 Cor. ii. 14–16); and the testimony thus furnished by Scripture itself is direct and conclusive, it being presupposed that the external testimony corroborates, or does not militate against it. Those who disparage it may be asked how else the Romish argument is to be met, that we Protestants first appeal to the Church to declare what is Scripture, and then on the authority of Scripture proceed to reject some of the traditions of the Church (*i.e.*, the Romish Church). Since by the term "Church" the Romanist means that portion of it of which the Pope is the acknowledged head, this argument, as *against him*, must be met in the manner indicated above; it is not on the authority of the Church of Rome, as distinguished from any other existing Church of Christendom, that we receive a book as Canonical. But the argument, in its essence, may be used by those who are not Romanists for a different purpose. Let the supposition be made, that the Christianity, say of the third and fourth centuries, as it appears in the pages of the great writers of that age, is not exactly that

of St. Paul or St. John; that, in fact, judged by the Apostolic standard, it exhibits, at any rate, germs of error, which afterwards blossomed into noxious fruit. Those who, notwithstanding their apparent discrepancy with the inspired writings, hold these developments to be legitimate and salutary, may urge against their opponents the very argument which the Romanist uses, and on better grounds; they may say, You admit that you receive the Scriptures on the testimony of the Church of the early centuries, and yet, after having done so, you proceed, on the authority of the Scriptures, to condemn the Christianity of those ages on certain salient points. The reply, then, must advance further than merely to meet the Romish claim, and be to the effect that we do not accept a book as the Word of God solely on the testimony even of the early Church. Even the latter is but the outer tabernacle through which we pass to the Holy of Holies, and not the very interior sanctuary where the presence of God speaks for itself. Though, therefore, we receive this testimony with the greatest respect and deference, we retain the right of criticizing the prevalent Christianity of those times from the sacred volume itself which has thus come down to us; just as the Jews scrupulously cherished the prophetical books of their Canon, which books present a most unflattering picture of the moral and religious state of this people. The early Church, consciously or unconsciously, handed down the antidote to its own errors; and the same may be said of every Church which transmits the Holy Scriptures in their integrity. Once in possession of the sacred touchstone, we apply it, without hesitation, to test the Christianity even of the transmitters; we are thankful for the gift of the volume, and for the care taken to convey it to us intact, but we refuse to be tied to that *interpretation* of it which even the primitive Church may have sanctioned. Nor would this Church have demanded such a sacrifice from us. It may have erred *materially* on some points or in some features; but in its *formal* principle it would have been one with us: a Cyprian, an Augustine, or a Chrysostom may not be safe guides on all points, but they would have been the first to say, Let whatever we write be judged by the Holy Scriptures; if it is consistent with them, let it be accepted—if not, let it be rejected. And if the early Church, as represented in its great writers, appears not to have perceived its deviations, if any, from the inspired standard, and sincerely thought it had faithfully reproduced that standard, this is an error common to the Church of every age. The Jews read their prophets, but failed to correct thereby the prevalent errors of their religious faith and practice. We ourselves possess the blessing of an open Bible, to which we attach the supreme authority in matters of faith, and yet English Christianity may

be defective as compared with the Apostolic standard, fresh from inspiration. The Bible is far from having spoken its last word to Christendom. In a word, we do not, we cannot, allow the external testimony even of the primitive Church, even of the Church universal, to be the ultimate ground of our reception of a book as Canonical. Such objectors, too, may be asked how—otherwise than by the direct testimony of the Holy Spirit in the Word—are the laity, who have neither time nor ability for learned researches, ever to arrive at a happy persuasion that the words they read are a message from God?

That the principle is capable of abuse may be true. It is not properly applied when a professed discerning of the mind of the Holy Spirit in a book is held of itself to warrant its admittance into the Canon; or, to state the same thing from the converse side, if, because we fancy that we do not discern the Holy Spirit in a book, we conclude that we are at once at liberty to reject it, as Luther rejected the Epistle of St. James, because it did not come up to his conception of what a Canonical book should be. But the error lies, as is often the case, not in the principle itself, but in the misapplication of it. A book which comes down to us, on probable testimony, as the work of an Apostle, written in the exercise of his office or under his immediate superintendence, and on that ground assigned a place in the Canon by the early Church, cannot be set aside on the adverse judgment of any *single* Christian. For if such a one should profess that he discerns in it no trace of inspiration, the answer must be, that no individual Christian possesses a monopoly of the Holy Spirit, and that it is more probable that he should be mistaken than that the whole Church should have gone wrong. It would be a serious thing indeed if the *whole Church* were to come round to his opinion; but this is exactly what has never occurred as regards any Canonical book. We must believe, then, that it was Luther's own fault if he failed to find spiritual nutriment in the Epistle of St. James, rather than that the Epistle is defective in internal evidence. We must not put asunder what God has joined together, or invert the order which Divine Providence has established in this matter. The Epistle of St. James, or the Apocalypse, reaches our hands as part of the Canon, admitted into it by that age which had the best means of deciding on its pretensions, and accepted by all Christian Churches. It comes, therefore, with a *primâ facie* weight of evidence in its favour—evidence partly, as we must believe, founded, as regards those who admitted the book, on the very same internal witness of the Holy Spirit which we demand. From this its position it cannot be deposed except by a verdict of the Church universal; and this cannot now be obtained,

partly on account of the divisions that prevail in Christendom, and partly because the *historical* evidence on which the early Church decided is, in a great measure, no longer extant; a plain intimation of Providence that we are not to make our private—or, in modern phrase, "subjective"—notions the sole ground of our acceptance or rejection of a book. And so, though the external attestation and the internal testimony are not the same, and the one is not complete without the other, we yet are warranted in believing that, in point of fact, no one who, taking into his hands a book which has been accepted as Canonical by the *whole* Church, proceeds in a humble and devout spirit to study its contents, will eventually fail to perceive therein the witness of the Holy Spirit.

It must be admitted that, in some instances, it is the external testimony on which we have chiefly to rely. It might be difficult, *e.g.*, to maintain that the books of Joshua, or of Ruth, though we hold them to be inspired, reflect their own light, or convey a conviction of their origin, so forcibly as the Gospel of St. John or the Epistles of St. Paul; and the same may be said of some books even of the New Testament, as compared with others. The testimony of the Spirit in these is more latent, does not appeal so directly to the spiritual instinct, and therefore we are compelled to make up for the deficiency by leaning more upon the historical attestation.

It is to be noted, finally, that there is reason to believe that the office of inspired men was not only to write themselves as the Holy Spirit prompted, but to authenticate the writings of their predecessors; a circumstance which may be thought to be hinted at in the well-known passage of Josephus:—"From the time of Artaxerxes to the present day, books of various kinds have appeared, but they are not esteemed of equal authority with the more ancient, because since that time the legitimate succession of prophets has failed." As long as this succession continued, inquirers had an infallible authority to appeal to on the question whether a book was inspired or not. Every reader of the Old Testament will have observed how often passages from the earlier prophets are quoted by the later ones, and thus receive an inspired attestation. In like manner St. Peter authenticates St. Paul's Epistles (2 Pet. iii. 15, 16); and it was doubtless ordered by the providence of God that St. John should survive to see the Canon of the New Testament virtually completed, and to give it his imprimatur.

E. A. Litton.

ART. III.—MISSIONARY SECRETARIAT OF HENRY VENN.

The Missionary Secretariat of Henry Venn, B.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's, and Honorary Secretary of the Church Missionary Society. By the Rev. W. KNIGHT, M.A., Rector of Pitt Portion, Tiverton, and formerly Secretary of the Church Missionary Society. *With an Introductory Biographical Chapter and a Notice of West African Commerce,* by his Sons, the Rev. JOHN VENN, M.A., Senior Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge, and the Rev. HENRY VENN, M.A., Rector of Clare Portion, Tiverton. London: Longmans, Green, & Co. 1880.

IN a previous Number the first portion of this valuable volume has been noticed by us, and to this it is not necessary to recur. It is our object now to deal with the second and more important division of the biography, in which the missionary aspect of Mr. Venn's life is presented to us—the more important division, for it is as Secretary of the Church Missionary Society that he will ever be remembered, and in that capacity he spent thirty out of fifty years of his ministerial life. Those thirty years saw the growth and development not only of missions, but of what Mr. Venn himself called "the science of missions:" during that period the great principles of missionary action were firmly established, and their application tested in almost all conceivable circumstances. We repeat the phrase "science of missions;" for just as it is no disparagement to the great teachers of earlier days to say that it is to Arnold that the public school system as now known amongst us owes its rise and establishment, so is it no discredit to Venn's predecessors in his line of labour to attribute to him a like result in the field of missionary enterprise. He was the last man to forget what was due to those who came before him. His sketch of the founders of the Church Missionary Society, and his portraits of Pratt and Bickersteth, which Mr. Knight has given in full, show his high value of the work done before he entered upon it, and gladly did he recognize the hand of God in raising up such labourers. "While we acknowledge," he writes, "the varied distribution of gifts by which the great Head of the Church qualifies his servants for occupying different departments of labour, we cannot but see and admire his goodness towards the Society in associating Bickersteth with Pratt, Coates, and Woodrooffe in the management of a great institution for the conversion of the heathen, in the most critical period of its early history" (p. 169). Yet we, who view the matter as it is before us to-day, feel that it is Venn's life-

long labour which has given this institution a permanent character and developed the principles of its action; and we recognize in the gift of such a man to the Society that same divine goodness which he ever loved to trace. He "will be known," as Mr. Knight says, "in any future records of the Church of England as the man who was the great agent in developing missions directed specially to the heathen, and, above all, Evangelical missions in connection with the National Church, and who made them a force in England and the world. The product of any man's life is the union of two factors—the occasion and the man. If the occasion has not come, the man will drift into some other work. If there is not the man for the occasion, the opportunity will be lost for want of some one to rise and seize it" (pp. 145, 146).

The great principles of this science of missions are twofold—spiritual and ecclesiastical. "The Society will be conducted upon those principles which we believe to be most in accordance with the gospel of Christ and with the spirit of the Reformed Church of England." This was the watchword of the founders, and to this the course of the Church Missionary Society has been true. "It must be kept," said Josiah Pratt, at the preliminary meeting, "in Evangelical hands." "There must be," said John Venn, at the same meeting, "the Church Principle, but not the High Church Principle." By these principles Mr. Venn stood firm. At the close of one of his reports he thus writes:—

> The Protestant or Evangelical spirit which the founders of this Society infused, by the help of God, into its very constitution and framework has stood the test of sixty years; that it has received a blessing from the Lord, and has won the confidence of the Church of Christ, the present report bears abundant evidence. The fundamental principles to which your Committee refer are such as these: that the Lord will guide his own work by the leadings of a special providence; that the only solid foundation of a mission is the individual conversion of souls to Christ; that the gospel of the grace of God is to be preached in its fulness and in its distinctness by the pioneer missionary and by the faithful pastors of 10,000 converts, in the bazaar, under the shade of a tree, in the capacious mission church, in the vernacular school, and in the training college; that a preached gospel "is the power of God" for the formation and for the perfection of a mission; that all other arrangements must give way to the fullest development of a preached gospel; that the preacher of the gospel is the true leader of a mission till a spiritual church is raised and the external organization of constituted authorities becomes expedient; that then the mission has accomplished its work, and this Society will be ready to withdraw its agency; though, as in New Zealand, it may be difficult on both sides to break the relationship which spiritual principles have cemented and consecrated. These principles your Committee now transmit to their successors, uncompromised and unimpaired, to be the guiding

star in a shifting age of every successive Committee of the Church Missionary Society.

These are noble words, and words most important for the Church to bear in mind. In these days, when some men seem to think that they can manipulate Christian churches by ritual and song, it is well to have an institution amongst us whose watchword is, "The holy seed shall be the substance thereof." "Let the gospel be fully preached," Bickersteth had said before, "and we are persuaded that this gospel will be the power of God unto the salvation of some who will believe. This is your first great work. Everything else must be subordinate to this." What is true for Africa and the East is true for England. Speaking of the possible conflict between the spiritual and ecclesiastical principles, Mr. Venn wrote:—

I will venture to predict what will be the battleground of this conflict. It will be, as it seems to me, the question—In what way can a sinner obtain pardon and peace with God? Other great questions agitate the minds of the few; this is the great personal question with every man whose conscience is awake. Every Church and every minister of a Church must give a distinct answer to this inquiry; in seasons of religious conflict this is sure to be uppermost, and by the answer given every Church or minister will stand or fall. Men cannot unite upon other points while they disagree in this.

By whatever expression the truth of the gospel may be indicated, whether as the doctrine of the cross of Christ, whether as justification by faith only, whether as the Atonement, whether as redemption through the blood of Christ, it has ever encountered opposition. It was "to the Jews a stumbling-block and to the Greeks foolishness." In the earliest ages of the Church, and ever since, the struggle has been going on within the Church, to tear from this blessed truth its significancy or its simplicity, to substitute a way of salvation more in accordance with natural reason and human prejudices. Popery worships the shadow but denies the substance of the truth, by setting up the doctrine of human merit, of works of supererogation, and of the mediation of saints. Superstition substitutes sacramental grace. Yet this truth, though ridiculed by the profane, though cavilled at by others, is cherished as the life of the soul by all who receive it. When received, it frees a man from the slavery of the world; it gives him power; it is accompanied by a change in the moral character which cannot be mistaken. This cardinal truth brought the Reformation. It has revived our Church. If its enemies are now mustering their forces, so are its friends. Its influence, blessed be God, increases daily. Presuming only to speak from personal experience, I hesitate not to say, that where one heart was swayed by its influence when I first entered the ministry of this metropolis,[1] thirty-seven years ago, hundreds might now be counted. At home it is becoming more and more the rallying point for all who are zealous on the Lord's side. It

[1] Mr. Venn came to London as minister of St. John's, Holloway, in 1834.

is the line of advance of all our social improvements. Abroad it is evangelizing the world. It is easily apprehended and cordially embraced by thousands of the negroes of Africa, of the Hindoos of India, and of the islanders of the Pacific. It has raised them into the brotherhood of Christendom (pp. 170, 171).

These, then, are the spiritual principles of this Science of Missions. The primary object of them, and of all true Churches, is the salvation of souls. And Mr. Venn was most jealous that this primary object should never be forgotten or overlaid. We well remember how in the early days of East African exploration by Krapf and Rebmann, when great interest was awakened amongst scientific folk by the discovery of the great snow mountains of that region, he was extremely anxious that the missionary should never sink into the geographical explorer; and when the high expectations of immediate triumph were for a time clouded by the successive deaths and failing health of one agent after another, his expression was, "The day of the Lord is on all pleasant pictures." We remember also, on the other hand, that when, as the result of Rebmann's work, there was one poor lame negro, and but one, truly converted to God, he rejoiced over him as the "holy seed"—the token that God had a blessing for the degraded tribes of that region; and how thoroughly he sympathized with the devoted Krapf, who, when his wife was taken from him in the island of Mombasa, carried over her corpse to the mainland of Africa for burial, and regarded that Christian grave as a sign that Africa should yet be the Lord's.

To carry on this work men of the right stamp were wanted, men understanding and valuing and living by the truth they were to proclaim. For many years they were not to be found in England; the English Church and Universities did not provide them, and this led to the establishment of the Islington College, a work begun by Mr. Bickersteth, but to which afterwards Mr. Venn gave most careful supervision. It would be invidious to select individual names out of a noble army of Christian warriors; but they will live in the history of the Church of Christ. Of later years the Universities have contributed a full and worthy contingent. By these men the gospel has been preached far and near and souls won for the Lord.

But when the spiritual work has made progress, and souls are won, and a Church is formed, then it becomes necessary to apply the ecclesiastical principles of the science of missions. And here at once come arrangements requiring much tact and delicacy combined with wisdom and firmness. From the first Mr. Venn recognized that the appointment and the withdrawal of agents must lie with the Church Missionary Society's Committee. Here was a work carried on by

a voluntary association, supported by voluntary funds. It was obvious that those who formed this association and supplied these funds must have a voice in the disbursement of them, would in fact only contribute them for the furtherance of their object; and if that work was in danger of being marred or hindered by unfit agents would withhold the funds. It is the principle now widely recognized in placing churches under trustee patronage; and this, let us observe, is nothing new, but only a development of that lay patronage from which the Church of England for so many centuries has so widely benefited. That the Church Missionary Society's Committee should occupy towards their labourers abroad a position analogous to that of lay-patrons at home is now on all hands admitted, and by the settlement of the Colombo dispute admitted, as we trust, conclusively. Thus the Church Missionary Society's contributors, through their representatives in Salisbury Square, exercise that control and legitimate influence of the lay element which is always a source of strength and safety to a Church.

No doubt there are those to whom this mode of proceeding is not acceptable. We have ourselves heard enunciated from the platform (not of a Church Missionary meeting) the dictum, "Let the Church go forth on the grand Ignatian principle—let nothing be done without the bishop: and because Ignatian, apostolical; and because apostolical, divine." But unfortunately for the speaker the true Ignatius never propounded the principle on which so much was to be built. If, however, we no longer hear this, we do meet with objections of the same kind, to one of which our attention is called in a note to p. 224. The source whence it is derived is not told us, but the mention of a Zulu scheme in the words which follow our quotation would perhaps sufficiently indicate it.

If you like to sound the Church Missionary Society as to funds, I have no objection, but nothing could induce me to submit to any dictation or interference on their part. The whole mission shall in every respect be managed by the Church here [that is, we suppose, by the Bishop?] or there shall be none. I have seen enough since I have been out here of the working of societies to make me loathe them—always excepting the dear Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, which seems to be mercifully preserved from the Society spirit. If the Church Missionary Society will follow the example of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and place £500 a year entirely at my disposal for the formation of a mission, I will thankfully accept of it. But if they mean to bargain for power I will have nothing to do with them. I see every day I live more and more clearly that the whole Church work must be done by the Church, and not by any other agency. And, thank God, this diocese is beginning to think so too. If the Church Missionary Society will not help me without annexing conditions which the Church here will not assent to,

and if the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel cannot assist us further, we must look to God for supplying us the means in other ways.

We quote this as indicating a spirit which has from time to time to be met with in dealing with missionary work, and which shows the wisdom and safety of the line the Church Missionary Society has uniformly pursued. At one of the early discussions of the founders, Mr. John Venn remarked, "I would sacrifice a great deal to preserve Church order, but not the salvation of souls." If the ecclesiastical and spiritual principles come into collision, the ecclesiastical must bend to the spiritual. Spiritual work done by spiritual men, and such alone can do it, is our motto.

But, subject to this limitation—and the limitation, be it observed, involves no more than the legitimate rights of lay-patrons—Mr. Venn and his colleagues have always held heartily and firmly to the ecclesiastical principles of the Reformed Church of England. How true they have been to that Church the whole story of their work demonstrates. When the Society was originated, a first step was to send a deputation to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops of Durham and London, with a copy of the rules of the Society and a respectful letter; and that episcopal countenance was so long withheld was due, not to any unwillingness on the part of the Society to welcome it, but to the fact that few men are able to rise so far beyond the level of their day as to throw themselves into a new and untried project which might perchance collapse and bring with its fall contempt and ridicule. But when the episcopal support came, it was most thankfully accepted. While to the importance of securing the supervision of their missionaries abroad by existing bishops, or by the establishment of new sees, Mr. Venn and the committee were always alive. It is a well-worn story that the Church Missionary Society in 1813 did battle for the foundation of the Indian Episcopate. The Bishopric of Sierra Leone, founded in 1851, was entirely due to Mr. Venn's zealous efforts; and among the stipendiary agents of the Society at the present time are no fewer than nine bishops, while at least three others have in earlier days marched under the same banner. We well remember a conversation of Mr. Venn with Dr. Russell, late Bishop of Ningpo, in which he said, "What you want is to have your episcopal position recognized;" the Presbyter being in fact, as were the Presbyters of the Philippian Church, really an Episcopus, though not of course assuming episcopal functions. But there is a vast difference between conferring the episcopal order on a successful missionary for the consolidation and development of his work, and sending out into the mission field bishops, who may be successful or not, and who,

as experience shows, not seldom return home to the discredit of the missionary cause.

We do not like to leave the subject of the Ecclesiastical Principles, which Mr. Venn maintained, without calling attention to the able and interesting Paper on the Sacraments which Mr. Knight has been good enough to reproduce and thus to render permanent. It deserves careful study and expresses, as we are convinced, the true teaching of the Reformed Church of England, which the supporters of the Church Missionary Society claim as their rightful inheritance. Here again we have a pleasant reminiscence of Mr. Venn. In conversation on this Paper, he thus illustrated the federal nature of the Baptismal Covenant: "It is as when men make a bargain and say 'done,' and give their hands upon it. But the bargain has yet to be carried out."

Such then were the great missionary principles of this remarkable man. It is not, however, to be supposed that he did nothing but insist upon them. On the contrary he never forgot to enlist in the good cause all such collateral aids as were not inconsistent with these principles or obstructive of them. To make use of any means that would improve the people among whom the missionary agents were labouring, to introduce when possible the arts and industries of life, to establish schools and colleges, to provide good school and other books—these, as well as the direct preaching of the gospel, were objects always kept in view. To combine these with distinct mission work is nothing new, as the history of the New Zealand and Sierra Leone Missions abundantly shows. To regard it as a recent discovery, that civilization should go hand in hand with the Word of God, and to speak, as some have done, of the Church Missionary agents as neglecting this combination, can result only from ignorance. Into this matter, however, we cannot enter more fully.

But what above all gave Henry Venn the success he achieved and the influence he exerted, was the spiritual power he never failed to wield. In the reports he wrote, in the charges he delivered to missionaries on their departure, and in the correspondence he carried on with them, the power of this influence may be seen. Of these charges or instructions, as they are termed, Mr. Knight has given us a large number, and they all deserve careful study. It is indeed this preservation and arrangement of documents which makes his sketch of the "Missionary Secretariat" so valuable and fits it to become a handbook on missions, which cannot fail to be useful not only to the committee in years to come, but to many a missionary labouring under trials or grappling with difficulties, and also, as we may venture to say, to the Bishops of the Church at home and abroad. Those who carefully study these documents cannot fail to remark the masterly way in which the circumstances,

the dangers, the wants, the trials of each mission and each missionary are dealt with, so that one and all would feel they served a chief who well deserved their confidence and had at Salisbury Square a sympathizing friend. As to his correspondence with missionaries abroad, we have the testimony of some of them of the high value they set upon it. "He encouraged me from time to time by his excellent letters, which were exceeding precious to me." "I know from experience how thoroughly Mr. Venn made himself acquainted with every detail of our work." "He was one who in a most remarkable and very uncommon degree combined greatness and largeness of heart with rare mental qualifications for the work to which he devoted the best energies of his life." "No one I ever heard of had such a power to sympathize with and draw to himself persons much younger than himself." "Fatherly and friendly counsel and encouragement given at first entrance on mission work; wise and comforting letters subsequently written; hospitable reception at Mortlake; counsel and immediate direction, are some among other reasons which must ever impress upon me a grateful regard to Mr. Venn's memory." Such are a few out of many testimonies given by those who regarded him as their friend and leader; and these show conclusively what manner of man he was.

As a further illustration of this spiritual power, we would refer to the instructions, headed "Dangers and Safeguards," pp. 441–451. Mr. Venn is there dealing with the question of missions to civilized and cultured races, as contrasted with those to rude and untutored savages. The cry, he says, not unfrequently comes, "Send us missionaries of well-cultured intellects and of mental power; men capable of mastering the national literature, of grappling with systems of philosophy, of meeting in argument subtle and cavilling reasoners." Now it would not be like him to neglect any gifts which the servant of Christ may possess or can improve, and he urges on all missionary students the importance of mental discipline, but utters at the same time a word of caution.

"Do not be discouraged," he says, "by any sense of deficiency in natural ability or of inadequate mental furniture. You have been led to your present position by the clear providence of God. And if you still wait upon Him, and do not wilfully thrust yourselves into any particular post or branch of the work, you will always be able to feel 'I am where God has placed me; the task before me is that which He has appointed, and for which I doubt not that He will give strength sufficient.' A missionary of ordinary secular attainments, who depends on Divine grace, who calmly and prayerfully speaks of that which he knows by his own experience, who patiently endeavours to understand his

opponent's position, ... will always meet with respect, and will feel, even when addressing such persons, that a Divine power accompanies the proclamation of God's truth. Let him but wield the sword of the Spirit; let him only live and speak in close communion with God; and he will find, after all, that the superiority, and the evident superiority, is on his own side" (pp. 443–444). And then he urges, as a natural sequel: "Beware of the temptation to omit or abridge devotional exercises, for the purpose of giving more time to intellectual study." "Languor in the spiritual life cannot be compensated by the most brilliant of earthly gifts. Let one or two hours be therefore daily given to private communion with God in prayer, and in reading the Scripture. Let it be actual communion—converse with God in solitude, real pouring out of the heart before Him, real reception from His fulness. Be abundant in intercessory supplication, especially in behalf of fellow-missionaries, native associates, members of your own household, and, the committee would also ask, in behalf of those who carry on the work at this central office" (p. 445).

There is a great deal in this interesting volume which we are obliged to leave without notice. The title it bears, "The Missionary Secretariat of Rev. H. Venn," accurately describes this second division of it, which we have now briefly reviewed. Mr. Knight was for many years his colleague, and he thoroughly understood the work he had to do, and has done it well. Such a history, supported throughout by original documents, is just what was needed. No one, who loves evangelical truth, can read this book without receiving great encouragement. It tells us that the principles we hold dear have been put to the proof and have never been found wanting. Only let us remember the great distinction, which Mr. Venn often made, between holding evangelical opinions and possessing the evangelical spirit. The opinions may be held and taught without life and power; but where the spirit lives there must be triumph. It is also worth the consideration of the clergy, who support missions, whether they give them their due place in parochial organization. We remember Mr. Venn's describing his arrangements at Drypool and at Islington. His parochial workers were divided into three classes: (1) Sunday-school teachers; (2) district visitors; (3) missionary collectors; and he was in the habit of promoting successful workers from the first class to the second, and from the second to the third. With him the missionary collector stood highest. It is not the classification which most men would naturally adopt, but coming from him we may be quite sure it has good grounds on which to rest. We suppose that in his view the field of labour should widen as progress was made. The Sunday-school teacher is connected

with the children of the parish, the district visitor with the adults and their homes, the missionary collector with the whole world. The last work, to be done rightly, would seem to require larger knowledge, wider sympathies, and the power of enlisting others in hearty service for the Lord. But whatever view we may take of this subject, the fact shows that when Mr. Venn went as secretary to Salisbury Square the mission field had already attained a position of paramount importance in his own mind. It was with that estimate and in that conviction that he lived and laboured for this great cause. The record of his life and work now before us ought to kindle in many hearts earnest zeal and happy confidence. The history of the Church Missionary Society teaches us that the gospel we love has lost none of its power. It has rescued from a life of blood the cannibal of New Zealand; it has melted the heart of the hard stoic of North-west America; it has elevated the down-trodden dwellers of the Indian hills and the crushed slave of Africa; it has cast down the thousand idols of the Hindoo. That which it has done it can and will do. There is still the same special Providence watching over the work of Christ's true Church. If difficulties arise, as they will, we may well remember the words of the venerable Thomas Scott, not seldom referred to in this volume, that "we must go forward believing that difficulties will be removed, in proportion as it is necessary for them to be removed."

We cannot better close these remarks than with an extract from a letter, written apparently to Mr. Knight himself, in which Mr. Venn expresses his own cheerful confidence. After writing of the defection, temporary, as it proved, of one from whom much had been hoped, he adds:—

"The Lord alone knows them that are his. Such cases as this do not affect me as once they did. Nearness to the world of light consoles me in the sight of gropers in the dark. The hope of soon seeing the 'King in His glory' makes me indifferent to the silly dishonour done to His office by those who obscure it by sacerdotalism. We have striven together, my dear friend, for the maintenance of the truth of the gospel. We are assuredly on the winning side, though a few ups and downs surround us. Let us strengthen each other in the Lord."

Art. IV.—BERTRAM AND THE REFORMERS.

IT is now more than a thousand years since Bertram wrote his famous treatise "On the Body and Blood of the Lord," against the rising error of the "Real Presence" and Transubstantiation; and unhappily the controversy still exists. Not only so,

but the error is being steadily pressed forward by some of the clergy in the National Church, from whose standards it has been authoritatively rejected.

Bertram, or Ratram, lived in the ninth century. He flourished about the year A.D. 840, though probably the treatise mentioned was written a few years later—A.D. 845. His real name is supposed to have been Ratramnus, and this, with the prefix Beatus expressed thus, B. Ratramnus, was in process of time corrupted or abbreviated into Bertram.[1] He was a priest or presbyter in the Church, and a monk of the monastery of Corbie in France, in the diocese of Amiens. His reputation for learning was great, and he wrote two or three other treatises besides that on the Lord's Supper—viz., on "Predestination," and on "The Manner of our Lord's Birth," &c. The century in which he lived was a very important and eventful one in many respects. It was one of the dark, if not the darkest, of the Middle Ages; exceeded in this respect only by the tenth, according to Baronius. The famous image controversy was at its height, and, unhappily, the images carried the day, kings and councils notwithstanding. It was the century when the *forged decretals* first saw the light, those huge impostures on which the Papal supremacy to a large extent founded and bolstered up its increasing and gigantic despotism. It was a century when the externals of religion, ceremonies and sacraments, were being multiplied—the form of godliness without the power thereof. The worship of, or superstitious veneration for, relics became quite a mania among the people, and the priests were nothing backward in encouraging them, as well as in supplying them with appropriate objects. "To see clearly," says Mosheim, "the heights which ignorance and perversity reached in this age, it is only needful to consider its extravagant or, more properly, senseless fondness for saints, and for their dead bodies and bones."

In this the greatest part of religion and piety was placed. Everybody believed that God would never be found propitious to those who had not secured some intercessor and friend among the inhabitants of heaven. Hence arose the rage for making, almost daily, new objects of deification. And the priests and monks were most successful in dispelling the darkness that concealed the wondrous deeds of holy men, or rather in fabricating the names and the histories of saints that never existed; so that they might have patrons enough for all the credulous and senseless people. . . . . The corpses of holy men, either brought from distant countries or discovered by the industry of the priests, required the appointment of new feast days, and some variation in the ceremonies observed on these days. And as the success of the clergy depended on the impressions of the people

[1] Mosh. i. 544, *Note.*

respecting the merits and the power of those saints whom they were invited to venerate, it was necessary that their eyes and their ears should be fascinated with various ceremonies and exhibitions. Hence the splendid furniture of the temples, the numerous wax candles burning at mid-day, the multitudes of pictures and statues, the decorations of the altars, the frequent processions, the splendid dresses of the priests, and *masses* appropriate to the honour of the saints (vol. i. p. 571).

Such is the description of the ceremonialism and superstition of the ninth century, and it is sad and painful to reflect that it is just as applicable now, not merely to the unreformed Churches of Christendom, but also to many of the churches of England. Between the ceremonialism of the ninth and the ritualism of the nineteenth century there is not much to choose. The latter portion of the extract given above would suit admirably for a verbal and literal account of what is taking place in our very midst.

It was in this rank soil that Paschasius Rhadbertus, Abbot of Corbie, first formally propounded and advocated the doctrine of the "Real Presence," and virtually that of Transubstantiation. This is confessed by Bellarmine, who says: "Hic auctor primus fuit, qui serio et copiose scripsit de veritate corporis et sanguinis Domini in Eucharistia."[1] The book to which Bellarmine refers, "De Sacramento Corporis, &c.," was first written in A.D. 831. It was enlarged and improved (?) in A.D. 845, and presented to the then emperor, Charles the Bald, grandson of Charlemagne. It was immediately opposed. Three of the most learned men of the age wrote against it. Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mentz; Johannes Erigena Scotus, the friend and companion of the Emperor; and Ratramnus, or Bertram, the monk. These two last mentioned, Scotus and Bertram, were requested to write by the Emperor, in order that the controversy to which the publication of Paschasius' book had given rise might be allayed, and the true Catholic doctrine might be authoritatively set forth. This we learn from the opening section of Bertram's book—"De corpore et sanguine Domini." The work of Scotus has perished. This is much to be regretted, as he was a profound philosopher and theologian, as well as an accomplished Greek scholar. Happily, that of Bertram has survived, and in the wonderful providence of God, after being, comparatively speaking, buried for seven hundred years, was again brought to light in the sixteenth century, to aid in the blessed work of our glorious Reformation.

The famous work, however, was not wholly lost sight of during the interval. The seed sown by its means, and that of

[1] Mosh. i. 544, *Note.*

Scotus, in the ninth century, perished not. It sprang up in the eleventh, when Berengarius, Canon of Tours, openly maintained the doctrine they set forth. Under threats and persecution the poor man was again and again obliged to recant, and even with his own hands, it is said, was compelled to throw the work of Scotus into the flames; and again and again, as soon as he escaped the fangs of the persecutor, he returned to his convictions. He narrowly escaped being burnt at the stake; and indeed, had it not been that he was, from motives of personal friendship, shielded by the famous Pope Hildebrand, Gregory VII., there is but little doubt that he would have been put to death.

Three hundred years after, in the fourteenth century, we find our own famous countryman, the Rector of Lutterworth, Wickliffe, the morning star of the Reformation, fearlessly propounding the same doctrine, albeit he may not have known precisely from whence the light had been derived which guided him to a correct interpretation of the words of our Lord. The doctrine of transubstantiation had been formally defined in the preceding century, at the Council of Lateran, A.D., 1215, and it met with the most determined opposition on the part of Wickliffe. His famous piece, called the "Wicket," is a treatise on the words "Hoc est corpus meum," in which, with great ability and ingenuity, he proves that the bread is only "the figure or mind of Christ's body in earth; and that therefore Christ said, "As oft as ye do this thing, do it in mind of me;'" and again, "All the sacraments that are left here on earth are but minds of the body of Christ; for a sacrament is no more to say but a sign or mind of a thing passed, or a thing to come; for when Jesus spake of the bread, and said to his disciples, 'As oft as ye do this thing, do it in mind of me,' it was set for a mind of good things passed of Christ's body; but when the angel showed to John (Apoc. xvii.) the sacraments of the woman and of the beast that bare her, it was set for a mind of evil things to come on the face of the earth, and great destroying of the people of God." As for the view that the bread is an accident without a subject, he denounced it as heresy; and yet this is the doctrine virtually put forth by the Council of Trent. Wickliffe was often in great danger, but through the powerful patronage of John of Gaunt he died in peace A.D. 1384. But his doctrine lived. It was immediately taken up by John Huss and Jerome of Prague, who suffered for their convictions at the stake A.D. 1415, by order of the Council of Constance. Their martyrdom gave an impetus to the cause of Lollardism, as it was called. Everywhere the human mind began to inquire into the reasons of things. The corruptions both in faith and morals of the clergy and the religious orders had scandalized the public

conscience. The Papal schism, which had lasted for the space of fifty years, from A.D. 1378 to A.D. 1431—when two and sometimes three anti-Popes claimed the chair of St. Peter—had outraged Christendom. The usurpations of the spiritual on the temporal domain had provoked the antagonism of the civil powers; and, soon, the invention of printing and the revival of literature, betokened the near approach of the coming dawn.

In the early part of the next century, Luther in Germany, Zuinglius in Switzerland, and Calvin in France, were God's chosen agents to reform the Church, and bring back the long-lost Gospel to the nations. As Burnet well says, "The design of the Reformation was to restore Christianity to what it was at first, and to purge it of those corruptions with which it was overrun in the later and darker ages."

The emancipation of the Church of England was now at hand. Long had it lain under the galling yoke of the Papacy, not without many a fruitless effort to shake it off; but the hour and the man had now come. With the personal or political motives of Henry VIII. we have nothing to do; he was raised up as an instrument in God's hands to burst the chain, break the bonds, and shake of the iron yoke of Rome. And, though he desired it not, this carried a reformation of doctrine along with it. Cranmer and Ridley had the chief hand in purging the public services of the Church, and drawing up the Liturgy and Articles of Religion. And now onee more we meet the Monk of Corbie, Bertram, who seven hundred years before had, at the command of his Sovereign, stood up for God's truth against mediæval superstition.

It was about the year A.D. 1545 that Ridley was led, we know not how, to peruse the book of Bertram; where he found it, who gave it him or recommended him to read it, we are ignorant. But he was a scholar; and perhaps in his researches into the true and ancient doctrine of the Church of Christ on this, at that time, the all-important question, he came across the treasure. Like Luther finding the Book of God in the ancient library, so Ridley finds the book of Bertram. It had, indeed, been printed at Cologne in A.D. 1532, and perhaps a copy of that edition had fallen into his hands, or, as some think, the edition published at Geneva A.D. 1541. Whichever it was, and however obtained, its perusal led him to abandon the views of Rome in which he had been brought up, and to embrace the doctrines which are now, and that mainly through his instrumentality, those of the Reformed Church of England. Let us hear what he says himself on this subject. In his disputation at Oxford, April, A.D. 1555, he says:—

Here, right worshipful masters, prolocutor, and ye, the rest of the commissioners, it may please you to understand that I do not lean to

these things only, which I have written in my former answers and confirmations, but that I have also, for the proof of that I have spoken, whatsoever Bertram, a man learned, of sound and upright judgment, and ever counted a Catholic for these seven hundred years, until this our age hath written. His treatise, whosoever shall read and weigh, considering the time of the writer, his learning, godliness of life, the allegations of the ancient fathers, and his manifold and most grounded arguments, I cannot (doubtless) but much marvel, if he have any fear of God at all, how he can, with a good conscience, speak against him in this matter of the sacrament. *This Bertram was the first that ever pulled me by the ear*, and that first brought me from the common error of the Romish Church, and caused me to search more diligently and exactly both the Scriptures and the old ecclesiastical fathers in this matter. And this I protest before the face of God, who knoweth I lie not in the things I now speak (Ridley, p. 206. P.S. Ed.).

Here we have the frank acknowledgment of his indebtedness to Bertram. "He was the first that pulled him by the ear." How momentous the result of that pull to the Church of England! To that, under God, we are indebted for Ridley's altered views, for their incorporation into the theology of our Church, and for the noble testimony he bore to their truth at the martyrs' stake at Oxford.

In two previous conferences with Secretary Bourn in the Tower he had referred to him, among others, thus:—

"Sir,—It is certain that others before these (Berengarius, Wickliffe and Huss) have written of this matter; not by the way only and *obiter*, as do for the most of all the old writers; but even *ex professo*, and their whole books entreat of it alone, as Bertram."

"Bertram," said the Secretary, "what man was he? and who was he? and how do you know?" &c.

"Sir," quoth I, "I have read his book. He propounds the same which is now in controversy, and answereth so directly, that no man may doubt but that he affirmeth that the substance of bread remaineth still in the sacrament."

In reference to this book Dr. Gloucester Ridley says:—"Few books have drawn after them such salutary consequences as this has done. This first opened Ridley's eyes, and determined him more accurately to search the Scriptures, and the doctrine of the primitive fathers who lived before the time of this controversy betwixt Bertram and Paschasius."

At his degradation Ridley once again referred to Bertram. When all that foolish ceremony was over, the disinterested Reformer, as they declined to talk with him further, said to Dr. Brooks, Bishop of Gloucester: "My Lord, I would wish that your Lordship would vouchsafe to read over and peruse a little book of Bertram's doing concerning the sacrament. I promise

you that you shall find much good learning therein, if you will read the same with an indifferent judgment."

So far as it regards Bertram's influence on Ridley. But the matter did not end there. Ridley brought the subject under the notice of Cranmer. This we learn from Burnet (vol. ii. 197, Pococke's edition), as also from Cranmer himself. The former, after recounting how Ridley had been converted to the truth by Bertram, proceeds: "He communicated the matter with Cranmer, and they set themselves to examine it with more than ordinary care. Cranmer afterwards gathered all the arguments about it into the book which he writ on that subject." He refers to Cranmer's great work "On the Lord's Supper," in which many of the arguments of Bertram, and indeed his very sentences, are sometimes reproduced.

The following is Cranmer's own statement on the subject, in his examination before the Pope's delegate, Dr. Brooks, Bishop of Gloucester:—

"I grant," he says, "that then I believed otherwise than I do now; and so I did until my Lord of London (Ridley) did confer with me, and, by sundry persuasions and authorities of doctors, drew me quite from my opinion" (p. 218, P.S. Ed.).

"Ridley was a scholarly divine," says Mosheim, "who had been led to the rejection of transubstantiation by the reading of Ratramnus' famous piece. This he reasonably viewed as a conclusive argument against the antiquity of the Romish doctrine; and by introducing the book to Cranmer's notice he brought him, too, over to the same opinion" (vol. ii. 454).

How marvellous the working of Divine Providence! Bertram was used of God to the conversion of these two great men, and these two were the principal agents in laying the foundations of the Reformation.

How wonderful, too, the chain in the succession of the truth as it regards this doctrine! Bertram proves his views from the word of Christ, the language of the Apostle Paul, and the testimony of the Fathers Augustine, Ambrose, Isidore, Fulgentius, and Jerome, and contends for the old catholic faith. After Bertram we have Berengarius, Wickliffe, John Huss, and Jerome of Prague, Ridley, Cranmer, and the other Reformers. Yes, truth is undying, and the Word of God still springs up from age to age. The sacred lamp of truth is passed on from hand to hand, and thus kept alive in the dark centuries, until at length it bursts forth in an effulgence of glory at the martyrs' stake in Smithfield and Oxford. The candle is then again relighted, never, we trust and believe, to be put out in England. God never leaves himself without witness, and we see an illustration of this in the case of Bertram and his works. How the truth still lives on, and in God's good time receives its triumphant vindication!

A few words as to the doctrinal value of Bertram's work.

It was written, as already stated, in reply to Paschasius, who maintained in his work chiefly the three following particulars:—"That the true body and the true blood of the Lord Christ existed in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist; that the substance of the bread and wine, after consecration, no longer remained; and finally, that it was none other than the identical body which was born of the Virgin Mary." (Mabillon, "Annal. Bened.," ii. 538, *vide* Mosheim, ii. 561.)

In reply to these statements, Bertram propounds two questions: (1) Whether the body and blood of Christ, which are taken in the church by the mouth of the faithful, be so in a mystery or in reality? and (2) whether it is the very same body which was born of the Virgin Mary? To these questions he gives answers distinct, clear, and unambiguous. He says: "The bread and wine are, *figuratively*, the body and blood of Christ" (sec. x.). Again: "From all that has been said, it is demonstrated that the body and blood of Christ, which are received in the church by the mouths of the faithful, are *figures* according to their visible nature, but according to invisible substance—*i.e.*, the power of the divine word—they are truly the body and blood of Christ" (sec. xlix.). He strongly maintains that in the desert the Old Testament saints fed on Christ when they ate the manna, and drank His blood when they drank of the water that flowed from the rock. And he says that in the same way as Christ converted the manna into His flesh, and the water into His blood, fifteen hundred years before He was born, so He now converts the bread into His body and the wine into His blood—*i.e.*, in spiritual efficacy to the worthy recipient.

> Wonderful truly. He had not yet assumed humanity, nor yet for the salvation of the world had He tasted death, nor yet by His blood had He redeemed us; and yet our fathers in the wilderness, by the same spiritual meat and the same spiritual invisible drink, *did eat His body and drink His blood.* . . . . For He who now, in the Church, by His almighty power spiritually converts bread and wine into the flesh of His own body and the stream of His own blood, He then also invisibly *made the manna given from heaven His own body, and the water flowing from the rock His own blood* (sec. xxv.).

We here see in what sense Bertram holds that the bread is changed into the body of Christ, precisely in the same sense as the manna was turned into His body, and the water into His blood. Cranmer accepts this argument, and presses it with great power.

> They say that the fathers and prophets of the Old Testament did not eat the body and drink the blood of Christ. We say that they did eat His body and drink His blood, although He was not yet born nor incarnated (i. 74).

In answer to the second question he says:—"*Great is the difference between the body in which Christ suffered and that which is daily celebrated by the faithful, and taken by the mouth*" (sec. lxix.). "They differ from each other just as much as a pledge and that on account of which a pledge is given; as an image and that of which it is an image; as a resemblance and the reality" (sec. lxxxix.).

He also maintains that in this body, which is celebrated in a mystery, is *the figure*, not only of the true body of Christ, but also of the people who believe in Christ. For it bears the figure of each body" (sec. xcviii.). But "even as not corporally but spiritually that bread is said to be the body of the faithful, so also is it necessary that the body of Christ be not corporally but spiritually understood" (sec. lxxiv.). As for taking His flesh and blood literally, "it would be not an act of religion, but a crime" (sec. xxxiv.).

But it is not necessary to quote any more to prove that substantially the doctrine of Bertram is that of the Reformers. He does, indeed, as do most of the early writers, use strong sacramental language, but allowance must be made for the time when he wrote, and for the fact that transubstantiation had not yet been defined as at Lateran, A.D. 1215, still less as at Trent, A.D. 1551. It is evident that he only held a real presence of Christ to the soul of the faithful in blessing and grace. Many of the Reformers quote from him, especially Becon, the learned chaplain of Archbishop Cranmer (*vide* vol. iii. pp. 444–449, P.S. Ed.)

The doctrine of Bertram is absolutely incompatible with either transubstantiation or consubstantiation—the former the doctrine of Rome, the latter that of the Romanizers in our Church. As to transubstantiation, which is the change of the substance of the bread and wine in the Supper of the Lord, Bertram asserts that there is no such change. "According to the substance of the materials, what they were before consecration, this afterwards they continue to be. They existed as bread and wine before, in which species also, now that they are consecrated, they are seen to remain" (sec. liv.).

As to consubstantiation—the doctrine, namely, that whilst the bread and wine remain after consecration, they truly become the real body and blood of Christ, objectively or externally present on the table—Bertram is equally decisive. "Great," he says, "is the difference between the body in which Christ suffered and that body which is daily taken by the mouth of the faithful" (sec. lxix.). Again: "Things which differ from each other are not one and the same; the body of Christ which died and rose again, now dies no more. But this which is celebrated in the Church is temporal, not eternal; it is corruptible, not incor-

ruptible; it is on earth, not in heaven. They differ, therefore, from each other; wherefore they are not the same" (sec. lxxvi.).

Nowhere does he teach that two distinct substances really co-exist in the sacrament—viz., bread and the body of Christ, but that one and the same substance is at once bread in nature, and the body of Christ in signification and blessing.

The doctrine of Bertram is thoroughly at one with that so clearly taught by the Church of England in the Twenty-eighth Article, as follows:—

"To such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ.

"The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner, and the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten in the supper is Faith."

In Sec. lxxxviii. Bertram quotes the language of the priest in the public services of the church, and argues from them as follows:—"May Thy sacraments, O Lord, effect in us what they contain, so that those things which now we celebrate in a figure (*specie*) we may receive in the truth of the things themselves." Because he says that they are celebrated in a figure, it is evident they are not in reality; that is, they are celebrated by a representation, not by the exhibition of the thing itself. Figure and reality (*species et veritas*) are very different things. Wherefore the Body and the Blood, which are celebrated in the church, differ from that body and blood which are acknowledged to be now glorified by the resurrection. And this body is a pledge and figure; but that is the truth itself. This is celebrated until we come to that; but when we come to that, this shall be done away.

He thus brings his arguments to a conclusion in the following sections:—

(xcix.) "Let us also add, that the bread and cup which is called the Body and Blood of Christ, represents the memorials of the Lord's passion and death, even as he says in the Gospel: 'Do this for a commemoration of me.' Expounding which the apostle Paul says: 'As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye declare the Lord's death till he come.'"

(c.) "We are thus taught by the Saviour, and also by the Apostle Paul, that this bread and this wine which are placed upon the altar, are placed for a figure or memorial of the Lord's death; so that it may recall to the present memory that which was done in the past; and that we may be reminded of his passion; by it also are we made partakers of the divine gift, whereby we are freed from death. Knowing that when we shall come to the

vision of Christ, we shall no more have need of such outward means, by which we may be reminded of that which divine goodness endured for us. For beholding Him face to face, we shall not be influenced by the outward admonition of temporal things; but by the contemplation of the reality itself (*ipsius veritatis*) we shall perceive in what way we ought to give thanks to the author of our salvation."

(ci.) "Notwithstanding, although we say these things, let it not be thought that, in the mystery of the sacrament, the body and blood of the Lord are not taken by the faithful. Since faith receives, not what the eye beholds, but what itself believes. For it is spiritual food and spiritual drink which spiritually feeds the soul, and bestows on it the life of eternal happiness."

Well would it be for the future of our Church if all her clergy held the wise, sober, and scriptural views on the Lord's Supper set forth in these extracts from the Book of Bertram.

W. F. TAYLOR.

ART. V.—A HISTORY OF OUR OWN TIMES.*

WE are not surprised at the success this work has obtained. There are several methods of writing history. There is the compiling method, so loved by the German student, which consists in collecting multitudinous facts and heaping them together in one confused mass, useless for all literary purposes until clearly arranged by the constructive mind. There is the philosophical method, which takes little heed of mere events, but confines its attentions to those results which enlighten the condition of nations and advance the progress of civilization. There is the Party method, which turns history into a political pamphlet; the Constitutional method, which interprets the chronicles of a country solely through the pages of its statute-book; the Ecclesiastical method, which attributes all national progress to the guidance and interference of the Church; and there is the Narrative method, which deals with events and characters as with a story, fond of vivid illustrations, smart conclusions, and anxious chiefly that the style be brilliant and dulness avoided. These volumes of Mr. McCarthy belong unmistakably to the last class. They are written throughout with the clever swing and rhythm of the practised hand; the events recorded are marshalled together in systematic order, then introduced, discussed, and dismissed without the easy flow

* "A History of Our Own Times." By Justin McCarthy, M.P. Volumes III. and IV. Chatto and Windus.

of the narrative ever being disturbed or interrupted. The different characters as they appear on the stage are made, by one who evidently knows human nature well, to represent real living beings inspired by motives and practical ends, and not the empty lay figures to which we are so often introduced, whilst the whole of the work is in perfect harmony with itself and set off by happy epigrams and apt allusions. In this history there is no attempt at extraordinary research or the discovery of new matter; the author has contented himself with consulting the ordinary works of reference which lie ready to hand, yet, thanks to a brilliant pen, a clear intelligence, and a sound judgment, he has written a history which will be read by all, and which will live.

The volumes now under review open with the outrage on the British schooner *Arrow* by the Chinese in Canton River, in the year 1856, and concludes with the fall of the Beaconsfield Cabinet. From 1856 to 1880 is an interval of no little importance in our country's history, and one well deserving the attention of the picturesque chronicler. During those twenty-four years men, not now middle-aged, can conjure up before their minds, as in a panorama, visions of a Commissioner Yeh and the Chinese War that followed his arbitrary proceedings; of the opposition to greased cartridges, and the awful mutiny of our Indian army; of the rise of the Second Empire, and the agitation consequent upon the Orsini conspiracy; of the progress of toleration in our Parliamentary institutions; of communication with the United States by that great achievement the Atlantic telegraph; of wars, and annexations, and treaties; of the rise and fall of States; of prosperity and adversity; and of the havoc made by death. Upon all these facts does Mr. McCarthy pleasantly discourse. Himself a practical politician, and a representative of advanced Liberalism, he views the events he has to describe not only from the literary standpoint, but also from that of the statesman and the legislator. Save when he has to deal with Irish questions, and the peculiar programme of the Home Rulers prejudices his conclusions, he is in the main impartial throughout the telling of his story. He can see good in a Tory, whilst he is not blind to the faults of a Liberal. He is a Roman Catholic, yet he does not feel it incumbent upon himself to bespatter—*more Hibernico*—the Protestant Church with abuse. He aims at being tolerant, judicial, and philosophical. No one will rise from his pages without feeling that the author has discussed the whole of the evidence brought before him, and has dealt with both sides of the question. We may not agree with the writer, but we feel sure that he has treated us with courtesy, and that we have not wilfully been misrepresented. As an instance of Mr. McCarthy's striving after impar-

tiality, let us give heed to his remarks upon the conduct of the Whigs. It has been of late years the fashion among a certain section of the Liberal party to regard the Whigs as the most exclusive of aristocrats, caring for office for themselves, but indifferent to the claims of their more humble followers, who abuse them one moment, and implore their aid when in difficulties the next. Our author puts the case very truly, and in his usual humorous and effective manner.

He is giving an account of the formation of the Russell Government after the death of Lord Palmerston:—

> The outer public did not quite appreciate the difficulties which a Liberal Minister had to encounter in compromising between the Whigs and the Radicals. The Whigs included almost all the members of the party who were really influential by virtue of hereditary rank and noble station. It was impossible to overlook their claims. In a country like England, one must pay attention to the wishes of "the Dukes." There is a superstition about it. The man who attempted to form a Liberal Cabinet without consulting the wishes of "the Dukes" would be as imprudent as the Greek commander, who, in the days of Xenophon, would venture on a campaign without consulting the Auguries. But it was not only a superstition which required the Liberal Prime Minister to show deference to the claims of the titled and stately Whigs. The great Whig names were a portion of the traditions of the party. More than that, it was certain that whenever the Liberal party got into difficulties it would look to the great Whig houses to help it out. . . . . Liberalism often turns to the Whigs as a young scapegrace to his father or his guardian. The wild youth will have his own way when things are going smooth; when credit is still good and family affection is not particularly necessary to his comfort. He is ever ready enough to smile at old-fashioned ways and antiquated counsels; but when the hour of pressure comes, when obligations have to be met at last, and the gay bachelor lodgings, with the fanciful furniture and the other expensive luxuries, have to be given up, then he comes without hesitation to the elder, and assumes as a matter of course that his debts are to be paid, and his affairs put in order.

Perhaps the most interesting, and certainly the most painful, portion of the book before us, is that which is devoted to those terrible weeks when English rule in India was shaken to its foundation. The five chapters in which Mr. McCarthy records the rise, progress, and suppression of the Indian Mutiny are among the ablest and most lucid that have been written upon the subject. The Sepoy Revolt came upon us at home like a thunderclap. It was totally unexpected, for it succeeded one of the most active and successful administrations that had ever been seated at Calcutta. Never had there been a more energetic viceroy than Lord Dalhousie. He had introduced cheap postage into India, and had made railways; he had set up lines of electric

telegraph, so that communication could be held from Calcutta with Bombay and Madras; he had devoted much of his attention to irrigation, to the making of great roads, and to the working of the Ganges Canal; he was the founder of a comprehensive system of native education, and especially of that ticklish Indian question, female education; he had suppressed infanticide, the Thug system and Sutteeism, or the burning of widows on the funeral pile of their husbands; he had given India convenience and prosperity; but he had, at the same time, by his all-conquering energy, excited mischievous heart-burnings and jealousies. His policy was, as he said, "to acquire as direct a dominion over the territories in possession of the native princes as we already hold over the other half of India." During his few years of office he had annexed the Punjaub, he had incorporated part of the Burmese territory, he had annexed Nagpore, Sattara, Berar and Oude. His lust of conquest had created the bitterest feelings, and the greased cartridges were but the excuse for the blazing forth of the long-smouldering discontent. Before the end of the June of 1857 the whole of Northern India was in rebellion. Lord Canning had succeeded Lord Dalhousie, and never was man placed in a more trying position.

There is no recklessness, no cruelty [writes our author] like the cruelty and the recklessness of panic. Perhaps there is hardly any panic so demoralizing in its effects as that which seizes the unwarlike members of a ruling race, set down in the midst of overwhelming numbers of the subject populations, at a moment when the cry goes abroad that the subjected are rising in rebellion. Fortunately, there was at the head of affairs in India a man with a cool head, a quiet firm will, and a courage that never faltered. If ever the crisis found the man, Lord Canning was the man called for by that crisis in India. He had all the divining genius of the true statesman, the man who can rise to the height of some unexpected and new emergency; and he had the cool courage of a practised conqueror. The greatest trial to which a ruler can be subjected is to be called upon at a moment's notice to deal with events and conditions for which there is no precedent. The second-class statesman, the official statesman, if we may use such an expression, collapses under such a trial. The man of genius finds it his opportunity, and makes his own of it. Lord Canning thus found his opportunity in the Indian Mutiny. Among all the distracting counsels and wild stories poured in upon him from every side, he kept his mind clear. He never gave way either to anger or to alarm. If he showed a little impatience it was only where panic would too openly have proclaimed itself by counsels of wholesale cruelty. He could not, perhaps, always conceal from frightened people the fact that he rather despised their terrors. Throughout the whole of that excited period there were few names, even among the chiefs of rebellion, on which fiercer denunciation was showered by Englishmen than the name of Lord Canning. Because he would not listen to the bloodthirsty

clamours of mere frenzy he was nicknamed "Clemency Canning," as if clemency were an attribute of which a man ought to be ashamed. Indeed, for some time people wrote and spoke, not merely in India, but in England, as if clemency were a thing to be reprobated, like treason or crime. Every allowance must be made for the unparalleled excitement of such a time, and in especial for the manner in which the elementary passions of manhood were inflamed by the stories, happily not true, of the wholesale dishonour and barbarous mutilation of women. But when the fullest allowance has been made for all this, it must be said by any one looking back on that painful time, that some of the public instructors of England betrayed a fury and ferocity which no conditions can excuse on the part of civilized and Christian men who have time to reflect before they write or speak.

The incidents throughout this terrible campaign, the famous soldiers who took part in it, and the manner in which English rule was restored in our Eastern dominions, are all related in bold stirring passages in this history. The great hero of the Mutiny, Sir Henry Havelock, has been the subject of many an eulogium upon his piety and his prowess, but we doubt if any *oraison funébre* more just and deserving, in spite of its brevity, than the following, has ever been delivered upon him:—

Alumbagh is an isolated cluster of buildings, with grounds and enclosure to the south of Lucknow. The name of this place is memorable for ever in the history of the war. It was there that Havelock closed his glorious career. He was attacked with dysentery, and his frame, exhausted by the almost superhuman strain which he had put upon it during his long days and sleepless nights of battle and victory, could not long resist such an enemy. On November 24th, Havelock died. The Queen created him a baronet, or rather affixed that honour to his name on the 27th of the same month, not knowing then that the soldier's time for struggle and for honour was over. The title was transferred to his son, the present Sir Henry Havelock, who had fought gallantly under his father's eyes. The fame of Havelock's exploits reached England only a little in advance of the news of his death. So many brilliant deeds had seldom in the history of our wars been crowded into days so few. All the fame of that glorious career was the work of some strenuous splendid weeks. Havelock's promotion had been slow. He had not much for which to thank the favour of his superiors. No family influence, no powerful patrons or friends, had made his slow progress more easy. He was more than sixty when the Mutiny broke out. He was born in April, 1795; he was educated at the Charterhouse, London, where his grave, studious ways procured for him the nickname of "Old Phlos"—the schoolboys' short for "old philosopher." He went out to India in 1823, and served in the Burmese war of 1824, and the Sikh war of 1845. He was a man of grave and earnest character, a Baptist by religion, and strongly penetrated with a conviction that the religious spirit ought to pervade and inform all the duties of military as well as civil life. By his earnestness and his example he succeeded in animating those whom

he led with similar feelings; and "Havelock's saints" were well known through India by this distinctive appropriate title. "Havelock's saints" showed, whenever they had an opportunity, that they could fight as desperately as the most reckless sinners; and their commander found the fame flung in his way, across the path of his duty, which he never would have swerved one inch from that path to seek. Amid all the excitement of hope and fear, passion and panic, in England, there was time for the whole heart of the nation to feel pride in Havelock's career and sorrow for his untimely death. Untimely? Was it, after all, untimely? Since when has it not been held the crown of a great career that the hero dies at the moment of accomplished victory?

Of the conduct of domestic affairs during the Palmerston administration, Mr. McCarthy expresses his approval, but he condemns the policy of the Prime Minister with regard to his control of foreign matters. "It did not seem to have occurred to Palmerston," says our author, "that England's truest interest would be to do justice to herself and to other states; to be what Voltaire's Brahmin boasts of being, a good parent and a faithful friend, maintaining well her own children, and endeavouring for peace among her neighbours. Palmerston's idea was that England should hold the commanding place among European States, and that none should ever seem to be in a position to do her scathe." We do not think this a correct view of the statesmanship of the most English of our Premiers. Lord Palmerston knew that our country did not consist of an island in the Northern Seas, but was a great Empire with possessions upon which the sun never sets. He therefore held that England was a nation not only to be respected, but to be feared: that when she had pledged her word, either by treaty or convention, to carry out what she had promised, no selfish interest should stay her hand; and that, with the advantages of her position, the strength of her fleet, and the bravery of her men, she was a Power that none dare despise. Proud of his country, he was resolved, so far as the responsibility rested upon his shoulders, that the British Empire should never be sacrificed for the pettier objects of the island. He maintained that though by our geographical position we were happily severed from many of the dangers that menace Continental nations, yet our welfare as a great colonial power was so intimately connected with European politics, that in seasons of crisis we could only retire from interference at the expense not only of our prestige but of our safety. Hence his policy was spirited and patriotic, but not aggressive. Mr. McCarthy is not of this opinion; he does not approve of Lord Palmerston's statesmanship in the main, nor does he consider him a great man. We hold different views. Lord Palmerston was not a statesman in the sense that Pitt or Peel were states-

men, but he had the gifts of a great Minister. No one felt more accurately the pulse of the nation; he was the most representative of Englishmen, and he knew exactly what the people of England wanted or disliked. His tact was consummate, and he played upon the House of Commons, to use a phrase of the then Mr. Disraeli, like an old fiddle. In his words and actions he was frank, straightforward, and eminently truthful. He stood staunchly by those who served him and never permitted a mean fear of public opinion to control his movements. His political vision was far-sighted as well as quick-sighted. Though not eloquent he was ready in debate, and the despatches he penned are amongst the most important in our State Paper literature. Such a Minister deserves higher praise than that which our historian coldly accords him.

Mr. McCarthy's portrait of the late Lord Derby is more just; indeed it is among the very best in the book. The description of character is our author's *forte*. We may not approve of his colouring, still we must confess that his portraits stand out from their canvas like living figures, limned by a master hand. The collection of biographical sketches scattered throughout these four volumes will compare favourably with anything of a like nature that Macaulay or Froude ever wrote. Gaze upon this portrait of the once impetuous "Rupert of debate" and see with what Meissonier-like touches the very man himself is made to appear before us:—

Lord Derby died at Knowsley, the residence of the Stanleys, in Lancashire. His death made no great gap in English politics. He had for some time ceased to assert any really influential place in public affairs. His career had been eminent and distinguished; but its day had long been done. Lord Derby never was a statesman; he was not even a great leader of a party; but he was a splendid figure-head for Conservatism in or out of power. He was, on the whole, a superb specimen of the English political nobleman. Proud of soul, but sweet in temper and genial in manner; dignified, as men are who feel instinctively that dignity pertains to them, and therefore never think of how to assert or maintain it, he was eminently fitted by temperament, by nature, and by fortune for the place it was given him to hold. His Parliamentary oratory has already become a tradition. It served its purpose admirably for the time. It was not weighted with the thought which could have secured it a permanent place in political literature, nor had it the imagination which would have lifted it into an atmosphere above the level of Hansard. In Lord Derby's own day the unanimous opinion of both Houses of Parliament would have given him a place among the very foremost of Parliamentary orators. Many competent judges went so far as to set him distinctly above all living rivals. Time has not ratified this judgment. It is impossible that the influence of an orator could have faded so soon if he had been really entitled to the praise which many of his contem-

poraries would freely have rendered to Lord Derby. The charm of his voice and style, his buoyant readiness, his rushing fluency, his rich profusion of words, his happy knack of illustration, allusion, and retort—all these helped to make men believe him a much greater orator than he really was. Something, too, was due to the influence of his position.

Mr. McCarthy, who has naturally a high opinion of the agitator O'Connell, proceeds as follows:—

> It seemed a sort of condescension on the part of a great noble that he should consent to be an eloquent debater also, and to contend in Parliamentary sword-play against professional champions like Peel, and O'Connell, and Brougham. It must count for something in Lord Derby's fame that, while far inferior to any of these men in political knowledge and in mental capacity, he could compare as an orator with each in turn, and could be held by so many to have borne without disadvantage the test of comparison.

Able and interesting as is this history, and in the main to be relied upon, it is in his account of Irish affairs that our author is to be least trusted. Himself an Irishman, and a prominent member of the Irish section of the House of Commons, it is in this part of the work that Mr. McCarthy seeks to transform history into a party pamphlet. It is the old, old story, the wrongs of Ireland and the despotic government of the English. We hear nothing of the improvidence of the Irish, of their turbulent habits, their laziness, their incapacity to avail themselves of the means at hand, the degrading character of their superstition. All we listen to is the evil that England has inflicted upon "poor ould Ireland." Are the Irish themselves blameless in the matter? Let Scotchmen or Englishmen own their land, and by industry and sobriety they would transform it into one of the most fertile and prosperous countries in Europe. Will the fact of having a Parliament in Dublin, composed of Irishmen and legislating solely for Irishmen, tend to suppress the present disgraceful state of things? The Irish once had a Parliament of their own, yet was their condition—to say the least—a whit better than it is now?

One by one their grievances have been redressed, yet we do not see the amelioration that was so confidently predicted. We were promised much should the Roman Catholics be emancipated; the Roman Catholics have been emancipated. We were promised much should the Irish Church be disestablished; the Irish Church has been disestablished. We were promised much should the land laws be reformed; the land laws have been reformed. Yet what have been the results of these measures? Precisely the same story as before—agitation, murder, and a poverty that ever looks upon rebellion as its only remedy. Now, it is given out that the great cure for all the ills that

Ireland is heir to, is to be ushered in by Home Rule organization. Irishmen have now come to the conclusion that it is wiser to trust to themselves than to any English Minister, Parliament or party. Only two alternatives, we are told, are before England; either she must give back to Ireland some form of national Parliament or she must go on putting down rebellion after rebellion, and dealing with Ireland as Russia has dealt with Poland. The principle of Home Rule, its advocates allege, contains the solution of the great problem of government which unsolved has so long divided England and Ireland, and offers a means of complete reconciliation between the two countries. We do not believe this. It is not a change of Government that the Irish want, but a change in the habits and temperament of the people. Let them substitute industry for indolence, sobriety for drunkenness, cleanliness for filth, education for agitation, and true religion and a high-toned morality for the lowest forms of superstition and resistance, and they will reap a reward in their own land such as no rule, whether Home or Imperial, can ever give them. To those interested in this question the chapters in the work before us entitled "The Irish Church" and "Irish Ideas," may be read with profit. Though capable of easy refutation, they still lay before us in very clear language the programme of those who are now agitating across St. George's Channel.

As in the first two volumes, so now in these later instalments, the observations upon the literary progress of the century are decidedly weak. The criticisms passed upon the different authors of the Victorian era who have risen to fame are bold, superficial, and hasty. They seem to have been inserted simply because they must be inserted, and to have been dashed off with a running pen and with little thought. In framing his judgment, however, upon one eminent man of letters, Mr. McCarthy has taken pains. At the present day it is the fashion to sneer at Lord Macaulay, to condemn his history as a brilliant fiction, to regard his reading as more wide than profound, to look upon his statements with distrust, and to class him with those who dazzle, but who do not convince. The remarks of our author are to the point, and worthy of quotation:—

> We have already studied the literary character of this most successful literary man. Macaulay had had, as he often said himself, a singularly happy life, although it was not without its severe losses and its griefs. His career was one of uninterrupted success. His books brought him fame, influence, social position, and wealth, all at once. He never made a failure. The world only applauded one book more than the other, the second speech more than the first. Macaulay the essayist, Macaulay the historian, Macaulay the ballad-writer, Macaulay the Parliamentary orator, Macaulay the brilliant inexhaustible talker—

he was alike, it might appear, supreme in everything he chose to do or to attempt. After his death there came a natural reaction; and the reaction, as is always the case, was inclined to go too far. People began to find out that Macaulay had done too many things; that he did not do anything as it might have been done; that he was too brilliant; that he was only brilliant; that he was not really brilliant at all, but only superficial and showy. The disparagement was more unjust by far than even the extravagant estimate. Macaulay was not the paragon, the ninth wonder of the world, for which people once set him down; but he was undoubtedly a great literary man. He was also a man of singularly noble character. He was, in a literary sense, egotistic; that is to say, he thought and talked and wrote a great deal about his works and himself: but he was one of the most unselfish men that ever lived. He appears to have enjoyed advancement, success, fame, and money only because these enabled him to give pleasure and support to the members of his family. He was attached to his family, especially to his sisters, with the tenderest affection. His real nature seems only to have thoroughly shone out when in their society. There he was loving, sportive even to joyous frolicsomeness; a glad schoolboy almost to the very end. He was remarkably generous and charitable, even to strangers; his hand was almost always open; but he gave so unostentatiously that it was not until after his death half his kindly deeds became known. He had a spirit which was absolutely above any of the corrupting temptations of money and rank. He was very poor at one time; and during his poverty he was beginning to make his reputation in the House of Commons. It is often said that a poor man feels nowhere so much out of place, nowhere so much at a disadvantage, nowhere so much humiliated, as in the House of Commons. Macaulay felt nothing of the kind. He bore himself as easily and steadfastly as though he had been the eldest son of a proud and wealthy family. It did not seem to have occurred to him, when he was poor, that money was lacking to the dignity of his intellect and his manhood; or when he was rich that money added to it. Certain defects of temper and manner, rather than of character, he had, which caused men often to misunderstand him, and sometimes to dislike him. He was apt to be overbearing in tone, and to show himself a little too confident of his splendid gifts and acquirements; his marvellous memory, his varied reading, his overwhelming power of argument. He trampled on men's prejudices too heedlessly, was inclined to treat ignorance as if it were a crime, and to make dulness feel that it had cause to be ashamed of itself. Such defects as these are hardly worth mentioning, and would not be mentioned here but that they serve to explain some of the misconceptions which were formed of Macaulay by many during his lifetime, and some of the antagonisms which he unconsciously created. Absolutely without literary affectation, undepressed by early poverty, unspoiled by later and almost unequalled success, he was an independent, quiet, self-relying man who, in all his noon of fame, found most happiness in the companionship and the sympathy of those he loved, and who, from first to last, was loved most tenderly by those who knew him best.

He was buried in Westminster Abbey, in the first week of the new year, and there truly took his place among his peers.

With this quotation we end. The "History of our own Times" is a work alike creditable to the author and the century. It places before us a faithful record of the events of the last forty years, written in a flowing and picturesque style, and though we are not always of the opinion of the historian, the opportunity is invariably offered us of forming a judgment for ourselves by listening to both sides of the question. We have before us the briefs of the plaintiff and the defendant, and it is for us to sum up. The book is one to be read, and to be studied.

ART. VI.—THE CHURCH CONGRESS.

ON "The Internal Unity of the Church"—"The Influence of the three great Schools of Thought in the Church of England upon each other and upon the Church,"—the reader of the first Paper was the Bishop of Durham. The Bishop said:—

> The existence of three schools of thought—I prefer so to speak of them, rather than as three parties—in our Church has now become the tritest of commonplaces. It is more important to observe that they had their prototypes in the Apostolic age; that, where a Church is vigorous and active they must almost of necessity coexist: that their coexistence is a guarantee of the fulness of teaching; that the loss of any one would be a serious impoverishment to the life of a Church; and that, therefore, it is not expedient to attempt to thrust out, or to starve out, any one of them, while, at the same time, adherence to the fundamental principles of the Catholic creed and loyalty to the Church in which they minister must be demanded of all alike. Pleading as I do to-day for toleration, and even large toleration, I am bound to emphasize this demand as a fundamental qualification. At this time more especially the obligation is the stronger, because some seem to think that a Church can do very well without a creed, or at least without a creed to which its ministers are required to subscribe. . . . . I do not understand a clergyman standing up to teach in a Church without first asking himself definitely what he is going to teach. I can see no other prospect before such a Church but vagueness, irresoluteness, inanity, confusion, decay. The motive power is gone. The bond of cohesion is snapped. Dissolution—rapid dissolution—is the inevitable consequence. So far as I have read history, no body ever has held together for long under such conditions as this.

"Comprehensiveness" was the key-note of this elaborate Paper; but its protest against laxity and dilution was positive. In the revival of the English Church, said the Bishop, the Evangelical school was the earliest in time. The stress of its teaching was

laid altogether on personal religion, the relation of the individual soul to God. Then came the High Church movement; and with reference to this the Bishop quoted from a sermon preached by Bishop Selwyn a quarter of a century ago:—

In this sermon he [Bishop Selwyn] applied, somewhat quaintly but with striking effect, the summons of the Apocalyptic messenger—"The Spirit and the Bride say come"—to the two lessons which the two schools of theology then prominent in the Church were commissioned especially to teach—the direct inward communion of the individual soul with God, and the functions and destiny of the Church as the Spouse of Christ. If my memory serves me rightly, he went on to say, that the order in which these two messages were delivered to the Church of England was providential—first the Spirit, then the Bride. It was essential that the lesson of the responsibilities of the individual soul should be impressed upon her first. Otherwise the doctrine of the Church would assume a hard, stiff, mechanical form. It would tend to petrifaction, not to life.

The second Paper was read by the Rev. Dr. Boultbee. The *Guardian* remarks that "it was from its own point of view an able Paper, well delivered, and attentively listened to, and he carried his audience thoroughly with him when he explained how unlikely it is and how undesirable that all the three bodies should be blended in a neutral-tinted but feeble compromise. His review of the effect of Broad Church principles on Biblical studies was very good; equally good, and not without its amusing features, was his description of the state of the Church of England half a century ago, and the contrast presented by the present aspects of her field of work. The improvement he attributed very largely to the efforts of the clergy of the Evangelical school, who alone, as he affirmed, dared fifty years ago to advocate missionary enterprise, to conduct cottage lectures, to use extempore prayers and hymns other than those which used to be bound up in our Prayer-book. Dr. Boultbee was loudly and generally applauded when he sat down." For ourselves, we have never listened to a Congress Paper with more interest and satisfaction. Its candour, great ability, common sense, and courtesy, with unmistakable faithfulness to principles, commanded respect and won regard.

The Hon. C. L. Wood, Chairman of the English Church Union, did not speak with his usual ease; and whether from design or through inadvertence, some of his remarks were offensive to a large proportion of his hearers.[1]

[1] For example, he laid great stress on the opinion of Cardinal Newman, and he concluded by saying that he hoped that the chair of St. Augustine might eventually stand in its proper relation to the chair of St. Gregory the Great.

To hear the discussion on "Church and Dissent," in the evening of the same day, there was a very large gathering.[1] The Dean of Peterborough had been prevented by illness from writing his Paper. Professor Plumptre had no hopes of any good result from negotiations for a reunion of the "home Churches," and had nothing practical to suggest, indeed, except a change of attitude :—

There remains [he said] the thought of a Christendom which includes all those bodies, and from which we dare not exclude any who "profess or call themselves Christians." That thought, while it leaves us free to hold fast to the forms of faith, of discipline, of ritual which we have inherited, or to modify them as may best meet our own necessities, while it gives us a fresh reason for maintaining the connection of the Church with the nation's life, as the best witness, so long as the connection is a reality, for that wider brotherhood which exists in spite of outward differences and interrupted communion, should at any rate mollify, in large measure, the feelings of bitterness and hostility which have found, even of late years, such frequent utterance. Look at the great body of Nonconformist agencies, Nonconformist hymns, and mission work and evangelizing literature, and schools and colleges, and ask whether the men who represent them are to be looked on as servants or enemies of Christ, elements of strength and nobleness in the nation's life, or only and wholly of evil? Can we say that the animus or the guilt of schism belongs to those who have inherited a position which was forced upon their fathers in part, at least, by the unwisdom and oppression of our own? Is it not our wisdom and duty to welcome every opportunity for courtesy, kindness, friendliness, for co-operation where to co-operate is possible?

Whether certain cheering facts, continued Professor Plumptre, are as the dawning of a brighter day, in which the entail of evil shall be cut off, and . . . . the Church of England in her widened comprehensiveness, attract those who are weary of the narrowness of Dissent, and, by the reform of the evils which now attach to her system of patronage and endowment, shall disarm the objections which are made to her connection with the State :—

Or whether dark days lie before us in which, after discord has done its work, the servants of Christ shall stand face to face with a nation secularized and non-Christian, so that a common peril shall unite those who have hitherto been warring with each other—I dare not venture to forecast. It is enough for us to be content for a while with

[1] One Leicester friend, himself a Nonconformist, told me, says the *Guardian*, that he had counted some 150 Nonconformists who were personally known to him, and were sitting within eye-shot; and it was stated that nearly if not quite all the Nonconformist ministers of the town were present.

the day of small things, and to do our little possible in the pathway of justice and charity and peace by acts of kindness and courtesy in the churchyard or the School Board, or in social intercourse. So may we, at least, inherit the blessing of the peacemakers, and take our place among the "healers of the breach and the restorers of paths to dwell in." So, sowing the good seed in the morning and the evening, we will wait, though the skies are dark and our labours end in apparent failure, for the far-off harvest.

Lord Nelson spoke well, and in a kindly spirit, concerning the removing of stumbling-blocks in the way of Dissenters. Churchmen ought never "to ignore the Christian witness borne by Dissenters—their holy lives and self-denying labours."

The Bishop of Liverpool followed.[1] After pointing out the "huge standing fact," the existence of Dissent on a large scale throughout the land, the Bishop asked, To what are we to attribute it?

Is there anything radically unsound or unscriptural in our Articles, Creeds, or formularies? I answer boldly, Nothing at all. Our great confession of faith, the Thirty-nine Articles, may safely challenge comparison with any confession in the world. Our Prayer-book, with all its imperfections, is a matchless manual of public worship, and is growing rather than declining in favour with mankind. Is there any general abstract dislike to Bishops, liturgies, and surplices in the English mind? I believe next to none at all. Give the average Englishman the pure Gospel of Christ in the pulpit, a holy, conscientious minister to preach it, a hearty, lively service to accompany it, diligent week-day pastoral work to follow it, and the vast majority of Englishmen are content, and want no more. We must go further than this to discover the cause of Dissent.

My own solution of the problem is short and simple. I believe that the first seeds of Dissent were sown by the narrow intolerance of the Church in the days of the Stuarts. The wretched attempt to produce uniformity by fines, and penalties, and imprisonment "drove wise men almost mad," and made them say, "Can any good thing come out of a Church which sanctions such things?" I believe, secondly, that the utter deadness and apathy of the Church in the last century did even more to drive men and women out of our pale than the intolerance of the Stuarts. Bishops who scandalously neglected their dioceses, and were everything that Bishops ought not to be—parochial clergymen who did nothing for souls, preached no Gospel, performed hasty, cold,

---

[1] The rising of the Bishop of Liverpool, says the *Guardian*, was the signal for loud and long-continued cheering. "As Canon Ryle he was always a favourite on the Church Congress platform, and his recent elevation to the Bench gave a special importance to his appearance at Leicester. He was greeted in a manner that was nothing less than enthusiastic. His speech was, as usual, straightforward, manly, and lucid. It did not everywhere carry all the very diverse elements of the audience with it, but was, on the whole, as well received as it was well delivered."

slovenly services in dirty churches full of high square pews like sheep-pens, and lived terribly worldly lives—these unhappy representatives of our Church filled the country; these were the real founders of Dissent, and caused half the chapels to be built in the land. I declare my own firm conviction, that if the Bishops and clergy of the last century had done their duty, and understood their times as well as many do now, an immense proportion of English Nonconformity would never have existed, and John Wesley and his companions would never have seceded from the Church of England. We reap what our forefathers sowed, and it is no use to complain. In short, Church apathy has created English Nonconformity, and to speak angrily and contemptuously of those whom we ourselves have made Dissenters is, to say the least, most unjust. That old saying is too much forgotten, *Schismaticus est qui separationem causat, non qui separat.*

The precise amount of good or harm which English Dissent has done, or is doing, continued the Bishop, is a wide and difficult question, and much may be said on both sides:—

On the one hand I have not the slightest sympathy with those who regard Dissent as an evil, and only evil, and would hand Nonconformists over to the "uncovenanted mercies" of God. I believe this to be an entirely untenable position. I shall never hesitate to declare my conviction that in thousands of parishes Dissenters have done an immense amount of spiritual good. They have supplied the Church's "lack of service." . . . . In short, when I look at the mass of infidelity, heathenism, and immorality which exists in the world, I must and will thank God for the work done by Trinitarian Dissenters. The enemy is coming in upon us like a flood; I welcome any volunteer who fights on our side, however strange and rough his uniform may be.

On the other hand, it is vain to deny that the inconveniences, not to say the evils, arising from English Dissent are very many and very great. The divisions of Christians are always an immense source of weakness to the whole cause of Christ in the world. An enormous amount of time, money, and energy is wasted on separate machinery and organization which would be saved if we were one united body. We supply the infidel with an argument which it is extremely difficult to refute. "When you can agree among yourselves," he says, "it will be time enough for me to believe." Collisions are continually arising between church and chapel, and especially in small parishes, where either party thinks its interests are in danger. The common cause of Christian education takes damage all over the country from the morbid fear of many that distinct religious teaching will injure their own particular denomination. Above all, the bitter crusade of Liberationists against the Establishment, which, if successful, would only paganize the rural districts, and do its promoters no good, is rapidly creating a breach between Episcopalians and their rivals, which will never be healed. All these, I say, are evils, grievous evils, and I pity the man who has not eyes to see them, or, seeing them,

does not long to devise means by which they may be lessened or removed.

"Can nothing be done," said Bishop Ryle, "to improve the relations of Church and Dissent? I dismiss, as utterly unworthy of notice, the new-born (Dean Stanley's) idea that the Church may be nationalized, and Church and Dissent brought together, by turning our parish churches into pantheons, and throwing open our pulpits to preachers of all denominations, with every kind of doctrine, or no doctrine at all. Anything more absurdly Utopian or unpractical I cannot conceive. I will not waste the time of Congress by dwelling on it. It is liberality run mad. It would never work."

Confining himself "to practical things," the Bishop suggested (1) Churchmen must remember to draw "a broad line of distinction between Dissenters and Dissenters:"—

If we suppose, for example, because some wild men are incessantly telling the public that the Established Church is a Babylon which ought to be destroyed—or that all the Prayer-books ought to be burned—or that the union of Church and State is an adulterous connection—or that all clergymen ought to be stripped of their endowments and turned into the streets—or that Anglican ministers are mere serfs and slaves who are paid out of the taxes—if, I say, we suppose because *some* Dissenters talk this rubbish, that *all* Dissenters agree with them, we are quite mistaken. I believe, on the contrary, that the vast majority of serious, God-fearing Nonconformists have no sympathy with this kind of language and thoroughly dislike it. Although attached to their own chapels they have no wish to quarrel with the Church, and are willing to "think and let think." The empty tubs always make most noise. We must not condemn all Dissenters on account of the extravagant words of a rabid minority.

(2) Churchmen should cultivate the habit of treating Dissenters with kindness, courtesy, and toleration. (3) We must not waste time and energy on the pleasant but Quixotic idea that we can ever bring about a wholesale reunion of Church and Dissent.[1] (4) To improve the relations of Church and Dissent, we ought to co-operate with Dissenters whenever we can:—

It is vain to deny that there is much common ground on which we

[1] Whatever may happen in isolated cases [said the Bishop], it is not reason to suppose that trained and educated Dissenting ministers, as a rule, will ignore their own orders, and seek to be re-ordained. Nor is it reason to suppose their congregations would follow them. And unhappily this is not all. Our own internal divisions place an insuperable barrier in the way of reunion. We do not approach the subject with clean hands. So long as our own beloved Church of England is infected with semi-Romanism on the extreme right, and semi-unbelief on the extreme left, and cannot cure or expel the disease, so long, we may depend on it, our Nonconformist brethren will never embark in our ship.

can work together without the slightest compromise of principle; and I contend that we ought to be always ready to occupy that ground in a brotherly spirit, and not to stand aloof, and turn the cold shoulder on possible allies. The great controversy with infidelity—the cause of Scriptural education—the maintenance of Sunday—the improvement of the dwellings of the poor—the grand temperance movement—the translation and circulation of the Bible—all these are points about which I advise every Churchman to work with Dissenters whenever he can.

His Lordship concluded by expressing an earnest hope that we should "all resolve to honour 'the grace of God,' wherever we see it:"—

In whomsoever we find "Aliquid Christi," let us respect him, even though he does not belong to our own communion. In high esteem for the orders and worship of our Church I give place to no man. In my own way I am as "High" a Churchman as any one in this room. But we travel towards a world in which possession of the grace of the Holy Ghost will be the one thing needful, and Episcopacy and a Liturgy will be of no use to us if we have not been washed in the blood of Christ. Let us remember this on earth, and honour the grace of God, whatever be the denomination of the man who possesses it. After all, the "kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." "In Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love."

The Rev. J. McCormick, in a vigorous speech, referred to the difference between orthodox Nonconformists and Roman Catholics. The Rev. Dr. Campion, on the other hand, asserted that Nonconformists "could not celebrate a valid Eucharist."

The last speaker was Canon Hoare, of Tunbridge Wells, who said, that whilst receiving such free hospitality from Nonconformists in Leicester, the Congress certainly ought to speak kindly of them; and he urged his brethren of the clergy, in spite of their present irritation about the Burials Bill, to endeavour to carry out its provisions in a loyal and friendly spirit. "This advice," we agree with *The Guardian*, "was, generally speaking, very well received."[1] Canon Hoare added a few weighty words against any "reunion" movement tending in the direction of Rome.

---

[1] The *Guardian* remarks:—"Archdeacon Denison's reappearance in full vigour was cordially welcomed. But his assertion that our want of discipline is the real cause of Nonconformity did not 'go down' with many. Some thought that a restoration of Church discipline might even bear hard on the Archdeacon himself. Neither did the Congress care very much on this occasion for what Canon Trevor said to it in censure of the Burials Bill. The conciliatory words of the Bishop of Winchester, who followed, were much more to its mind. . . . And so [after Canon Hoare's

On the important subject, "The Internal Organization of the Church: Whether it is desirable that increased facilities or powers of legislation should be granted to Convocation; and, if so, whether the granting of such powers or facilities should be accompanied by any, and what, Reforms of Convocation," the Bishop of Carlisle read the first Paper. It explained and vindicated the "Draft Bill" concerning rites and ceremonies, which is, as his Lordship said, mistakenly connected with his name, and it made answer especially to some strictures upon the "Draft Bill" recently made by the Bishop of Worcester in his Charge.—Bishop Harvey Goodwin was followed by the Dean of Lichfield in an elaborate Paper, mainly historical. It strongly protested against the admission of the laity into Convocation.—Professor Montagu Burrows warmly advocated lay co-operation; he thought a consultative lay body would do much good. He rather sharply complained of unwillingness on the part of the clergy to admit the laity to a share in the government of the Church.—The Archdeacon of Ely made an eloquent, vigorous, and practical speech. He spoke with warmth of the value of lay co-operation. For *his* part, said the Archdeacon, he should have no objection to the admission of the laity into Convocation, none whatever; but he thought a practical step, at present possible, was the formation of a consultative lay body, without whose adhesion no Convocation scheme should be laid before Parliament. He believed that the influence and action of the lay element would be wholesome, helpful, and conservative. Considering his long connection with Congresses and Diocesan Conferences, Archdeacon Emery's earnestly expressed views had great weight. He also advocated reform as regards the Lower House of Convocation.—The absence of Canon Garbett, through ill health, was matter of sincere regret with many; he had not been able to send his Paper.—The first selected speaker was the Rev. W. O. Purton. According to the *Record*, Mr. Purton said—

---

admirable closing speech] this, certainly the most remarkable meeting closed, and closed also the most remarkable day of the Congress of 1880. The afternoon meeting had certainly brought out an unexpected kindliness of sentiment amongst the three schools of Churchmen towards each other; this evening meeting evinced a feeling certainly not less kindly on the part of Churchmen towards their fellow-citizens not of the Church. If there was nothing said by any partisan, High, Broad, or Low, in the afternoon—and there was certainly next to nothing—which could gall or wound any Churchman of the other schools, there was assuredly as little said at night which could reasonably irritate the susceptibilities of Nonconformists. There was, on the contrary, free confession of the errors and shortcomings of the Church in the past, and repeated expression of a desire to amend the one and cure the other. We have reason, indeed, to know that the many Nonconformists present were much gratified at the equity of tone and general fairness which characterized the discussion."

That while agreeing in the main with Archdeacon Emery he must go a little further. They had had the *principles*, he would give the *details*. He advocated, as to Convocation (1), Upper and Lower House of Canterbury sitting together, as in York; (2) a large increase of parochial proctors for the clergy; curates to vote; (3) cumulative vote—with voting papers—for due representation of minorities; (4) diminution of *ex-officio* members. As to a consultative lay body, he advocated that members should be elected from Diocesan Conferences: cumulative vote here also; that they should speak in the presence of a selected body from both Convocations of clergy; and that nothing should be submitted to Parliament without consent of the majority of this body. Mr. Purton quoted from recommendations of the Lower House of Canterbury[1] to show that they merely suggested "consultation." He insisted that the laity should speak and vote. With reference to the "Draft Bill," he mentioned that at the Chichester Diocesan Conference only two speakers had a good word to say for it, and they were the two Archdeacons. He spoke of the influence of the lay element in Diocesan Conferences, and pleaded earnestly for Church reforms.

Mr. Beresford Hope followed. The right honourable gentleman denied Professor Burrows's allegations about a clerical jealousy of laymen; he said that such jealousy had long since passed away. He did not believe that "the Bishop of Carlisle's Bill" had any chance of passing into law:—

> Both Houses were jealous of restrictions upon their authority. Even in the most churchy House of Commons it would be severely criticized with lengthened debates. But the political creed of the present House of Commons was to do as little good to and hamper and clip the Church as much as possible. Such a Bill would provoke debate, recrimination, and evil speaking about the Church, the mischief of which was inexpressible.

Mr. Beresford Hope further agreed with Archdeacon Emery and other speakers that it was desirable to establish, by the action and goodwill of the clergy, a consultative lay body; this could be done without Parliamentary action—could be done without delay.

Several speakers followed; "but we did not perceive," says the *Guardian*, "that the subject was much advanced by their efforts. It was sufficiently apparent, from the tone of this meeting, which coincided signally with some opinions expressed by the Bishop of Peterborough in his Inaugural Address, that men's minds

---

[1] In the year 1877. "That in the opinion of this House it would be for the advantage of the Church that a Provincial House of Laymen should be formed, to be convened from time to time by the Archbishops, and to be in close communication with the Synod, who shall always be consulted before application is made to the Crown or to Parliament to give legal effect to any act of the Synod."

are quite ripe for the formation of a consultative and representative assembly of laymen to work in co-operation with Convocation. There were some who did not even shrink from the idea of laymen sitting side by side with clerical Proctors in Convocation itself. There was a strong and unanimous demand for reforms in Convocation considered as representative of the clergy; and a no less strong and unanimous determination to have as little to do with Parliament about these matters as possible."

And here we may quote those passages in the Inaugural Address which referred to lay co-operation, and, especially, to the formation of a general assembly, "elected, representative, deliberative, entitled to speak for the whole Church."

The Bishop pointed out that in seeking the revival of her public assemblies—which were a part of her original constitution, and to the gathering together of which her Master had promised from the first the blessing of His presence—the Church was only, like all other living things, developing her life in accordance with its own inherent and necessary laws:—

> This feeling first took outward shape in the revival of Convocation. But it soon became manifest that Convocation could not completely satisfy this need of the Church; and for this reason—that while, on the one hand, Convocation represented only the clergy, on the other hand a great change had passed, during its abeyance, over the great council of the nation, which at one time might have been regarded, and indeed was regarded, as representing the laity of the Church. Parliament—which at one time in its history was virtually a lay Convocation—had long ceased to be an assembly exclusively of Churchmen; it had even ceased, or was just then ceasing to be, an assembly exclusively of Christians.

When, therefore, the time for the revival of Church councils had come, some place had to be found, under these altered conditions, for the representation of the laity, and that, too, in their distinctive character as members of the Church, and not, as heretofore, as members of the nation.

"It appears to me," continued the Bishop, "that Church Congresses, in their constitution and idea, are an attempt to find such a place for the laity:"—

> Certainly they first gave to the laity an equal place with the clergy in a Church Conference, and they seem, moreover, to have aimed from the first at giving to each Congress a representative character; not representative by *e*lection, for which the Church was not then ripe, but representative at least by *s*election; the principle acted on from the first by Congress committees being that, so far as regarded its selected elements, the Congress should as much as possible present that aspect which it would present if freely elected by the Church at large. Add to this the fact that *bonâ fide* membership in the Church is a condition of membership in the Congress; and, further, that it must

be presided over by the Bishop of the diocese in which it assembles, and you will see, I think, that the Church Congress from the first was something more than a mere chance-medley of persons interested in Church matters—a mere fortuitous concourse of Church atoms—and that it has always exhibited the distinct, even if rudimentary, outlines of those mixed and representative assemblies of clergy and laity which are becoming, under the conditions of modern political and ecclesiastical life, the form in which Church corporate life is necessarily and instinctively shaping itself.

But these elements being, as I have said, but imperfectly present in Church Congresses, it is clear that these labour under considerable disadvantages, and are exposed to dangers from which other assemblies are free. For instance, not being in any way legislative, their discussions are not steadied and weighted by the sense of responsibility attaching to words which may become laws; and further, as the subjects for discussion do not arise spontaneously from the necessities of legislation, there is the obvious temptation to select, not those which are solid and important, even if unattractive, but rather those that are telling and popular, and which will *draw* speakers and an audience.

Again, these Congresses not being truly and perfectly representative, not only are they an imperfect test of Church feeling and opinion, but they are actually in danger of becoming an untrue test, inasmuch as a sense of fairness induces each committee to aim at giving to all schools in the Church an equal representation in our debates, which, as all schools in the Church are not equal in numbers or importance, must be so far a misleading representation. And inasmuch as Congress is not, properly speaking, a deliberative assembly—does not, that is to say, come to any decision directly upon any question discussed by it—there is the obvious temptation to come at this decision indirectly, if not by votes, by voices; by the volume of sound which greets the appearance of some party leader, or the cheers which follow the utterance of some party watchword, as each party in turn tries thus to elicit what may appear in the papers as the "feeling of the Congress," forgetting that, after all, shouting proves nothing except the strength of the lungs of the shouters.

In one word, the dangers of Church Congresses are manifestly these—that in numbers they may prove unwieldly; in choice of subjects limited; in discussion rhetorical and declamatory; in general result unpractical.

Now, if this be so—if, on the one hand, Congresses are really exposed to these dangers, and if, on the other hand, much of their original work is now being done by more regular Church assemblies which have since sprung into existence, and which are, what Congresses are not, elective, representative, and deliberative—it may be asked, and, indeed, it is being asked by many, whether Congresses, having done their work in the past, might not give place to those other Church assemblies, the formation of which they have so largely stimulated?

"And, if I were asked why this is not yet so," continued the

Bishop—"if I were asked to explain the fact of the continuance of such assemblies as we see here to-day, I should venture to interpret it as meaning this—that the desire and the need which Congresses first sought to meet are not yet all fulfilled."

Our ruridecanal, our diocesan conferences, excellent as they are, are still local; they are not yet even provincial. They cannot, therefore, claim to speak for the whole Church. There is yet to be evolved out of them, and there are, I think, signs that there will yet be evolved out of them by a process of natural growth and selection, some central and general assembly, elected, representative, deliberative—entitled to speak for the whole Church, lay and clerical, with all the weight of its representative character—a body to which may yet be intrusted, whether *in amalgamation* [the italics are our own] or in alliance with a largely reformed Convocation, within due and reasonable limits, some such powers of self-regulation, of local control, as Parliament seems increasingly disposed to grant to other institutions not more desirous, nor, I will venture to say, more deserving of it than the Church of England.

"That some such central and general assembly of the Church of England will yet be the completion of her present growth of representative institutions, seems to me," said Dr. Magee, "as certain as any event in the future can be. That when it does come it will bring its own defects and dangers is quite certain. He must be a careless student of Church history who believes that Church councils are a panacea for all Church difficulties. But of this, nevertheless, I am persuaded, that some such uniting central assembly of the Church is all but a necessity, if she is to hold her own amidst her many rivals, who, though inferior to her in numbers, are yet superior to her in this, that they are, what she as yet is not, thoroughly and completely organized, whether for work, for reform, or for defence."

This portion of the presiding Bishop's Congress Charge appears to us not the least remarkable among the pregnant passages of recent pleas for Church Reform.[1]

On "The Church and the Poor—Compulsory Insurance," an able Paper was read by the Rev. W. L. Blackley, and several speeches were full of interest. "Church Patronage," and "The Position of Curates," were discussed with animation. The subject of "Church Finance"[2] was introduced by the Hon. Wilbraham

[1] Our readers may be interested in comparing the suggestions of the Bishop of Peterborough with those of the Right Hon. H. C. E. Childers, M.P., CHURCHMAN, vol. i. p. 155.

[2] In one of the interesting letters from the *Record's* special correspondent, it is remarked that considering the dangers which threaten all established institutions, too much importance could hardly be attached to the opportunity which the Congress afforded of eliciting the opinions of well-informed Churchmen from all parts of the country on such points

Egerton, M.P. He showed the urgent need there is of some wider and more general organization of the financial resources of the Church; and he pointed out that Churchmen are very far behind the Dissenting societies in respect of the system and efficiency with which our financial concerns are managed.—Lord John Manners brought before the Congress the work of the Tithes Redemption Trust, of which he is chairman. This trust has effected the restoration of near £3,000 a year of tithes to a number of poor parishes from which these sums had been formerly taken. Altogether, through the Ecclesiastical Commissioners and other agencies, he stated that about £132,000 per annum of tithes has been already given back to the parochial clergy.—Sir T. Fowell Buxton advocated, under certain restrictions, the union of small and badly-endowed parishes, which, he said, were now exceedingly hard to fill up with worthy incumbents.—Next came Mr. T. Salt, who advocated, as has been more than once ably done before, the amendment of the Pluralities Act of 1838. For our own part, as has already been stated in the CHURCHMAN, we believe that under certain circumstances the union of small contiguous parishes is desirable.

In the discussion on the Cathedral system the general feeling

---

as "The Reformation of our Cathedral System," "Church Patronage and Preferment," and "Church Finance." These, writes the correspondent, "are not party questions within the Church. They affect all sections of the Church alike, and they are of vital importance to all at the present moment. The absorbing demands upon the time of all earnest clergymen, and the special desire of the Evangelical clergy to devote themselves to the chief work of the ministry, have tended to relegate the consideration of these subjects in the past to a few, mostly High Churchmen, who have worked them very much from their own standpoint, and have secured not a little help in the extension of their own views of Church doctrine and worship by the prominent part they have taken in these ecclesiastico-economic questions. But amongst our Evangelical clergy are men fully competent to enter upon these matters, and to redeem them from the one-sidedness with which they have been treated, and it is greatly to be desired that the duty should be pressed upon their attention, and that they should be moved to undertake the public and prominent service to the Church which was a large element in the development of Evangelical influence in the past generation. . . . . I am not a novice nor a careless observer of the signs of the times. I see with pain and sorrow that some of our most cherished Evangelical societies lack both the men and the money which were once at their command. . . . . The times [continues the *Record's* correspondent] are changing. New measures require new men. Where are they, and upon what platform are they to do their meed of service for the Church in this time? I venture to think that it is in connection with these subjects, which have heretofore been appropriated by High and Broad Churchmen, that they must come forward in order to ensure the vigour and permanence of the Church's institutions in association with the scriptural principles and the devotional fervour which it is the especial duty of Evangelical Churchmen to maintain and cultivate."

seemed to be, that Canons Residentiary ought to reside; it is a mistake to give an incumbent £600 or £1,000 a year to take a three months' holiday.—Mr. Magniac, M.P., said that when the Ely Conference declared that the Canons should reside nine months in the year, it meant that they must do diocesan work for that time.—Canon Trevor read an able and amusing Paper, well worth studying, on the evils of non-residence.—The Canons, clearly, must do diocesan work; but what is their work to be? That a Canon should be the Diocesan Inspector is not a suggestion, we think, likely to be adopted.—In regard to evangelistic services, Canon Farrar made the remark that there are but fifty-two Sundays in a year; what can six Canons do as preachers in a diocese? Dr. Farrar forgot, however, that important evangelistic services are held on week days. A Canon would not be overworked, surely, if he preached five evenings a week during Lent, Advent, and Epiphany.[1]

On "The Religious Condition of the Nation," admirable speeches were made by the Rev. Canon Lefroy and the Rev. F. F. Goe, who referred particularly to the middle classes. The Working Men's Meeting was, in many respects, especially considering it was held in an ultra-Radical town, a very great success.

At the closing meeting of the Congress, on Friday evening, an unprecedented event took place. The Nonconformist ministers of Leicester, in number upwards of fifteen, mounted the platform and presented, through the Bishop of the Diocese, as President, an address of welcome and of brotherly greeting to the Congress. The address was read by the Rev. Joseph Wood, one of the ministers, and at present chairman of the School Board. The closing sentences of this remarkable Paper ran as follows:—

> We trust that your visit to the town has been pleasant to yourselves, and will be full of advantage to the Church of Christ. There is no Nonconformist in our midst who would not deplore as a great calamity any diminution of the religious efficiency of the Church of England.
>
> We rather earnestly hope that your labours here will have for their result an increase of spiritual power—such as shall be felt throughout the whole of your communion, and throughout the country at large. We offer you our greetings in the spirit of the wise and comprehensive charity which is happily becoming more and more a distinctive note of the churches of our time, well assured that all who seek to follow as disciples in the footsteps of our Lord Jesus Christ, and who labour with a single heart to bring in his glorious kingdom, are friends and allies, notwithstanding the different means they use, and the different names by which they are called.

---

[1] Not a single evangelical clergyman, so far as we are aware, read or spoke on Cathedral Reform. One representative evangelical was prepared to speak, but through some misadventure he was not called upon.

In his eloquent and impressive reply—one of Dr. Magee's happiest speeches—the Bishop said:—

We know that Nonconformists have vied with Churchmen in eager hospitality, and I can assure you that without that we should have found it difficult to house the members of our Congress in Leicester. I can assure you we cordially accept that result. This *rapprochement* between Nonconformists and Churchmen, so happily expressed to-night and during the last four days, is no new thing in Leicester. Nearly seventy years ago one of the most eloquent orations ever made was spoken over the grave of an incumbent of this town by a great Christian orator, whose name is indissolubly connected with the religious history of Leicester—Dr. Robert Hall. Nearly seventy years have passed since Robert Hall expressed the grief of a Christian brother over the grave of Thomas Robertson, the minister of St. Mary's. Gladly, therefore, do we recognize the renewal of good feeling, the renewal of these deep principles of charity and mutual forbearance and mutual reflection, that then blossomed around that grave, and that are bearing fruit here to-night.

And here we must close this Article. We have not attempted to give a sketch of the proceedings of the Congress, but rather to show the drift of a few of the meetings which have especially attracted our own attention. Viewed as a whole, the Leicester gathering must be, we think, pronounced one of the most successful of all the Church Congresses. The Archbishop of York preached a very valuable opening sermon, and read a masterly Paper on the weakness and evils of Positivism. The Bishop of the Diocese made, as was expected, an admirable chairman, and fully kept up his reputation as an orator second to none. The attendance was large; the speeches as a rule were practical; there were no "scenes;" an earnestness and reverence of tone was unmistakable. We must add that while High Churchmen and Evangelicals held their own quietly, kindly, and firmly, at two or three gatherings Broad Churchmen were rampant and aggressive. The Ritualists made no way; an attempt by a section of them to silence Bishop Riley served only to show their weakness. The speech of Bishop Ryle on the Protestant Church of Mexico was excellent.

Reviews.

A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities. Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, D.C.L., LL.D., and SAMUEL CHEETHAM, M.A., Archdeacon of Southwark, and Professor of Pastoral Theology in King's College, London. Volume II. John Murray. 1880.

THE value of Dr. Smith's series of Dictionaries is so universally acknowledged that it would be a useless expenditure of time and labour to explain their general design, or to pronounce any eulogium upon the mode of its execution. We shall content ourselves, therefore, so far as any

general remarks may be deemed desirable, with the single observation that the high reputation which these Dictionaries have already achieved will not be impaired by a careful examination of the volumes of Christian Antiquities and of Biography, which have appeared under the able editorship of Archdeacon Cheetham and of Professor Wace,

It will be at once apparent that the office of the Reviewer, in respect of a work of so comprehensive a character as a Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, is somewhat different from that which devolves upon him in the discharge of his ordinary functions. It would be as unwise to attempt, as it would be impracticable to accomplish, the task of conveying to his readers, *seriatim*, any adequate idea of the character and value of the numerous and, in many cases, very elaborate articles which are contained in the volumes before us; and it would be an equally useless and invidious task to institute any comparison with a view to determine their respective merits. We desire our readers, therefore, to understand that in the selection which we are about to make out of a large number of articles which invite our consideration, we shall be guided rather by the subjects with which they deal than by the amount of learning and ability which is displayed in their treatment. Now we think that we shall not misapprehend or misrepresent the views of a large proportion of the readers of these pages if we assume that there are no articles which will present a stronger claim upon their consideration than those which deal with the constitution of the early Church and with the various functions of the Christian ministry. Much valuable information on these important subjects will be found under the respective heads of *Orders*, *Ordination*, and *Priest*. Whilst it is important to exercise caution in regard to general inferences drawn from the designations given to specific offices it is always a matter of interest and of importance to trace up such designations, when it is practicable, to the time when they were first employed. The volume now before us will be found of great service in the prosecution of this inquiry; and, unless we are greatly deceived, a careful examination of the articles which we have specified will strongly corroborate the inference which, in our judgment, a diligent investigation of the Apostolical Epistles is calculated to produce in every candid and reflecting mind—viz., that sacerdotalism, in the modern acceptation of the term, has no foundation whatever in the history and constitution of the primitive and Apostolic Church. We are well aware that the human mind is so formed that when any ideas have taken a strong and permanent hold upon it, it unconsciously discovers in language, the least calculated to convey such impressions, arguments in support of the theories which it has imbibed from other sources. Such has been pre-eminently the history of sacerdotalism in its rise and development in the Christian Church. In all ages of the world's history of which the records have been preserved, there appears to have been some idea existing in the minds of men of the necessity of expiation and propitiation by means of sacrifice. Nor have terms been wanting, so far as we are aware, in any language, by means of which such ideas have been expressed, nor is there any language in which more accurate expression has been given to those ideas than that in which the Apostolical epistles are written. The general absence, then, of such terms which we observe in those passages which relate to the Christian ministry is a fact which is deserving of our most serious attention. We do not forget, as we make this remark, that the words "altar" and "sacrifice" are both found in connection with Christian service; but the context in which they occur determines the sense in which they are employed. Whatever may be the precise meaning of Hebrews xiii. 10, the context clearly shows that the sacrifice which Christians are to offer by means of the altar, or of Him who suffered thereon, "is the

sacrifice of praise;" the sacrifice of praise, alike under the law and under the Gospel, being distinct from the sacrifice of expiation; whilst in the one and only passage in which the hieratical priesthood is ascribed to a Christian minister—viz., Romans xv. 16—the nature of that priesthood is distinctly explained as consisting, not in the presentation of any material offering on a material altar, but in the "offering up of the Gentiles" themselves as an acceptable sacrifice unto God, "being sanctified by the Holy Ghost."

The inference which we draw from the marked absence of sacrificial terms in regard to Christian worship in those places in which, on the supposition that sacerdotalism is the religion of the New Testament, we should naturally expect to find them, is strongly confirmed by the results of the closest and most accurate inquiry into the earliest records of ecclesiastical history. In the prosecution of these inquiries the volume before us will be found of much practical service, as embodying, with ample references to the sources from which it is derived, much information which has been obtained only as the result of long and patient inquiry in a field of investigation which is too commonly neglected.

A few illustrations must suffice. We turn, *e.g.*, to the article entitled *Holy Orders*. Here we learn that the word *ordo* was the earliest and most general Latin word which was used to denote the clergy as distinguished from the laity in common with that which, at a later period, became a distinctive dress of the clergy. This name appears to have been transferred from Roman civil life, in which it was an ordinary designation of a governing body of both a municipality and a *collegium*. And here it is important to show that at first the words *ordo* and *ordines* comprised not only Church officers, but also any "estate" of men or women in the Church. Thus, *e.g.*, St. Jerome speaks of the "faithful" and the "catechumens" as forming two of the five ecclesiastical "orders." At a much later period we find reference made by Rabanus to the three orders of *clerics*, *laics*, and *monks*, and even so late as in Bishop Leofric's Exeter Missal of the tenth century, we find not only *bishops*, *presbyters*, and *deacons*, but also *acolytes*, *exorcists*, *readers*, and *door-keepers* included under the general term *ordines*. So also in regard to the use of the word κλῆρος, *clerus*, whence the English word *clergy*. Mr. Hatch refers, in proof of the use of this word in the plural number as identical with the "flock" in the preceding verse, to 1 St. Peter v. 3. As evidence of the early, possibly the earliest, ecclesiastical use of the word, we admit the propriety of Mr. Hatch's reference; we think, however, that in a work such as that now under review, Mr. Hatch should not have omitted to inform his readers that the genuineness of the verse has been called in question, and that it is omitted in some of the critical editions of the New Testament. Not only, however, so late as the beginning of the fifth century, Mr. Hatch shows that laymen, as well as church officers, were included under the appellation of κλῆρος, but he observes that from the sixth century downwards "it appears to have become a custom in the Gallican churches to confer upon persons privileges and immunities of the clergy by giving them the tonsure without admitting them to any special office in a church;" and, "such persons," he observes further, "were called *clerici*." It appears further, from the evidence adduced by Mr. Hatch, that the distinction between various grades of orders was by no means uniform. Thus, *e.g.*, in the East we sometimes find bishops and presbyters classed together in distinction to deacons and other clerks, whilst, on the other hand (as we may observe, in passing, is the case in the title to the Latin version of our own Thirty-Second Article of Religion), we sometimes find *deacons* included amongst those who had sacred or priestly rank. We will only add, in reference to the article entitled "Holy

Orders," that Mr. Hatch's account of the external organization of the clergy and the original independence of each Church, and the gradual association of different churches into a single organization, is well deserving of careful consideration, whether all of his positions may or may not be sustained by adequate evidence.

Passing on from the important articles to which we have already referred to that of "Priest or Presbyter," for which we are indebted to the same contributor, we observe, with much satisfaction, the remarks which Mr. Hatch has made respecting the connection of the Christian Church with the Jewish synagogue. The following extracts will suffice to convey to our readers some general idea of the views which Mr. Hatch has propounded in this article.

Having first observed that the ἐκκλησία was not separated from the συναγωγὴ even in name, Mr. Hatch observes as follows:—

> It is natural to suppose that when the Jews who became Christians met in assemblies and formed communities which bore the accustomed names, they continued in their assemblies and communities the main features of the accustomed organization. And this, is in fact, the case. Presbyters are found from the first in the Judæo-Christian community at Jerusalem, at Ephesus, in the Churches of Asia Minor—which were organized by Barnabas and Saul—and in the Churches which are addressed by those of the apostles who were most conservative of Jewish usages, St. Peter and St. James. . . . . It is a fair inference that officers who bore the same name in analogous communities had analogous functions, and that the Christian, like the Jewish, Presbyters were officers primarily not of worship but of discipline.

Mr. Hatch observes further, that there is no evidence of the existence of the institution of *presbyters* "outside the limits of the Judæo-Christian communities;" and he adduces, in support of the presumption in favour of the non-existence of that institution, the fact that when St. Paul addressed Churches which were probably non-Jewish in character, as *e.g.*, the Churches of Philippi and Thessalonica, he designates the Church officers by other names, as ἐπίσκοποι (Phil. i. 1) and προϊστάμενοι (1 Thess. v. 12).

Mr. Hatch's remark upon the relations of presbyters to bishops appear to us to be deserving of serious consideration. He candidly admits the difficulty, or rather the impossibility, with the evidence which is at present available, of returning more than a tentative reply to the inquiry which he has proposed. He suggests, however, that as presbyters appear to have been clearly of Jewish origin, so bishops appear to have been of Gentile origin, and that as, in the first instance, the former presided over Jewish communities, so the latter presided over Gentile communities, and hence that, in process of time, as the distinction between Jewish and Gentile communities gradually faded away, the two sets of officers, discharging analogons functions, were regarded as possessing equivalent rank and authority. Those of our readers who are familiar with Bishop Lightfoot's admirable Dissertations, in his "Commentary on the Epistle to Philippians," will not need to be reminded that, to a very considerable extent, the views propounded by Mr. Hatch are in accordance with those which are maintained with so much learning and candour by the present Bishop of Durham.

The name of Professor Swainson affords a sufficient guarantee for the sound scholarship and laborious research of which we reap the results in the article entitled *Liturgy*. We recommend a careful perusal of this article with much confidence to our readers, whether they be already well versed in liturgical literature, or whether they have yet to become acquainted with the elements of a branch of theological study which, of late years, has deservedly attracted a more than ordinary amount of attention on the part of English Churchmen. It is difficult to make

selections from an article which is replete with varied information on so many points of great and increasing interest. Professor Swainson's remarks on the Ambrosian Liturgy of the Church of Milan are deserving of special notice. That Church, as he observes, appears to have been entirely independent of the Church of Rome until Gregory, in the year 593, attempted to exercise patriarchal privileges within the province. The manner in which the oblations were made in the Church of Milan is thus described:—"They were brought in, not by the deacon, but by ten aged men and as many women, and presented by them to the priest." Some of the most important points to which Professor Swainson calls attention in his account of the Ambrosian Liturgy, if the account of Muratori may be trusted, are that there was (1) no offering after consecration, (2) no prayer for those who had departed with the sign of faith, (3) no commemoration of the (Roman) martyrs, and (4) no ceremony of fraction before the Lord's prayer; all of which are contained in the rite as published by Pamelius.

In regard to the character of those Liturgies in which, as English churchmen we are most nearly concerned—viz., the Liturgies of the early British and Celtic churches—Professor Swainson observes that we are "in almost entire ignorance," but that it is "most probable that they resembled in some degree the uses of the churches in Gaul or Spain." An ancient document, originally published by Spelman, is said by Professor Stubbs to be silent on the Liturgy of Britain before the year 429, and its evidence, so far as it goes, is only to the effect that "the Irish Liturgy used by St. Patrick was neither Roman nor Gallican, but Alexandrian." Coming down to the time of Gildas—*i.e.*, to the following century—we find an assertion attributed to him that the Britons were opposed to the whole world and to the Romans in particular "in the mass." So long, moreover, as the Britons and Celts refused to observe the Roman Easter, they must, as Professor Swainson has observed, have refused to adopt the Roman ritual for the Eucharist, and as we know that the Roman Easter was not observed in Scotland or Ireland before the beginning of the eighth century, we are warranted in concluding that up to that period, at all events, their Eucharistic ritual must have been different from the Roman. We are aware that it has been inferred from phrases which are found in the writings of Gildas and of the biographers of St. Columba that the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist occupied a very prominent place in the liturgies and rituals of the Celtic Church. The phrases to which reference is made are such as the following: *sacra offerre; sacra consecrare mysteria; Christi corpus conficere; sacram oblationem consecrare; sacra celebrare mysteria,* but independently of the fact that some of these phrases do not vary from those which the followers of Calvin would not scruple to adopt, the most superficial acquaintance with the theological literature of the fourth and the following centuries ought to suffice as a safeguard against assigning a literal interpretation to language which undoubtedly was often used, and was designed to be understood, in a figurative signification. Equally unsatisfactory as it appears to us are the inferences which have been recently drawn[1] respecting "the position and attitude of the Celebrant," from casual references to the position of St. Columba as "standing at, or before the altar," and, also, respecting the choral services "at the altar" from the allusion of Gildas to "the musical voices of the young sweetly singing the praises of God." We find, however, in Adamnan's "Life of St. Columba," evidence of existence at Iona of a singular custom of joint consecration of

[1] See an Article on the Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church in the April number of the *Church Quarterly Review.*

the eucharistic elements by two priests, it being deemed the prerogative of bishops, or of individual priests specially selected, to consecrate singly. The extract is as follows:—

On one occasion a stranger from the province of Munster, who concealed through humility the fact that he was a bishop, was invited on the next Sunday by Columba to join with him in consecrating the body of Christ. . . . . Columba, on going to the altar, discovered his rank, and addressed him thus:—"Christ bless thee, brother, consecrate alone as a bishop; now we know that thou art of episcopal rank."[1]

The Article on "Marriage," for which we are indebted to Mr. Meyrick, is one of considerable research, and represents the results of extensive reading and investigation. It comprehends an inquiry into (1) the marriage laws of the first eight centuries of the Christian era; (2) the marriage ceremonies; and (3) the law of divorce. In regard to the interpretation of the much vexed direction given by St. Paul to Timothy and Titus, "the husband of one wife," Mr. Meyrick observes that that which is adopted by St. Chrysostom is, that persons were not to be selected for the ministry who were polygamists. He observes further:—

The thought underlying St. Chrysostom's interpretation is that, whereas polygamy was allowed by the Jews, and was still practised, as shown by the example of Herod, and proved by the testimony of Justin, it might have been the purpose of the apostle to allow a converted Jew who was a polygamist to live as a layman without repudiating his existing wives, but not to allow a man in such a position to be a presbyter.

In regard to the light in which marriage was regarded by the Church of the first eight centuries, Mr. Meyrick observes that there is no sign or hint of its being considered as a sacrament, and that although the term *sacramentum* is used by St. Augustine with respect to marriage, it is nowhere employed by him in the modern sense of the word *sacrament*. After a careful and comprehensive review of the documents and authorities of the early Church in regard to remarriage after divorce, Mr. Meyrick observes, that "while the remarriage of the guilty party was sternly and uncompromisingly condemned, there was no *consensus* on the question of the lawfulness or unlawfulness of the remarriage of the innocent party."

It would be easy to multiply our extracts and references, but we trust that we have already given our readers some fair specimens of the varied information which they may expect to find in the very valuable and elaborate volume which we heartily commend to the favourable consideration of that numerous class of readers for whom its pages are specially designed.

Healthy Life and Healthy Dwellings; a Guide to Personal and Domestic Hygiene. By GEORGE WILSON, M.A., M.D., C.M. Edin. London: J. & A. Churchill. 1880.

THE greater attention which has of late been directed to sanitary questions has led to the issue of a number of works of more or less merit purporting to deal with matters relating to health either generally or in detail, in a popular manner.

An enumeration of these would lead one to believe that the subject had been written out, but the truth is, that such a book as the present was still wanted, and we can with confidence recommend it as the best by far of its kind.

Dr. Wilson is the author of a "Handbook of Hygiene," intended for the

---

[1] The *Church Quarterly Review* for April, 1880, p. 73.

use of Medical Officers of Health, which, though not coming up to what such a work should be, has already reached a fourth edition. But viewed in relation to the purposes for which each has been written, we consider the present to be by far the more perfect of the two. In less than 300 pages it covers an extent of ground such as has never been attempted in a popular treatise, and so far from being superficial, it contains a surprising mass of facts and information. It is remarkably free from the faults of similar popular works; though eminently readable, it avoids the sentimentalism and would-be-rhetorical efforts which disfigure so many of its class. It is marked throughout by a sound scientific spirit, an absence of all hasty generalizations and abuse of statistics, in support of the writer's own particular views. This tone of moderation, without the least surrender of principle, is conspicuous in the discussion of the use of alcohol and tobacco and the fashions of female dress.

The First Chapter introduces the reader to the teachings of Vital Statistics, with special reference to preventible diseases and the awful waste, especially among the poor of our large cities, of infant life. We might take exception to his implicit acceptance of the so-called healthy and unhealthy districts of the Registrar-General as such, a fallacy which had been ably exposed by the late Dr. Rumsey; but as the work is addressed to private individuals rather than to physicians or statists we may let it pass.

Chapter II. contains a good summary of the principles of Human Physiology, and Chapter III. treats of the causes of disease, which he divides into—(*a*) those due to *hereditary influence*; (*b*) *self-induced, and social causes*, these comprising what have been called the "diseases of modern life;" and (*c*) *material, local, and communicable causes of disease*, as damp, impure air and water, unsound food and infection. Chapter IV., on food, is thoroughly sound and practical. It is mainly compiled from the works of Parkes, Letheby, and Ed. Smith, and discusses the (*a*) nutritive value, (*b*) choice, (*c*) and preparation of food, with (*d*) hints on diet in general, and on infant feeding.[1] Mothers in every class, and wives, especially in the middle and lower, would learn much from this chapter. Men, too, the hours and quantity of whose meals must be regulated by the inexorable demands of their several employments will find here much useful advice. Chapter V., on cleanliness and clothing, calls for no special remark beyond a protest against the practice of open air bathing *before breakfast*, even by the "vigorous and strong."[2] Chapter VI., on exercise, recreation, and training, deserves the attention of all, especially of such as have the care of the young, and of those who would aid in promoting the physical, and, through it, the moral well-being of the masses.

In Chapter VII., the author discusses the home and its surroundings, matters of vital importance in these days of rapid and dishonest building. The general principles of sanitary construction, and their application, so far as the occupier is concerned, are clearly explained. The best patterns of traps, closets, stoves, ventilators, &c., are named, and attention is directed to several points usually ignored, such as the shameful

[1] The mischievous, but too prevalent practice of rearing young children on *starch*, under the various names of corn flour, arrowroot, Ridge's food, &c., which infants are, for physiological reasons, incapable of assimilating, and which consequently induces diarrhœa, rickets and consumption is justly condemned.

[2] It is not so much to cramp, as commonly supposed, but to failure of the heart's action from the depressing influence of prolonged exposure to cold, we believe, that deaths while bathing are really due.

relegation of the servants' sleeping accommodation to ill-ventilated basements, or more often to dark low garrets, cold in winter, and oppressively hot in summer; the absorption and subsequent evolution of foul gases by the "water seal" of traps, the erosion of lead by sewer gas, and the ease with which gas-burners might be rendered efficient ventilators instead of being, as at present, powerful deteriorators of the air. The Chapter concludes with a short summary of the means of redress afforded to the householder by the law in the event of the landlord refusing to accede to the reasonable requests of the tenant. The last Chapter gives a history of epidemics from the Middle Ages, and a concise description of the several zymotic or infectious diseases. Their modes of origin are clearly stated, though we fail to see on what grounds he hopes we have done with cholera, unless through the increased vigilance of our port sanitary authorities, so successful in 1873.

Among the means by which smallpox and scarlatina are spread, he calls attention to the practice of tailors, dressmakers, &c., of putting out their work, though he omits the scarcely less dangers of the private laundry and mangle; the measures to be taken in the event of such diseases breaking out in the family or school; and directions for the subsequent disinfection of rooms, bedding, and clothing. We notice with special approval his warnings on the utter futility of exposing vessels of so-called disinfectants in the sick-room with a view to checking the extension of the disease, an end to be attained only by free ventilation and perfect isolation; the folly, nay, wickedness, of deliberately exposing children of tender age to the infection of measles (or even the mildest scarlatina) as to something in itself inevitable or in the course of Nature, and his recommendation that all cases of infectious disease should, in the absence of legislative compulsion, be voluntarily reported to the sanitary authority. While deprecating most strongly all attempts by the clergy (or their wives) to assume the functions of the physician, under a false notion of charity, the present writer—a medical man—would assure them that they might do good service by first acquiring and then disseminating the lessons contained in this book. The greatest ignorance of the laws of health prevails among all classes, but it is on the poor that the consequences press most heavily. In villages, the co-operation of the clergy and school teachers with the Medical Officer of Health, might work wonders. But it must be borne in mind that a fourth of all the deaths in a community, and three-fourths of those of infants, are absolutely preventable; that a large proportion of children among all classes are victims to the ignorance or errors of their parents; that the greater part of our diseases are the natural consequences of our acts—the penalties of the violation of God's physical laws, whether we choose to attach a moral character to them or not; and that prayers against plague and pestilence are a solemn mockery if unattended by sanitary amendment, as much so as the prayers of the drunkard who should persist in his sensual indulgence. This may seem strong language to those who have not studied the subject, but it is true. What a man sows he reaps, and there is now no more mystery in the origin of fevers than there is in the cultivation of mushrooms.

Chaucer. By ADOLPHUS W. WARD. "English Men of Letters" series. Macmillans. 1879.

THE "Chaucer Society," an outcome of the zealous study of the old English language and literature by a small band of scholars in England and Germany during the last ten or twenty years, has not merely collected and published the best and oldest texts of his poems, but has exhumed a

mass of facts and documents relating to his life, such as in the case of a private citizen who lived five hundred years ago is really surprising. Without the labours of this Society the present work, as its author frankly admits, could never have been written.

Mr. Ward begins with a review of the political and social aspect of the times, a period of transition between the old world life of the Middle Ages and the dawn of modern civilization. The union of Norman and Saxon into one people and the blending of their respective languages into our incomparable English was now complete, and with the creation of a House of Commons, composed of representatives of the people, the middle classes were becoming conscious of their own importance. But between 1360 and 1370, the defeat and disgrace which the English arms had sustained in France had dispelled the illusion of previous military success, and the distress of the people, crushed by taxation and decimated by a succession of epidemics, culminated in the peasant revolt of 1381. After its suppression, the desire of security and order led to reaction, but the masses, though silenced, were sullen, for their wrongs were not redressed. Chivalry which had been for preceding generations at once a culture and a religion, keeping alive in ages of lawlessness all that was noble and manly in man, pure and womanly in woman, was fast passing away; what was left was but an unreal sentiment, powerless in moral influence. The times were out of joint, and the moral leprosy was nowhere so conspicuous as in the Church. The monks and nuns aped the luxury, sports, and indulgences of the aristocracy, amassing vast wealth; the friars strove not unsuccessfully to retain their hold on the poor by pandering to their vices and ignorance; the secular clergy alone could show a few pure and pious men, but their poverty and humble birth, no less than the honesty of the better members, neutralized their influence for evil or for good. Yet amid the cares and unrest which pervaded all classes, we can recognize the childish love of play and show, so characteristic of an imperfect civilization. Frivolity and laxity of morals in the higher classes, ostentation in the middle, and boisterous sport in the lower, conjoined with a universal coarseness of language and absence of social decency or domestic comfort, such was the age in which Chaucer lived, and as such it is vividly reflected in all his works.

The second chapter, which forms the bulk of the work, is devoted to the story of Chaucer's life and the sources and dates of his numerous works. Into the details of his parentage and biography it is needless here to enter. We must, however, express our surprise that Mr. Ward should give his preference to the supposition that the heroine of the *Complaint of Pitè* was the Philippa whom he did marry, rather than the Lady Blanche whose marriage with John of Gaunt first, and whose death in 1369 finally destroyed his hopes of ever calling her his own. Nothing seems clearer, making all allowance for the romantic language of love-song, than that inequality of rank was the bar to the desired union. In the pathetic elegy on this lady, the *Book of the Duchesse*, written at the request of John, it is the poet's love and not the Duke's which inspires it, for the latter was utterly unworthy of her; his immorality was notorious, and indeed, as was shown in the *Lancet* recently, we have the testimony of his own physician that it was the immediate cause of his death.

On the decease of Blanche, Chaucer married his namesake (cousin?) Philippa Chaucer, but like too many poets he was not happy in his married life; her temper was bad, and might explain but cannot excuse his infidelity, which a document lately discovered has proved.

Mr. Ward traces the influence of the French poetry on the first half of our poet's literary career. At first Chaucer appears as a translator, or adapter of French models, not only as regards theme and language, but in their sceptical mocking tone with regard to woman in general. The original

Romaunt of the Rose is sketched and compared with Chaucer's abridged version. The influence of Italian literature, especially Boccaccio and Petrarca, and to a less degree Dante, is traced subsequently to his visits to that country, notably in his *Troilus and Cressida* and *Parliament of Fowls*, the latter a pretty allegory founded on the popular legend of the courtships of the birds on St. Valentine's Day, and adapted to the marriage of Anne of Bohemia, daughter of the Emperor Charles IV., to our King Richard II., after successive betrothals to a Prince of Bavaria and a Margrave of Meissen.

Then we have the development of Chaucer's own personality, essentially English, as seen in his *House of Fame*, a masterly satire on the motives, sometimes worthy, but more often unworthy, which prompt men to "seek the bubble reputation;" the *Legend of Good Women*, an attempt at an *amende honorable* for his former ungallant treatment of their sex in a series of stories of womanly and wifely fidelity, which, however, he had not either the leisure or the patience to complete, not having given more than nine of the nineteen he had promised, and these all taken from classic legends, mostly from Ovid; and lastly, in his greatest but unfinished work, the *Canterbury Tales*, of which we find a full analysis with prose abstracts of the best. His minor pieces, the *Ballad to King Richard*, *Envoy to Scogan*, the *Complaint to his Purse*, a serio-comic appeal to the new king, Henry IV., for money of which he was greatly in need, and which it appears he obtained through its means, are more lightly touched on. These notices of his books are interspersed with biographical details; and the author alludes to the influence of Chaucer on Spenser, and the imitations, or rather parodies, of his works by Pope and Dryden, which are ably treated by Mr. Stopford Brooke in his Primer of English Literature. With regard to the "Parson's Tale" Mr. Ward admits that it is mutilated, but he hesitates to go the same length as Mr. Simon, or, like the German scholar, to submit it to a process of verification, and to determine how much is really genuine.

The last chapter on the characteristics of Chaucer will repay perusal; the religious character of Chaucer is fairly handled. Mr. Ward shows, from the "Man of Law's Tale" and the Treatise on the *Astrolabe*, that though justly incredulous of the false science of the day, and a foe to superstition and priestcraft, he had a firm belief in the historic truth of the Bible and the doctrines of Christianity, whatever practical influence they may have had on his life. Of few of his contemporaries could so much be said, and we would fain judge him leniently, attributing his faults to the age in which he lived, and hoping that the evangelical doctrine of repentance and faith in the Redeemer, so clearly set forth in the indisputably genuine portions of the "Parson's Tale," were the consolation of his dark declining years.

For the rest, the quaint and consciously anachronistic treatment of subjects sacred and profane, his apprehension of character, his irrepressible humour, his kindly satire, and the music of his verse, are all pointed out; but on laying down the book, we feel that though this part of the work is honest, laborious, and scholarly, there is a lack of that indescribable poetic feeling which a man may have without being himself a writer of poetry, but which is essential to a true and hearty sympathy between the critic and the poet, to a keen enjoyment of his writings, and without which the most praiseworthy efforts are powerless to elicit such pleasure in the reader. Mr. Ward's style, too, we must confess, is not always agreeable. While on the whole favouring the severe and sometimes strained simplicity of a recent school, which has arisen as a protest

against the Johnsonian edition of the last, and the penny-a-lining of the present generation, his constructions are often awkward and his sentences halting and needlessly involved.

Early History of the Athanasian Creed. With an Appendix containing Four Ancient Commentaries. By G. D. W. OMMANNEY, M.A., Vicar of Draycot, Somerset. Rivingtons. 1880.

MR. OMMANNEY may justly claim credit for much careful and laborious research, and for the examination of many documents which appear to have escaped, either partially or entirely, the observations of previous investigators. It may fairly be doubted, however, whether the result of his inquiries can be regarded as a sufficient remuneration for the time and labour which have been bestowed upon them. We will assume, for the sake of argument, not only that Mr. Ommanney has succeeded in proving that Professor Swainson was mistaken in the dates which he has assigned to certain documents, but also that the Creed commonly ascribed to St. Athanasius *may* have been composed as early as the middle of the fifth century; and, farther, that Vincent of Lerins *may* have been its author. Our inquiry is, Would the establishment of either, or of both of these theories materially affect our judgment as to the value of the Creed, or as to its adaptation for recital in the public services of the Church? We are disposed to answer this inquiry in the negative. Whether the Creed, in its present form, be a production of the fifth century, or of the eighth, we should still receive its dogmatic statements, when rightly interpreted, not on the score of their antiquity, but because "they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture" (8th Art. of Religion). Our opinion respecting the expediency or inexpediency of putting into the mouths of an ordinary congregation language which must be utterly unintelligible to the greater part of them, would not be affected in the remotest degree by the conclusions which we might have adopted as to the age in which the *Quicunque vult* was originally formulated, or as to that in which it underwent certain modifications.

So far, however, as we have examined Mr. Ommanney's arguments, we confess our inability to see how they justify his conclusions. We will adduce one or two instances by way of illustration. One of Mr. Ommanney's strongest arguments in favour of the early date of the Creed in question is derived from that of the most ancient Commentaries which were written upon it. The earliest of the Commentaries to which our author refers is that which is commonly attributed to Venantius Fortunatus. Now if Mr. Ommanney has succeeded in proving that this Commentary was written in "the commencement of the seventh century" (p. 274), it will at once be conceded that Professor Swainson is mistaken in assigning the composition of the Creed to a much later period. But what is the nature of the proof to which Mr. Ommanney appeals? Why, unless we have altogether mistaken our author's chain of reasoning, his conclusion appears to rest mainly, if not exclusively, upon the alleged fact that there is nothing in that Commentary which "can be shown to be borrowed from any source subsequent to the sixth century."

Lest, however, we should unintentionally have misrepresented the character of Mr. Ommanney's argument in this instance, we will refer to that which is based upon the dates which he ascribed to the Oratorian and Bouhier Commentaries on the Athanasian Creed—viz., the beginning of the eighth century, and a somewhat later period in that century, respectively. It is obvious in this, as in the preceding case, that if the Oratorian and Bouhier Commentaries can be proved to have been composed during

any part of the *eighth* century, the Creed in which they were composed must be assigned to a period earlier than the *ninth* century. But, again, we refer back to Mr. Ommanney's arguments and conclusions as to the time at which these Commentaries were composed, in regard to which he speaks of "the fuller light" which we have "to guide us to their dates" (p. 27). In the first place we are somewhat surprised to find it alleged, as an argument in favour of the early date of the Bouhier Commentary, that it is ascribed to St. Augustine (p. 28)—a fact which disposes Mr. Ommanney to draw from it the conclusion that it is the product of the eighth century, but which may possibly fail to produce a like result upon the minds of others. But Mr. Ommanney does not rely upon this "external evidence" only. He has "internal evidence" also on which his conclusions are based. Both this and the Oratorian Commentary "contain language evidently borrowed from the definitions of the Sixth Œcumenical Council which was terminated in September, A.D. 681. "And this circumstance," Mr. Ommanney argues, "which is a conclusive proof that neither of them existed prior to that date, is also a probable proof, to say the least, that neither of them originated very much later." We freely admit the former of these conclusions. Our readers will probably agree with us that the latter is not equally apparent.

We have noted other portions of this work which appear to us to contain assumptions and conclusions resting on very insufficient evidence. But we forbear from adducing further illustrations of the justice of the criticism which we have pronounced upon Mr. Ommanney's arguments, and we conclude this brief notice of his contribution to the controversy on the date of the Athanasian Creed, on the one hand by a cheerful acknowledgment of the good faith and the laborious research of the writer, on the other hand, by the expression of our conviction that Professor Swainson will reasonably demand the production of some more convincing arguments before he is led to any material modification of the conclusions at which he has arrived upon the subject of discussion.

Croker's Boswell, and Boswell. Studies in the "Life of Johnson." By PERCY FITZGERALD, M.A., F.S.A. Chapman and Hall, 1880.

BOSWELL'S "Life of Johnson" will always keep its own peculiar charms, and really able criticisms upon it will always be welcomed by literary students. The work before us, "Studies" in Boswell's Johnson, is divided into two parts; the first discusses Boswell as edited by Croker, and the second Boswell's work as he wrote and left it.

In the first place, Mr. Fitzgerald sets himself to show that "one of the best edited books in the English language," as the *Quarterly Review* styled "Croker's Boswell," exhibits an elaborate system of defacement and mutilation; the interpolations are bewildering, while the text is freely altered and many omissions are made. Mr. Fitzgerald points out, however, that after faults and blemishes are duly admitted, "Croker's Boswell" remains a most remarkable monument of industry, research, and information of a very interesting kind. Mr. Croker undoubtedly possessed stores of curious learning; from survivors of the Johnstonian era he collected valuable information; and he was an eminent political *littérateur*. The forthcoming edition of his work, it may be hoped, may be cleared of its blemishes.

On the opening pages of this book we meet with Mr. Disraeli's portrait of the Right. Hon. John Wilson Croker as drawn in the novel "Coningsby." Mr. Fitzgerald proceeds to give an account of the well known encounter between Macaulay and Croker—"so unbecoming an episode in the lives

of both." Croker's style cannot be defended; but it is not pleasant to read Macaulay's words: "*See whether I do not dust that varlet's jacket for him in the next number of the* Blue and Yellow. *I detest him more than cold boiled veal.*" Certainly the criticisms of our day are, in some respects at all events, vastly improved; there is everywhere courtesy if not charity. Into the quarrel between the Whig and Tory critics we have no intention of entering. Macaulay's *Edinburgh* Essay is, no doubt, familiar to most members of the general reader class; and it is wonderfully clever. For ourselves, we have no desire to discuss either the style or the literary power of the Essay, with additions, and Croker's replies. Upon one point, however, an interesting classical allusion, we may quote Macaulay's criticism and Croker's defence.

Mr. Macaulay says on the *θνητοι φιλοι*—

Mr Croker has favoured us with some Greek of his own. "At the altar," says Dr. Johnson, "I recommended my *θ. φ.*" "These letters," says the editor (which Dr. Strachan seems not to have understood), "probably mean *θνητοι φιλοι—departed friends.*" Johnson was not a first-rate Greek scholar; but he knew more Greek than most boys do when they leave school; and no schoolboy could venture to use the word *θνητοι* in the sense which Mr. Croker ascribes to it without imminent danger of a flogging.

The answer in *Blackwood's Magazine*, known to be Mr. Croker's own work, runs thus:—

The question is not here about classical Greek, but what Johnson meant by the *cipher θ. φ.* Mr. Croker's solution is not only ingenious, but, we think, absolutely certain: it means "*departed friends,*" beyond all doubt. See, in Dr. Strahan's book, under "Easter Sunday, 1781," an instance of the same kind—"I commended (*in prayer*) my *θ. friends.*" The Reviewer, with notable caution, omits to tell us which of the derivatives of *θανατος* and *θνησκω he* would have chosen; but we think with Mr. Croker, that none was more likely to have occurred to Johnson's mind than *θνητοι*, because it is *good Greek*, and is, moreover, a word we find him quoting on another occasion, in which he deplores the loss of a friend. *Good Greek* we say, in defiance of the menaced flogging; for we have authority that we suppose even the Reviewer may bow to.

What does the Reviewer think of the well-known passage in the *Supplices* of Euripides, cited even in Hederic?—

βᾶθι, καὶ ἀντίασον——,
Τέκνων τε θνητῶν κόμισαι δέμας.—V. 275,

where *Τεκνων θνητων* is used in the same sense as *Τεκνων θανοντων*, v. 12 and 85; *Τεκνων φθίμενων*, v. 60; and *Τέκνων κατθανοντων*, v. 103!

Suppose it had been—

φιλων τε θνητῶν.

The Edinburgh Reviewer seems inclined to revive his old reputation for *Greek!* He thought he was safely sneering at Mr. Croker, and he unexpectedly finds himself *correcting* Euripides.

On the reply by Croker, Macaulay afterwards added a note:—

An attempt was made to vindicate this blunder by quoting a grossly corrupt passage from the *Ικετιδες* of Euripides. The true reading, as every scholar knows, is *τεκνων τεθνεωτων*. Indeed, without this emendation it would not be easy to construe the words, even if *θνατῶν* could bear the meaning which Mr. Croker assigns to it.

I myself, says Mr. Fitzgerald, would offer a conjecture which seems more plausible. "My *θ Φ . . .*" was "my *θετα φιλα*," *i.e.*, "my beloved Tetty," the *t* becoming *th* as in Elizabeth, her name. The objection from "my *θ* friends" would be slight. As all Johnson's diaries were hard to decipher and transcribe, it ran probably "my *θ* friend."

Short Notices.

Mediæval Missions. By THOMAS SMITH, D.D. Edinburgh. Pp. 280. T. & T. Clark. 1880.

The Duff Missionary Lectureship was instituted under the provisions of the will of the late Dr. Alexander Duff; a course of lectures "on some department of Foreign Missions or cognate subjects" is to be delivered once in every four years in Edinburgh or Glasgow. Dr. Thomas Smith, associated with Dr. Duff in mission-work in Bengal, and afterwards in the home management of the Missions of the Free Church of Scotland, during a long period—a friend, in fact, of forty years' standing—was appointed as the first holder of the lectureship; and although we confess we are somewhat surprised at his choice of a subject, the Biographical Lectures before us form an interesting addition, we think, with a value of their own, to our store of missionary volumes. The second lecture, "On the Early British Church," is very readable, and has many good points; but we cannot agree with the esteemed lecturer that St. Patrick was "not an episcopalian!" In the third lecture, it may be here mentioned, after giving the statement of Gallus, "I cannot be your bishop; I am a foreigner"—a statement, surely, plain enough—Dr. Smith remarks with an amusing *naïveté*: "It has occurred to me, as a very probable thing, that the reason why Gallus declined to be consecrated was, that being a presbyter, he held that he was already a bishop!"

Critical and Exegetical Handbook of the Gospels of Mark and Luke. By HEINRICH A. W. MEYER, Th.D. Two vols. T. & T. Clark. 1880.

To those who know how to use Meyer's Commentary it is of singular valne; in some respects, indeed, it stands alone. The volumes before us, the thirteenth and fourteenth volumes of the series—a notice of which should have appeared in an earlier number—are translated from the fifth edition, the last issued during Dr. Meyer's lifetime, by special arrangement with the German publishers. The learned editor, Dr. Dickson, Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow, points out that the sixth edition, "worked up anew" by Dr. B. Weiss, is so changed in form of substance that it can no longer be regarded as the proper work of Meyer. Dr. Dickson has deemed it his duty to present to the English reader the last form of the book as it came from the great master of exegesis. What we have here, in fact, is Meyer, faithfully rendered, and nothing but Meyer.

As regards St. Mark xvi. 9–20, Meyer's remarks may be compared with Dean Burgon's. The Dean's work remains, in our judgment, unanswered.

The Cup of Consolation. Bright Messages for the Sick-bed, from the two great volumes of Nature and Revelation. By AN INVALID. With an Introduction by J. R. MACDUFF, D.D. Pp. 290. Hodder & Stoughton. 1880.

An interesting book. The extracts, as a rule, are well chosen, and well set: prose and verse.

Modern Anglican Theology. Chapters on Coleridge, Hare, Maurice, Kingsley, and Jowett. Third edition revised; to which is prefixed a Memoir of Canon Kingsley, with Personal Reminiscences. By the Rev. JAMES H. RIGG, D.D. Pp. 560. London: Wesleyan Conference Office. 1880.

Dr. Rigg is well known as one of the most eminent among the honoured leaders of the Wesleyans; an able, vigorous, and independent writer, an

administrator of no mean order. The chapters on "Modern Anglican Theology," in the interesting book before us, were written and published some five-and-twenty years ago. The first two editions sold quickly, and the book has now for many years been out of print. Dr. Rigg waited and waited, as many authors do, in the hope of getting leisure to recast the book so as to keep it abreast of the times; but he has not been able to do this; and he therefore sends out his work as a third edition, almost untouched. He has added, however, a very interesting Memoir of Charles Kingsley, originally published in the *Wesleyan Magazine*. The errors of Maurice are brought out clearly and faithfully; and Dr. Rigg shows the changes through which Kingsley passed, tending in an evangelical direction, or at all events becoming much more conservative. The chapter on Professor Jowett's "semi-pantheism," and the chapter on the unscriptural Maurician theories of the Atonement are as fresh to-day as when they were written.

Messianic Prophecies. Lectures by FRANZ DELITZSCH, Professor of Theology, Leipzig. Pp. 120. T. & T. Clark. 1880.

For theological students a very helpful volume; brief, but full and firm. The Lectures are translated by Professor Curtiss.

Modern Scepticism. Christian Evidence Lectures in 1871. Hodder & Stoughton. Christian Evidence Society, 13, Buckingham Street. 1880.

A new and cheap edition of the Christian Evidence Lectures, we are glad to know, is now to be published; the volume before us, first of the series, contains Lectures by the Archbishop of York, Dr. Rigg, Dr. Leathes, Dean Payne Smith, and other eminent men.

Sketches of the Women of Christendom. Dedicated to the Women of India. By the Author of "Chronicles of the Schönberg-Cotta Family." Pp. 360. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 1880.

Another volume of the "Home Library." The "Sketches," a prefatory note tells us, were originally undertaken at the request of a member of the Cambridge University Mission at Delhi, with the hope of giving our fellow-subjects, the women of India, some conception of what Christianity has done for the women of Christendom. One hundred and eight pages are occupied with women of the Gospels and of the Acts. Blandina, Monica, the Abbess Hilda, Joan of Arc, the Mother of the Wesleys, Catherine Tait and others, together with Hannah More and Mrs. Fry, complete the list.

Some Heroes of Travel. Chapters from the History of Geographical Discovery and Enterprise. By W. H. DAVENPORT ADAMS. Pp. 400. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 1880.

The "heroes" of this attractive book are Marco Polo, G. F. Ruxton (Rocky Mountains), Dr. Barth, Alexina Tinné (Soudan), MacGahan (Campaigning on the Oxus), Major Burnaby, Sir Samuel Baker, and others. The narratives of these great travellers are well summarized, and the book, as a whole, is remarkably interesting, with a good deal of useful information.

Wrecked Lives; or, Men who have Failed. By W. H. DAVENPORT ADAMS. First Series. Second Series. Published under the Direction of the Committee of General Literature and Education. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 1880.

In the preface to the first volume appears an explanation of the title-page and stand-point of this interesting work. The author says:—

"Failure" from the Christian moralist's point of view, and failure from the point of view of the man of the world, is a widely different thing. The sole conception of success possible to the mind of the latter is a coarse and material one; power, rank, influence, wealth, and social favour—these are his "prizes," and he who gains them he pronounces "successful." He rejects with scorn the idea that a man can succeed in his career of ambition, can attain to the enjoyment of a large measure of prosperity, can raise himself from a low to a high position, and yet can be said to have "failed." But the thoughtful observer knows how frequently the seeming triumph conceals a severe defeat, how often a Ligny involves a Waterloo, and that a man is oftenmost in need of pity when the world is lavishing upon him its loudest applause. The true success is that which in its far consequences reaches beyond the limit of our "little lives;" the true failure is that of a man whose success is based wholly upon material conditions. If a man has been endowed with rare gifts of intellect and imagination, of which he makes an imperfect use, or which he recklessly throws away, or wilfully misuses, that man's life is surely a failure. If he be provided with opportunities of self culture, or of promoting the cause of truth and freedom, and neglect to avail himself of them—if he live for himself alone—he must be included among the Men who have Failed.

The Lives in the first volume are Rienzi, the last of the Roman Tribunes, Wolsey, Dean Swift, Savage, and Chatterton; in the second volume are Robespierre, Burns, Haydon, Heine, E. A. Poe, and Kosciusko. The insertion of the life of Kosciusko in such a work as the present the author seems to admit is a mistake. Kosciusko had no cause to reproach himself for his failure. We heartily recommend these well-written and very suggestive volumes.

Earl Hubert's Daughter; or, The Polishing of the Pearl. A Tale of the Thirteenth Century. By EMILY SARAH HOLT, Author of "Mistress Margery," "Sister Rose," &c. London: John F. Shaw & Co., 48, Paternoster Row.

In the preface to this attractive and very interesting book appear the following remarks:—

The thirteenth century was one of rapid and terrible incidents, tumultuous politics, and in religious matters of low and degrading superstition. Transubstantiation had just been formally adopted as a dogma of the Church, accompanied, as it always is, by sacramental confession, and quickly followed by the elevation of the host and the invention of the pix. Various orders of monks were flocking into England. The Pope was doing his best, aided by the Roman clergy—and, to their shame be it said, by some of the English—to fix his iron yoke on the neck of the Church of England. The doctrine of human merit was at its highest pitch; the doctrine of justification by faith was absolutely *unknown*. Amid this thick darkness a very small number of true-hearted Heaven-taught men bore aloft the torch of truth—that is, of so much truth as they knew. One of such men as these I have sketched in Father Bruno. And if, possibly, the portrait is slightly overcharged for the date—if he be represented as a shade more than at that time he could well be—I trust that the anachronism will be pardoned for the sake of those eternal verities which otherwise have been left wanting.

The character of Father Bruno is admirably drawn. The story is well told from beginning to end, and is full of information. We heartily recommend it.

The Hasselaers. A Tale of Courage and Endurance. By E. E. COOPER. S.P.C.K.

A tale, well told, of the siege of Haarlem, 1572. It took the Spaniards seven months, with the loss of twelve thousand men, to reduce the weakest city in Holland. This "tale of courage and endurance" is a pleasing little gift-book.

Counsel and Might. Prayers and Meditations, adapted from Sermons by the Very Rev. C. J. VAUGHAN, D.D., Dean of Llandaff, Master of the Temple. Compiled by R. N. C. Second edition. Nisbet & Co.

This interesting little volume of some eighty pages, tastefully got up, has already been recommended in our columns; wise selections from Dr. Vaughan's writings. We are pleased to call attention to a second edition.

The Boys' Own Annual. Religious Tract Society.

We cordially commend this most attractive and useful "Annual," the second volume of that excellent publication, which has attained an immense circulation—well merited—the *Boys' Own Paper*. The first volume was warmly praised in these columns a year ago; and, so far as we have examined the volume before us, we see no symptoms of falling-off in any way whatever. A juvenile critic, whom we have consulted, gives it as his opinion that the second volume is rather better than the first. Tales, pastimes, travel, adventure, happily intermingled with instructive matter, supply a rare feast for boys. There are coloured illustrations and many woodcuts.

The Union Jack. A Magazine of Healthy, Stirring Tales of Adventure by Land and Sea, for Boys. Vol. I. Griffith & Farran. 1880.

Opposite the title-page of this handsome volume appears a good likeness of the late Mr. W. H. G. Kingston. The first portion of the volume was edited by Mr. Kingston, the well-known writer of tales for boys—a sincere Christian, holding firmly evangelical principles, to whom we are pleased to write an *In Memoriam* line of respect. So far as we have read, *The Union Jack* gives wholesome, attractive stories, sound as well as spirited. There is rather too much "soldiering" for our own taste; but boys, as a rule, like the Captain Marryat style, and stories of Red Indians. The great point is, after all, a good healthy tone; in the sickly hothouse air of some stories smuggled into schoolrooms there is much mischief.

Hand and Heart: The Church Herald and Review. An Illustrated Weekly Journal, conducted by the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D. Volume V. *Hand and Heart* Publishing Office, 1, Paternoster Buildings, E.C.

We most heartily recommend the fifth volume of Mr. Bullock's excellent paper. His efforts to supply a cheap illustrated Church newspaper of the highest class are to a great extent appreciated; but unless we are mistaken—and we confess we have no knowledge on the point—the circulation of *Hand and Heart* is not nearly so large as it might be, and as it ought to be. In a sphere where work was undoubtedly greatly needed, Mr. Bullock has been labouring, now for many years, with persevering zeal, tact and energy; and in supporting him Evangelical Churchmen will do much to spread throughout the country those truths which are to them so dear. The volume before us contains a mass of interesting and valuable matter. We should be pleased to know that a copy was placed on the table of every working-men's and parochial reading-room.

The Divine Authority and Perpetual Obligation of the Lord's Day. By DANIEL WILSON, D.D., Bishop of Calcutta. Fourth edition. Pp. 180. Lord's Day Observance Society. 1880.

In a brief preface to the present (the fourth) edition of Bishop Wilson's sermons on the Lord's Day, the venerated Vicar of Islington remarks that the sermons—seven in number—were preached in the year 1830. "They were largely circulated at the time, and contributed, I believe mainly, to the formation, in the following year, of the present Society for

Promoting the Due Observance of the Lord's Day." Prebendary Wilson adds that it will be a cause for thankfulness if the republication of these sermons should assist the strenuous efforts which are now being made to maintain the strict observance of the sacred Day of Rest. "The principles here maintained are drawn from the immutable Word of God, which admits of no change or modification." The volume has an interest and a value of its own.

Elsie Gordon; or, Through Thorny Paths. By EMILY BRODIE. London: John F. Shaw & Co. 1880.

A fresh, pleasing tale, inculcating many useful lessons of Christian living. Specially bearing on the necessity of "patience under suffering," it tells the story of a clergyman's family suddenly left desolate by the death of its head, and thus finds many opportunities for laying down Christian duties.

Every Boy's Annual. Edited by Edmund Routledge, F.R.G.S. George Routledge & Sons. 1880.

This year's volume of our old favourite, *Every Boy's Magazine*, seems up to its usual standard. It contains a large amount of really good reading. Some of the tales are above, while others, again, are below the average. We may notice as a good serial story "School-days at Kingscourt," by the Rev. H. C. Adams. It is a very attractive volume.

Routledge's Every Girl's Annual. Edited by Miss ALICIA A. LEITH. George Routledge & Sons. 1880.

The illustrations of this handsome annual grow more tasteful at each succeeding issue. The frontispiece especially of this year's volume is a perfect gem. The tales, too, are exceedingly good. The translated fables of Laboulaye are interesting.

The Clergyman's Ready Reference Register: forming a Complete Record of Private and Parochial Information; containing Fourteen Registers, arranged for Ten Years, for Services, Occasional Offices, Confirmations, Churchwarden' Accounts, Collections, Summaries, Parish Meetings and Clubs, with Private and Miscellaneous Matter, on an Original Plan. By Rev. THEODORE JOHNSON, Curate of Warkton, Northamptonshire, Author of "Plea for Children's Services;" "Litanies;" "Manual of School Prayers;" "Geography and Atlas of British Empire;" "English History;" "Historical Poetry Book;" &c. &c. Bemrose & Sons, 10, Paternoster Buildings; and Irongate, Derby. We gladly recommend this novel and very useful work.

A Diocesan Map of Ireland, 1880, drawn and compiled by the Rev. DONALD J. MACKAY, B.A. Cantab., author of the "Diocesan Map of England and Wales," recently recommended in these columns, seems well done. The names and boundaries of every diocese are given *in colour*—the province of Armagh being coloured red, and the province of Dublin blue, for greater clearness. The Map gives the names and limits of counties; acreage; number of benefices; cathedrals; bishops' residences; and ancient see towns. *The Diocesan Map* is published by Messrs. W. & A. K. Johnston, Geographers to the Queen, Edinburgh; and 6, Paternoster Buildings, London, E.C.

Little Wideawake for 1881. Edited by Mrs. SALE BARKER (published by Messrs. Routledge & Sons), is as attractive as usual. Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen (Lord Brabourne) again favours the little ones with some charming fairy tales, which are well illustrated by Ernest Griset. The volume will make a beautiful Christmas gift; it has gained, we happento know, the cordial verdict of "better than ever" from certain critics.

We very gladly call attention to our old friend *The Quiver*, one of the best of our religious magazines. (Cassell, Petter & Galpin.) With the fifteenth volume, just published, we are much pleased.

From the Religious Tract Society we have received *The Girl's Own Annual*, being the first volume of that successful publication, *The Girl's Own Paper*. We are much pleased with this ably-edited book, and heartily recommend it. Well illustrated, it contains both interesting, or attractive, and really useful reading. Among gift-books for girls, or presents for girls' libraries, there are none better than this; few as good.

We understand that a new book of private devotions, entitled *Morning, Noon, and Night*, is to be published immediately by Mr. Elliot Stock. The work is contributed to by Bishop Perry, Bishop Ryan, the Dean of Ripon, Archdeacon Prest, the Revs. R. Allen, Canon Bell, Prebendary Cadman, Canon Clayton, E. K. Elliott, Canon Money, J. Welstead Powell, Canon Richardson, and it will be edited by Canon Garbett.

Messrs. T. & T. Clark, of Edinburgh, are about to issue the second volume of their Illustrated "Popular Commentary."

THE MONTH.

THE Naval Demonstration has been held, but Mr. Gladstone's coercion policy did not prove a success. The Sultan's Note, a very Vatican *non possumus*, brought about a deadlock, which would have been ludicrous if it had not been, unmistakably, full of danger. After friendly pressure, in secret, from some of the Powers, the Sultan gave way, and Dulcigno is to be surrendered to the Montenegrins. The Greek difficulty remains, and the language of King George is decidedly bellicose.

In France the influence of M. Gambetta is, probably, on the increase. The nation as a whole, however, sees that it needs quiet and peace.

The Right Hon. Sir Bartle Frere has returned from the Cape.

The condition of Ireland grows worse and worse. Outrages are of daily occurrence, and murder follows murder, apparently to the satisfaction of the peasantry in the disturbed districts. The Land League agitation continues, while no protest from the dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church comes for the protection of life and property. At an assembly in Dublin of the owners and agents of landed property the proceedings were necessarily kept private; but it is known that strong representations were made to Mr. Forster, whose promises probably failed to give satisfaction. Irish landowners have terribly good reasons for asking the Government for measures of coercion.

At the Oxford Diocesan Conference approval was given to the

recommendations of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Patronage, and at the Ripon Conference a resolution was passed to send three members of each order to a General Council of Delegates. We have read the opening address at the Durham Diocesan Conference with the greatest satisfaction; it brings forward, and in a very practical way, the question of organized lay agency. Under Bishop Lightfoot's rule this question, the importance of which can hardly be exaggerated, will speedily come to the front.

The Rev. H. C. G. Moule, for some time senior Dean of Trinity College, Cambridge, has been appointed to the headship of Ridley Theological Hall—an admirable appointment, full of promise.

The judgment of the Capetown tribunal in Bishop Merriman's case has created consternation in the Church of South Africa. The Cape judges have held that a community which has so materially modified its character, cannot claim to retain lands which have been granted "for ecclesiastical purposes in connection with the Church of England." The *Cape Times* says:—

> One thing is clear: legislation is required to secure to the Church of England in this land, called for convenience' sake the Church of the Province of South Africa, the full rights to property conveyed in the time of Crown-appointed and letters-patent Bishops. Essential unity with the Church of England is independent of Crown appointments and of letters patent. Whether that essential unity has been secured under the provincial constitution, is another matter; whether it could possibly be secured more firmly than at present, is also a question for argument.

Another American expedition has conducted a partially successful search for further relics of the Franklin expedition.

The Archbishop made the Cathedral Commission the subject of his Charge to the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury. His Grace urged the necessity for the cathedral to be the centre of the religious life of the diocese.

The Rev. Stopford Brooke has seceded from the Church, but he has no intention of joining the Unitarian body.[1]

Maria Louisa Charlesworth, author of "Ministering Children" and other admirable books, has entered into her rest.

---

[1] "The form of doctrine to which the Church of England has committed itself appears to stand on the miracle of the Incarnation, as a building on its foundation. Not to accept that miracle is to separate myself, not I hope from the spirit, but from the external form of the faith as laid down by the Church of England; and it is the inability to confess this miracle which, beyond all else, forces me out of its communion."