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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

DECEMBER, 1880.

ART. I.—THE DISESTABLISHED CHURCH OF IRELAND.

III. REVISION.

1. *The Book of Common Prayer, &c., according to the Use of the Church of Ireland.* Association for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Dawson Street, Dublin.
2. *Report of Master Brooke's Committee for the General Synod.* Dublin: Hodges, Foster & Co. 1871.
3. *Revision Committee's Report and Minutes.* Dublin: Hodges, Foster & Co. 1871–3.

IT has been shown that the revision of the Prayer-Book was not accomplished by the neglect of other useful work. It is often asked, however, why the question was not postponed for ten or twelve years, when it might have been discussed more leisurely and calmly than at the very outset. But it is not certain that ten years of expectancy and agitation would have tended to produce tranquillity. The proceedings of English Ritualists, and especially an adverse decision in the Bennett case, which was afterwards reversed, produced not unnatural alarm. At the critical moment, a Dublin clergyman fanned the flame by imprudently circulating a well-known manual of devotion. A certain amount of revision was forced upon us by disestablishment, not only in the State prayers and the ordinal, but even in the rubrics and canons. For the laws of a voluntary church cannot be a dead letter; but they could only be enforced when they would cease to order that recusants should be denounced by name in the Cathedral, that ministers should wear no night-caps but of black silk, satin, or velvet, that the rate of *Bona Notabilia* should be liable to the Prerogative Court, and that schismatics should be presented. Revision being thus inevitable, it was naturally wished to avoid the issue of two

revised books within a few years of one another. One hundred and thirty thousand copies of the Irish Prayer-Book have been already printed, at prices ranging from twopence to a sovereign, and an edition of twenty thousand more is in the press, and it would have been a great hardship if the owners of these books had been forced either to remain without them until now, or to find them presently rendered obsolete.

Influenced by these various motives, the advocates of immediate action became so powerful that moderate men were convinced of the necessity for dealing boldly with the question, since the agitation was upon us, and nothing could be less desirable than to renew it within a decade.

The Revised Prayer-Book is now used by hundreds of clergymen and a dozen or two of laymen who declared in the heat of the struggle that they never should be persuaded to employ it. In a short time it will be universally adopted. Men of all views confess that, at the worst, "no great harm has been done," and only contend for share in the praise of this result. The opponents of every change boast that the carriage has not upset, because they applied so powerful a brake: the moderate revisionists interpose the observation that they held the reins; and the extreme men, with a very few exceptions, point to the result as evidence that the horses never had the least notion of running away. Nearly every one is content with the Book we now possess, and not a few of us are heartily proud of it.

The present Article seeks less to recommend one or other of these judgments than to inform English readers what has really been done, and to exhibit the reasons which, rightly or wrongly, influenced the successful party. Yet it would be scarcely possible so to do this that the views of the writer should not betray themselves. And therefore it will be safer to avow them frankly upon occasion, without unduly obtruding them, and with the clear understanding that THE CHURCHMAN does not commit itself to all the positions of this article, but merely to the trustworthiness of the statements it contains.

Revision fairly began when Master Brooke's Committee was appointed. But as this body was only instructed to suggest measures "calculated to check the introduction and spread of novel doctrines and practices," it failed to combine the various forces favourable to the movement, and was defeated in April, 1871.

Thereupon it was moved by Dr. Salmon, the Regius Professor of Divinity, and resolved by great majorities, "that the time has arrived for entering upon a complete revision of the formularies of the Church of Ireland, and that the Bishops, together with certain representative members to be named by the Synod, be therefore requested to consider the whole subject of revision,

and report," &c. In the selection of names every ecclesiastical party was included, and consented to act; and the present revision is the result of their combined labours, softened by the rejection of some, and the modification of more of their report.

Several minor changes were made from regard to abstract correctness and symmetry of statement; but these it would be tedious to enumerate,[1] and every important alteration may be traced to one or other of four motives—

I. The defences against Roman doctrine and practice were to be adjusted to the modern attack; and, at whatever sacrifice, the true intention of abused passages was to be put beyond perversion.

II. The real comprehensiveness of the Church, and its charity, sought to assert themselves by easing the position of all who could justly claim a place within our fold, and by withdrawing any condemnatory phrase which even seemed to overstep the warrant of Holy Scripture.

III. It was desired to convey the meaning of a few passages in words which would fall more gently upon sensitive ears.

IV. The flexibility and power of adaptation, refused to our services by a few rubrics, were rendered more desirable than ever by disestablishment.

1. With High Churchmen of the old school the Church of Ireland had no quarrel whatever. It was against Ritualism in its twofold aspects that she declared war. Regarded as a system of sensuous and ceremonial worship, Ritualism will not easily struggle against the following restrictions:—

The Fourth Canon directs that—

> Every Archbishop and Bishop at all times of his Public ministration of the Services of the Church shall use the customary Ecclesiastical Apparel of his Order. And every Presbyter and Deacon at all times of his Public ministration of the Services of the Church shall wear a

[1] The following are examples. In the Nicene Creed, a comma is introduced into the clause, "the Lord, and Giver of Life," and it is interesting to observe that a few gallant anti-revisionists still maintain that we have darkened the sense of *το κυριον και το ζωοποιον*. The dates of the Prefaces are given. In the Baptismal services we renounce "all the sinful desires of the flesh," which was the intention, scarcely perhaps so accurately worded, of "all the carnal desires of the flesh." In the Communion Office for the Sick, the sick person is not required to say exactly "how many are to communicate," but "so far as he may, how many." Instead of insisting that the communicants "shall be three, or two at the least," we direct that they "if possible shall be two at least." The imperative mandate was in conflict with the final rubric, which allows, when panic has arisen from infectious disease, that "the Minister may only communicate with him," or, as we read, "the Minister may communicate with him alone." The Order for reading the Psalter has its rubric greatly simplified, and transferred to their natural place above the Psalter itself.

plain white Surplice with Sleeves, and such Minister may wear Bands, and upon the Surplice the customary Scarf of plain black silk, and being a Graduate of a University he may wear the Hood pertaining to his degree. And no Minister shall wear any other Ecclesiastical vestment or ornament: Provided that any Minister shall be at liberty to wear a plain black Gown when preaching. And if any question shall arise, touching the suitableness of any vestment or ornament worn by any Minister during the Public ministration of the Services of the Church, the same shall be decided by the Ordinary, subject to an Appeal to the Court of the General Synod.

The lawyers, it may be feared, will not find this passage as entertaining as the Ornaments Rubric, so cultivating to the trained intellect, of which we have entirely bereaved them.

The Fifth Canon orders that—

Every Minister, at all times of his Public Ministration of the Services of the Church, shall speak in a distinct and audible voice, and so place himself that the people may conveniently hearken unto what is said, and in no case when he is offering up Public Prayer shall his back be turned to the Congregation.

And every Minister, when saying the Prayer of Consecration in the Service prescribed for the administration of the Lord's Supper, shall stand at the North Side of the Table, by which, both here and in the Rubric of the Communion Office, is to be understood that side or end of the Table which, in churches lying East and West, is towards the North.

. . . . . .

No Minister or other person during the time of Divine Service shall make the sign of the Cross, save where prescribed in the Rubric; nor shall he bow, or do any other act of obeisance to the Lord's Table, or anything there or thereon; nor shall any bell be rung during the time of Divine Service.

It shall be competent for the Ordinary to restrain and prohibit in the conduct of Public Worship any practice not enjoined in the Book of Common Prayer, or in any Rubric or Canon enacted by lawful authority of the Church of Ireland.

Other Canons run as follow:—

34. *Of the Communion Table.*

The Communion Table shall be a movable table of wood, and shall have such decent covering only as the Ordinary shall approve of; but for the administration of the Lord's Supper, it shall be covered as provided by the Rubric.

35. *Of Lights at the Communion Table, or elsewhere.*

There shall not be any lighted lamps or candles on the Communion Table, or in any other part of the Church, during the celebration of the Services or the Administration of the Sacraments, or any other of the Public or Common Prayers or Rites of the Church, or during Public Preaching, except when they are necessary for the purpose of giving light.

36. *Crosses on or behind the Communion Table forbidden.*

There shall not be any cross, ornamental or otherwise, on the Communion Table, or on the covering thereof, nor shall a cross be erected or depicted on the wall or other structure behind the Communion Table, in any of the churches or other places of worship of the Church of Ireland.

37. *Of the Administration of the Lord's Supper.*

In the administration of the Lord's Supper, the elevation of the Paten or Cup beyond what is necessary for taking the same into the hands of the officiating Minister, the use of wine mixed with water, or of wafer bread, and *all acts, words, ornaments and ceremonies other than those that are prescribed by the Order in the Book of Common Prayer, are hereby declared to be unlawful, and are prohibited.* Provided always that nothing herein contained shall be taken to prohibit the customary act of reverence when the name of our Blessed Lord is mentioned in reciting the Nicene Creed.

38. *Of Incense.*

No incense or any substitution therefor, or imitation thereof, shall, at any time, be used in any church or chapel, or other place in which the Public Services of the Church are celebrated.

39. *Of Processions.*

It shall be unlawful to carry any cross, banner, or picture through any church or churchyard, in any religious service or ceremonial. Nor shall any procession take place therein as a Rite or Ceremony in connection with any part of such Service, unless prescribed by the Bishop, or by the Rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer.

While Ceremonialism is thus resolutely dealt with, Ritualism in its doctrinal aspect has not been left unbridled.

The 16th Canon prohibits private communions except for the benefit of the "impotent or dangerously sick."[1]

A new Preface has been enacted after long debating, and with all the elaborate precautions mentioned in the last Article. Every word of this weighty and important document is now law in the Irish Church, and any statement which contravenes it is within the cognizance of the Courts. This Preface contains the following clauses:—

As concerning the Holy Communion, some of our brethren were at first earnest that we should remove from the Prayer-Book certain expressions, which they thought might seem to lend some pretext for the teaching of doctrine, concerning the presence of Christ in that Sacrament, repugnant to that set forth in the Articles of Religion, wherein it is expressly declared that the Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner, and that the

[1] As no Irish Prayer-Book is printed without the Canons they are in every person's hands, and cannot be violated without observation.

mean whereby it is therein received and eaten is Faith; but, upon a full and impartial review, we have not found in the Formularies any just warrant for such teaching, and therefore, in this behalf, we have made no other change than to add to the Catechism one question, with an answer taken out of the Twenty-eighth of the said Articles.

As for the error of those who have taught that Christ has given Himself or His Body and Blood in this Sacrament, to be reserved, lifted up, carried about, or worshipped, under the veils of Bread and Wine, we have already in the Canons prohibited such acts and gestures as might be grounded on it, or lead thereto; and it is sufficiently implied in the Note at the end of the Communion Office (and we now afresh declare) that the posture of kneeling prescribed to all communicants is not appointed for any purpose of such adoration; but only for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ, which are in the Lord's Supper given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder as might ensue if some such reverent and uniform posture were not enjoined.

. . . . . .

The Special Absolution in the Office for The Visitation of the Sick has been the cause of offence to many; and as it is a form unknown to the Church in ancient times, and as we saw no adequate reason for its retention, and no ground for asserting that its removal would make any change in the doctrine of the Church, we have deemed it fitting that, in the special cases contemplated in this Office, and in that for the Visitation of Prisoners, absolution should be pronounced to penitents in the form appointed in the Office for the Holy Communion.[1]

No change has been made in the formula of Ordination of Priests, though desired by some; for, upon a full review of our Formularies, we deem it plain and here declare that, save in the matter of Ecclesiastical censures, no power or authority is by them ascribed to the Church or to any of its Ministers, in respect of forgiveness of sins after Baptism, other than that of declaring and pronouncing, on God's part, remission of sins to all that are truly penitent, to the quieting of their conscience, and the removal of all doubt and scruple; nor is it anywhere in our Formularies taught, or implied, that confession to and absolution by a Priest are any conditions of God's pardon; but, on the contrary, it is fully taught that all Christians who sincerely repent, and unfeignedly believe the Gospel, may draw nigh, as worthy communicants, to the Lord's Table without any such confession or absolution; which comfortable doctrine of God's free forgiveness of sin is also more largely set forth in the Homily of Repentance and in that of the Salvation of Mankind.

When our children are old enough to learn by the catechism that Christ's Body and Blood are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper, it was judged that they are old enough to learn also the mode in which this stupendous grace is given. And it was considered that some

[1] Accordingly, the famous "*Absolvo te*" has vanished completely from the Irish Prayer-Book, which knows only a precatory Absolution.

persons might be protected against dangerous error, if the doctrine of the Church upon this subject were no longer locked up in the Twenty-eighth Article. Accordingly, the words we have quoted are succeeded by a new question and answer :—

Question. After what manner are the Body and Blood of Christ taken and received in the Lord's Supper?

Answer. Only after a heavenly and spiritual manner; and the mean whereby they are taken and received is Faith.

At the beginning of the Communion Service the minister is again reminded to "say the service following in a distinct and audible voice."

The Calendar no longer embalms those obscure, and, perhaps, legendary names and events which were handed down to us, not without hesitation,[1] from antiquity. Those only are retained for which a special collect, epistle, and gospel are provided. The Invention of the Cross, St. Anne Mother of the B.V.M., Holy Cross Day, and the Conception of the B.V.M., have all disappeared, and even the unassailed innocence of *O Sapientia* has not been spared. Antiquarians, who, more than other men, are born to trouble as the sparks fly upward, cannot but sigh at the removal of this ancient ivy from our church towers; but they have long known logic to be as inexorable as the architects, and the only line which could be drawn straight and clear was that which divided the worthies and the events of Scripture from those of human record.

The Rubric at the end of the Service for Public Baptism of Infants has been expanded as follows, and the Thirtieth English Canon, which so few laymen have ever seen, is now printed in every Irish Prayer-Book :—

Whereas the sign of the Cross is by this Office appointed to be used in Baptism according to the ancient and laudable custom of the Church, it is not thereby intended to add any new rite to the Sacrament as a part of it, or necessary to it; or that the using that sign is of any virtue or efficacy of itself; but only to remind all Christians of the Death and Cross of Christ, which is their hope and their glory; and to put them in mind of their obligation to bear the Cross in such manner as God shall think fit to lay it upon them, and to become conformable to Christ in his sufferings; as more largely is expressed in the Thirtieth Canon of the Church of England, which Canon is printed by direction of the General Synod at the end of the Canons of the Church of Ireland.

Such are the new defences against Roman corruption which the Church of Ireland has drawn around her fold. Here, at least, there has been no feebleness. And yet there is not a line, not a word, to make an old-fashioned High Churchman fear for his own position. He may regret that any change, any "smell of

[1] Except St. George and St. Lawrence, we have omitted nothing that was in the edition of 1559.

fire has passed" upon a document so ancient and venerable. We all share his feeling. But more than the modification of familiar and sacred words should we regret the loss of the truth for which their authors lived and died—the sacrifice of the jewel for the casket.

2. We strove, secondly, to ease the position of all who had a right to a place in our communion, either by retracting the phrases which galled them, or by giving an authoritative explanation.

Such complaints most frequently referred to the Baptismal and Burial Services, and to the Athanasian Creed. In one case out of these three, the report of the committee has been substantially carried out; it was only after weary debating in the Synod itself that a settlement of the others could be reached.

Strenuous efforts were made, both in the Revision Committee and in the Synod, to eliminate from the Baptismal Service the declaration that "this child is regenerate." But so strong an opposition developed itself, so deep would have been the pain inflicted upon multitudes of loyal Churchmen, that the great middle party, which had always a majority in its keeping, could not be prevailed upon to make the change on behalf of those who declared, by their presence in the Church, that, after all, they did not feel it to be vital. These latter, however, refused to accept as their sheet-anchor in the Church of Ireland the decision of English lawyers in the Gorham case. They wished to be assured by the voice of the Church herself that they were not aliens, barely tolerated within her fold. A rubric which the Committee drafted for this purpose provoked some fair criticism, and some to which no adjective need be applied; but it was finally shot to death by an epigram of the Bishop of Killaloe. It is replaced by a clause in the preface which the Bishop of Cashel has described as "a great relief," which has stilled the complaints of all but the smallest fraction of the Synod, and which renders the position of Evangelical Churchmen entirely beyond assault. It runs thus:—

> In the Formularies relating to Baptism we have made no substantial change, though some have desired to alter or omit certain expressions touching which diversities of opinion have prevailed among faithful members of our Church. At the same time, we desire fully to recognize the liberty of expounding these Formularies hitherto allowed by the general practice of the Church. And as concerning those points whereupon such liberty has been allowed, we hereby further declare that no Minister of this Church is required to hold or teach any doctrine which has not been clearly determined by the Articles of Religion.

The Athanasian Creed presents a unique example of legislation actually carried through all its stages, and yet reversed in the next

Synod, by vast majorities, out of deference to the defeated minority. The first arrangement boldly cut away those clauses called damnatory, or condemning, or minatory, or warning, or hortatory—for these are some of the ingenious phrases which express, or possibly avoid expressing, their essential difference. And this firm action had two advantages—it found shelter under the precedent of the Nicene Creed, from which, also, an ecclesiastical anathema has been shorn away, and it preserved to the Church the great blessing of a public recital of that priceless exposition of the doctrine of the Trinity. It was judged, however, that the defeated minority were too deeply wounded by the "mutilation of a creed:" English opinion was also agitated; and the powerful influence of the Bishops of Killaloe and Cork led all but a handful of the Synod to agree in restoring the excised clauses, on condition, however, that the rubrics should be expunged which allow it ever to be read in the service. It is printed in its place, but it is dumb. It only affects the subscription of the clergy, who may, perhaps, be expected to interpret the English by the softer Latin words. Some there are, however, who think that at a great price we obtained this freedom, and are ill consoled by the avoidance of the pathetic word "mutilation"—as if it is not mutilation to extract the tongue—or by the knowledge that we are better off than the American Church, from whose Prayer-Book it has been entirely rooted out, not even its name lingering in the Eighth Article as there received.

In the Funeral Service two wants, opposite in their direction, were felt. It was not desired entirely to exclude from comfort the friends of unbaptized infants at home, or of catechumens in pagan lands. And, on the other hand, it seemed prudent to speak somewhat less dogmatically of the happiness of all our dead, and to refrain from calling upon the relatives, even of the best, to give "hearty thanks" when resignation is an effort. Accordingly the Rubric at the head of the service runs as follows:—

Here is to be noted, that the Office ensuing is not to be used for any that die unbaptized, or excommunicate, or in whose case a verdict shall have been found of felo de se. *But if any be brought for burial who have died unbaptized, being infants of tender age, the offspring of Christian parents, and not having been withheld from Baptism by wilful default or neglect, or being persons known or certified to the Minister to have been at the time of their death prepared for or desirous of Baptism, the Minister shall, in such cases, read one of the following Psalms and Lessons, or such portion of them as he shall see fit, and the four Sentences at the grave, concluding with the Lord's Prayer and the Benediction at the close of the Office.*

In the service itself we read:—"Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God to take unto Himself the soul," omitting the

words, "of his great mercy;" and instead of saying, "We give thee hearty thanks that it hath pleased thee to deliver this our brother," we substitute, "We bless thy Holy Name for all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear." But we have not interfered with the charitable words, "as, our hope is, this our brother doth." It is only from the positive assertion that we recede.

In the Communion Service we simply read, instead of a much longer sentence, "we eat and drink judgment to ourselves." In one of the addresses we read, "ye do but increase your *condemnation*," instead of "damnation." Similarly in the Commination Service we read, "worthy fruits of *repentance*," instead of "penance." And in one or two other places a gentler word has been introduced for one which seemed overstrained, or of which the sense had drifted.

3. The most signal instances of improved phraseology are to be found in the Marriage Service; where, in addition, the causes for which the permanent bond of Matrimony was ordained are more accurately defined than formerly—

First, for the due ordering of families and households, that children might be brought up in the fear and nurture of the Lord, and to the praise of his holy Name.

Secondly, for a remedy against sin.

Thirdly, for the mutual society, help, and comfort, that the one ought to have of the other, both in prosperity and in adversity.

The substance of a subsequent prayer has been more happily expressed as follows:—

Then may follow this Prayer.

O merciful Lord and Heavenly Father, by whose gracious blessing mankind is increased; Bestow, we beseech thee, on these thy servants the heritage and gift of children, and grant that they may also live together so long in godly love and honesty, that they may see their children christianly and virtuously brought up to thy praise and honour; through Jesus Christ our Lord.

One consequence of these changes is that a mutilated Marriage Service is now almost unknown.

It is an improvement in something more than phraseology that disciplinary canons have been carefully framed by able lawyers, by obeying which a clergyman may prevent the Lord's Table from profanation without bringing himself under the censure of the law.

4. Space is only left to glance at the provision made for an increase of flexibility in our services.

Except upon Sundays and the greater Festivals

The Order for Morning or Evening Prayer may be shortened at the discretion of the Minister by the omission of the Exhortation; of one

or more Psalms (one Psalm at least, or one portion of the 119th Psalm, being always retained); of one Lesson (not being a proper Lesson); of one Canticle; and of the Prayers following the third Collect, except the Prayer of St. Chrysostom, and the Prayer following, which shall always be read.

Upon special occasions, instead of the whole Order for Morning or Evening Prayer, such selections from the Services of the Church and from Holy Scripture may be used as shall be approved of for the purpose by the Ordinary.

Whenever it is found that the use of all the prescribed Services in any Church upon Sundays and Holydays is attended with serious inconvenience, the Ordinary shall have power to dispense with one or more of them.

On occasions sanctioned by the Bishop the Communion Service may begin at the Collect and Epistle. In the Burial Service the Lesson may be 1 Thess. iv. 13, and in great cemeteries where funerals follow in rapid succession, this shorter lesson is a real gain.

Special Services are provided for the first Sunday after the institution of a minister appointed to a cure; for Thanksgiving for Harvest; for the Consecration of a Church, and for that of a Graveyard. The use of the Harvest Thanksgiving Service has this year been almost universal, and the attendances have been so very large as to show how deep was the anxiety, and how calamitous would have been another harvest like the last. The Service upon the Institution of a Clergyman is also proving very useful. It provides for a preacher to be nominated either by the bishop or the incumbent, and no better opportunity could be devised for speaking words of counsel and encouragement, by which the harmony of many a parish may be promoted and its deepest well-being aided.

We have now glanced at the result of an immense amount of careful and intelligent labour. Much will be universally acknowledged an improvement; none is, in the judgment of the most conservative, gravely damaging. The general texture of our Prayer-Book is unaltered; its quality as the noblest and most sober manual of devotion which the world has ever seen remains entirely unimpaired. The greatest changes are small compared with those which the American Church has made, bringing to the task, we fearlessly assert, less literary taste, less theological acumen, and less perception of the spirit of the majestic original. And, since no person has challenged the competence, or resented the decisions, of the Church in the United States, every Irish Churchman asks himself, not seldom, with perplexity and pain, What is it that we have done to estrange the sympathies of the great Church of England? We cannot but feel that these sympathies have been withheld from

us. Money we have never brought ourselves to ask, although the poverty of very many parishes, and the absolute destitution of some, made it impossible that we should not welcome the aid, all the more generous because unsolicited, of a few friends in England, and also impossible that we should not remark how comparatively few they must have been. Far more sadly have we missed the warmth of comradeship, the fraternal encouragement, the feeling that we were understood or even that our brethren greatly cared to understand us. Too often our constitution has been misrepresented, our monetary sacrifices unheeded, our loyalty to the Church of Ireland, the most ancient Church of Britain, has been assailed. Outnumbered at home, sometimes persecuted and always isolated, we have looked across the Channel only to learn how much melancholy and how much consolation are in the sacred words, "Ye shall leave me alone, and yet I am not alone."[1]

Would that these Papers might help to a better understanding of our work, remove some misconception that has alienated kindly and Christian English hearts from us, open the eyes of some few of our brethren to the struggles and the fidelity of the native, ancient, and reformed Church of this unhappy Irish land.

If, in conclusion, the writer were to express his own opinion of the future of the Church of Ireland, with all freedom and committing no person but himself, that opinion would be as follows:—

Financially, *but for one portentous fact*, the prospect would seem to have cleared and to be clearing still. True that we have sore need of all the aid our friends can give us, that the average stipend is far too low, and prizes too few to make the ministry attractive, that some parishes have fallen behind in their assessment and some are almost unprovided for, while many are so extensive that no energy could work them as English Churchmen expect their parishes to be worked. Yet there is nowhere an absolute famine of the Word of God. Not an inch of the soil of Ireland has her National Church forsaken. We might hope that the Representative Body would gradually find means to supply the worst deficiencies, that the bright example of many private endowments would be followed by many more, that legacies would come in, and even that the farming class would learn the strange duty of beneficence. All this we might reasonably hope, *but for one portentous fact.*

[1] Thus, "Crockford" assumes that his clients are interested in the bishops, not only of Moray and of St. Andrews, but also of Honolulu, and of Grafton, and Armidale, and of Saskatchewan. But he does not find it necessary so much as to tell them whether there is any Archbishop of Armagh or Dublin.

Again, the supply of qualified clergymen does not seem so scanty as we feared it would have proved. It is true that many parochial nominators are not able to value scholarship and refinement. But the Bishops, whose hold upon the door of the ministry is unshaken, have for several years refused to lower the qualification. The percentage of literates is smaller than in the Church of England, and it is decreasing. In several dioceses, including the great Diocese of Dublin, there is scarcely a single curate who has not graduated, and our University authorities declare that the divinity students are of a class quite equal to those of ten years ago, and steadily improving. Our brightening financial prospects would naturally carry this improvement forward, *but for one portentous fact.*

And again, regarding the Church in its deepest spiritual aspect, there would seem to be reason for humble gratitude and hope. Neither fever nor chill, Ritualism nor Rationalism, has laid hold upon her. The Plymouth sect is not fed chiefly from our communion, and it is not now progressing. The last census showed us to have gained largely upon Rome and Dissent in the ten years before disestablishment; and the coming census, it is confidently expected, will show that the same process has continued. The agitation caused by revision, which might have exasperated party bitterness, leaves it wonderfully assuaged, for men have learned to understand and to respect each other. The Evangelicals among us are, with scarcely an exception, loyal to their Church. The High Churchmen are, with scarcely an exception, true to the soul of evangelical truth. The predominant school of thought appears to be liberally and moderately Evangelical, uncalvinistic let us confess, fearless of modern science, and, because it is fearless, tolerant of divergence in detail, while heartily and earnestly concerned for something holier than loyalty to any "school of thought." From such a Church, differing in details, but united in essentials, and as free from error as any church that has not parted company with independent thought, great things might with reasonable confidence be hoped, *but for one portentous fact.*

This fact, which overshadows all our future and baffles all our calculations, is that in half of Ireland the Protestant population is too scattered and too poor to maintain its Church if the landlords are subtracted; and England has, at least for a while, looked tamely on while the landlords were being shot down or hunted into exile.

Should they disappear, by the stress of lawlessness or of laws, the Protestant tenantry will quickly be absorbed or forced to emigrate; the Church of Ireland will be driven out of the South and West; and the English interest, for whose imagined well-being so much guilt is now connived at, will be left without a friend.

GEO. A. CHADWICK.

Art. II.—THE RULE OF FAITH.

Part III. Inspiration of Scripture.

IN the preceding section the questions have been, What books constitute the volume of Holy Scripture? and, What has been, and is, the office of the Church in the formation of the Canon? External and internal testimony combined lead to the conclusion that the Protestant churches have good reason for differing from the Church of Rome in their decisions on these points. The question now before us is, On what ground do we assign to the books thus ascertained a supreme authority in matters of faith and practice? To the Christian the books received in the first instance on the tradition of the Church commend themselves by the light which they impart, as the sun is seen by his own beams; but a further question remains, What is the measure of the intensity of that light? The witness of the Holy Spirit in the volume seals the witness of the Church; but *to what extent* was the Holy Spirit an agent in its composition?—this is the point which now demands consideration. And the answer has been already briefly given. The supreme authority of Holy Scripture rests on the presumption that its authors, when they wrote, did so under a special influence of the Holy Spirit, which differs not merely in degree, but in kind, from His ordinary influences; to which special influence the Church has given the name of "inspiration."

The plenary[1] inspiration of Scripture is rather assumed than anywhere directly affirmed in our formularies; probably because at the time no controversy on the point had been raised, at least between the great contending divisions of Christendom. If there ever was a general consent of the Church catholic on any question, it exists on this. East and west, from the earliest to later times, concurred in assigning to Scripture a pre-eminence, which consisted in its being, as no other collection of writings is, the Word of God. The foreign Protestant Confessions (more explicit on this point than our own) take up the sacred tradition; and the Church of Rome itself is in substantial agreement with them. She has, as we think on insufficient grounds, added to the number of canonical books; she has, in our opinion, improperly made tradition a co-ordinate authority with Scripture; but the books which she does receive with us she with us assigns to the special inspiration of the Holy Spirit. It is, next to our common acceptance of the doctrines contained in the three creeds, one of the links that

[1] This descriptive epithet is on many grounds to be preferred to "verbal."

connect us with that Church, and makes a reconciliation at any rate within the range of possibility. From this it will be seen that it is the province of dogmatic theology not so much to *prove* the Inspiration of Holy Scripture—for no Christian church, as a church, least of all our own, doubts the fact—as to define and explain what is meant by it, and to attempt to meet objections which parties or individuals in the Church may urge against the received doctrine on the subject.

And first let the meaning of the term "inspiration," as applied to Scripture, be fixed; fixed for the purposes of this discussion. The etymology conveys simply the notion of "in-breathing," or the communication of divine influence; for what special purpose is determined by the nature of the result. Thus Bezaleel is said to have been inspired for the work of the tabernacle (Exod. xxxi. 3); Moses was inspired to give the Law, David to compose Psalms, the Prophets to admonish and to predict, the Apostles to preach and lay the foundations of the Church. In one of our collects we pray ourselves for the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. The expression, therefore, "inspiration of Holy Scripture," admits of a variety of meaning: it may, *e.g.*, be understood as simply affirming that a peculiar religious geniality pervades the book; or, in a more definite sense, that the authors of these books did indeed enjoy the privilege of a special divine assistance as men, but not particularly so as writers; and that this is enough to account for the position of pre-eminence which the Church assigns to Holy Scripture.

No definition of the word, when used in reference to *Holy Scripture*, is adequate which puts aside, or ignores, its application to the actual composition of the books. The Apostles were all inspired, but were they all inspired to *write?* If not, what was the nature and the extent of the divine influence which prompted, or superintended, those of them who did write, in the particular act of *writing?* Was it something, if not beyond yet distinct from, their general endowment of inspiration; or was their writing such and such books the natural efflorescence of the latter? As we may say, Milton was a great genius, and, therefore, naturally threw off the "Paradise Lost." Was there, in short, a commission to write as well as to preach? The hinge of the controversy really turns on the answers to these questions.

No little difficulty has been introduced into the subject by the indiscriminate use of the terms "revelation" and "inspiration." A revelation must, of course, have been inbreathed, or inspired, into the recipient thereof; but it is better to apply the term to all divine communications which stopped short of being committed to writing, and to appropriate the term "inspiration" to this latter special act. The distinction is founded on fact.

Revelations may have been imparted to a person who was not commissioned to reduce them to writing, that task being deputed to another; or the same person might receive the revelation at one time, and long afterwards be directed to place it on record. Of some of the writers of the New Testament—*e.g.*, St. Mark and St. Luke—it is not recorded that they received any revelations; yet we believe them to have been inspired to write the books which bear their names. The divine teaching with which St. Paul was favoured he himself calls revelation (ἀποκάλυψις), not inspiration (Gal. i. 12). Of revelation, miracles and prophecy were the proper credentials; but in the case of an inspired *writer* they were not necessarily attached to the function. It may, indeed, be a question whether the theory that revelation belongs especially to the Logos, and inspiration to the Holy Ghost, has Scriptural foundation;[1] but that the terms may fitly be appropriated to different operations of the same divine Agent hardly admits of doubt. Inspiration thus understood may be defined to be a special influence of the Holy Spirit, whereby the *writers* of Scripture were, in the act of writing, supernaturally preserved from error, and enabled to transmit, in its integrity, the original revelation as they had received it, either themselves directly from above, or mediately through others. We call it a *special* assistance of the Holy Spirit to distinguish it from that which all Christians enjoy, or ordinary illuminating grace: between the highest degree of this and the gift of inspiration there exists a specific difference, nor could the former, by natural growth, ever have passed into the latter. We confine it to the writers (or compilers) of Scripture to distinguish it from the spiritual gifts with which men of God, who had received no commission to write, may have been endowed; who, in one sense, were inspired, but were not the chosen agents of the Holy Spirit in the particular function of writing.

An *a priori* mode of arguing, that what seems to us necessary to the efficiency of Scripture must therefore belong to it, cannot, certainly, be universally commended; but there are some cases, and this is one of them, in which the probabilities are so strong that it has real weight. If the volume, and not merely the subject-matter, of Scripture is to be our Rule of Faith, how can we conceive it capable of discharging this function if a special superintendence was not vouchsafed to the writers *as writers?* It does not seem enough to admit that, if the Creator vouchsafed to reveal to man the wondrous scheme of redemption, He must also be supposed as providing for its being somehow committed to writing, for otherwise the benefit would be confined to the hearers of the first recipient and his oral

[1] See Lee's "Inspiration of Holy Scripture," Lect. iii.

teaching: this is true, but the case seems to demand more—viz., that the record thus within the scope of divine Providence should itself be so watched over and controlled by a special agency of heaven as to preclude the possibility of error, or essential error—too probable when we consider the wide field of human infirmity—on the part of the human instrument; the letter, as well as the contents of the volume, must in a real sense admit of being called the Word of God.—We may approach the same conclusion by another path. Regarding the New Testament simply as a trustworthy history, let us examine what it tells us respecting the prerogatives of the Apostles as witnesses for Christ and founders of the Church. We read, then, that to these chosen witnesses a special guidance of the Holy Spirit was promised, not only to remind them of what Jesus had taught, but to supply what was wanting in their knowledge of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven (John xiv. 13). They were assured that when summoned to give an account of their doctrine before public authorities they needed not to be anxious about the result, for the Holy Ghost should speak in and through them (Matt. x. 20). The risen Saviour symbolically conferred on them the Holy Ghost for a special function connected with their office (John xx. 22, 23). These promises, we are assured, were fulfilled. On the day of Pentecost, the Holy Spirit, under visible symbols, descended upon them, and thenceforth they appear in quite a new character. They speak boldly, as conscious of a divine commission; represent themselves, in their official regulations, as acting under the guidance of the Holy Spirit (Acts xv. 28; 1 Cor. vii. 40); and lay claim to a spiritual wisdom which is not of man, but was revealed to them by God, and which they clothe in words "not of man's teaching, but what the Holy Ghost teacheth" (Gal. i. 12; 1 Cor. ii. 10-13). If these claims are not groundless, we must believe that the Apostles, in their public teaching and their official acts, enjoyed a divine assistance which no other Christians have enjoyed, prerogatives to which no teachers of a subsequent age can make pretension. With their *oral* teaching, at any rate, the plenary inspiration of the Holy Spirit must be connected.

But then, of the eight writers of the New Testament, five belong to the company of these accredited messengers, and surely we cannot suppose that when they took in hand to write for the benefit of the Church, they would be left destitute of special spiritual aid; that they would be supernaturally preserved from error when preaching to the comparatively few and revert to fallibility when writing for all ages? Indeed, the promise of Christ that He would be with his Apostles for ever (Matt. xxviii. 20) implies such a divine superintendence over their writings; for since they were not in their own persons to remain always

upon earth, and since as *Apostles* they have no successors, it can only be in their writings that they survive; which they do. St. Matthew, St. John, St. Peter, still, in the Scriptures, authoritatively declare the doctrine of Christ, refute error, remit and retain sins, order the affairs of the Church, preside in all Christian assemblies; in short, exercise all their Apostolic functions. If, therefore, the Holy Ghost was not the Prompter of their writings in the same sense in which He was the Prompter of their oral teaching, it is not easy to see how the promise of Christ has been fulfilled.

This, however, it will be said, applies only to the Apostles in the strict sense of the word; but a considerable portion of the New Testament (*e.g.*, the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke and the Acts of the Apostles) was not written by Apostles, and therefore does not come to us with the same authority as the rest of the volume. But let it be considered, in the first place, that the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit were not confined to Apostles; and therefore there is no antecedent improbability against the supposition that St. Luke and St. Mark, equally with St. Matthew, may have been endowed with the gift of inspiration. And, in the next place, let us ask what it was that rendered the *Apostles* specially qualified for the discharge of their office? Not natural endowments of mind, or acquired learning, but the fact that they alone had lived for years in closest intercourse with Jesus of Nazareth; that their eyes had seen, their hands handled, the Word of Life, as had been vouchsafed to no other disciples (1 John i. 1); and so that they, beyond all other men, were fitted to transmit the living portraiture which we have in the Gospels. Emphatically they were "witnesses" of Christ. But this advantage was possessed only in a secondary degree by the Apostolic men in question. If they were not actual witnesses of the mystery of godliness (1 Tim. iii. 16) they consorted habitually with those who had been, received from their lips the very words and actions of Christ, and possessed opportunities, which none of their successors could possess, of testing the accuracy of current traditions and correcting their own impressions by constant reference to those who had seen the Saviour in the flesh. If they were not actual founders of the Church they were the friends and companions of those who were. Next, then, to the Apostles themselves, none, surely, were so fitted to be entrusted with the Divine gift as persons thus circumstanced. If, then, they were commissioned to write, as we believe they were, there seems no reason why we should assign to their writings a position inferior to that of the others; and we receive, without hesitation, the testimony of the Church that the Gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke, the Acts of the Apostles, and, we may add, the Epistle to the Hebrews, are inspired compositions in the same

sense in which those of St. Paul are. It is to be observed that the special relation in which these apostolic men stood to the Apostles, as constant friends and companions, draws the line between them and other apostolic men such as Polycarp, who may have seen and heard Apostles, but were not in habitual attendance upon them. Nor, when we examine the compositions themselves, does the internal testimony refuse to lend its aid. Were any marked discrepancy visible, either in doctrine or style, between these books and those of the Apostles, there might be reason, if not for a summary decision against their claims, yet for perplexity and doubt. But what may be called the *style* and *manner* of inspiration are as clearly stamped on these writings as on any others contained in the volume. There is the same absence of mere human emotion, the same dignity and authority of address, the same freedom from puerile details and legendary fables, the same *abstinence* of taste in the selection of materials, the same noble simplicity of language. If we may judge from the spurious productions of the first two centuries, these characteristics are most difficult of imitation. With the single exception of the first Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, nothing, even in the age immediately succeeding that of the Apostles, approaches, in these points, the books in question. Writings so peculiar, the compositions of men not remarkable for genius or learning, carry their own impress of authority; the Christian instinct discerns in them, as writings, the co-operation of the Holy Spirit, and without an effort assigns them to the same category with those of St. John or St. Paul.—Yet again, we may found an argument on the manner in which the New Testament speaks of the "Word of God" as contained in the Old. It is to be observed, then, that our Lord, in referring to the Old Testament, constantly describes it as "the Scriptures" (*τὰς γραφάς*, Mark xii. 24). The well-known collection of canonical writings received by the Jews, "Moses and the Prophets," in our Lord's view, means not the matter of which they treat, but "the volume of the book" itself (Heb. x. 7); the written, and not merely the contained, Word of God. The idea is a definite, not a nebulous, one. "Search," says Christ, "the writings" (*τὰς γραφάς*, John v. 39); "the writing" (*ἡ γραφὴ*, *Ibid.* x. 35) "cannot be broken," or nullified. And in a capital passage St. Paul declares that each particular writing (*πᾶσα γραφὴ*) of the collection with which Timothy had been acquainted from his childhood was inspired of God, the quality being attached not merely to the authors in their *persons*, but to the authors in their *writings*.[1]

[1] Whether *θεόπνευστος* in this passage is to be taken as an epithet, or as the predicate of *γραφὴ*, *sub judice lis est*. The present writer inclines to the former; but whichever way we take it matters little to the argument.

It appears, then, that by our Lord and the Apostles the inspiration of the Old Testament belongs to the writing; we may say to the writing as distinguished from the author. And the argument is—If the records of the earlier and merely preparatory dispensation are thus honoured, can we suppose that those of the later and more perfect one would come under another category? It is true that Christianity is described as a system "not of the letter, but of the Spirit" (2 Cor. iii. 6), but this refers to the *nature* of the dispensation, by no means to the quality of written documents which belong to it. In proportion to the superiority of the revelations it contains, we should expect, to say the least, that the outward vehicle of these revelations would be the subject of as careful a divine control as the outward vehicle of its predecessor, to which, as we have seen, no slight importance is attributed by Christ and the Apostles. And if we be asked to point out any passage affirming of the New Testament Canon what St. Paul affirms of the Old, we reply that none such could be expected until this latter Canon was complete; but that of a most important portion of it, St. Paul's Epistles, we actually have such an attestation, in the words of St. Peter, "Even as our beloved brother Paul hath *written* to you in all his epistles . . . . which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also *the other scriptures* (*τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς*), unto their own destruction" (2 Peter iii. 16).[1]

In considering, then, the question of the inspiration of Scripture, the actual writing can never be put in the background; and, as previously suggested, the subject will gain in clearness by our appropriating the term to the particular act of literary composition. With a true instinct, the Church deems all such statements as that "the men were inspired, the books are the result of that inspiration" (Dean Alford, "Commentary," vol. i. c. i. s. 6), not indeed erroneous, but inadequate to express the facts of the case.

Before we pass on to consider more particularly the nature of the superintendence which the Holy Spirit exercised over the inspired writers in their act of writing, it may be noted that though every Canonical book was held to be inspired, the converse does not follow that every inspired book necessarily found

---

[1] Another passage has been cited in this connection—viz., Rom. xvi. 26, "by the Scriptures of the Prophets made known" (*διά τε γραφῶν προφητικῶν*), as if the Apostle were alluding to a collection of writings by *New* Testament prophets (Gaussen, *Theopn.* c. ii. s. 4). But it is more probable that it is the Old Testament volume of prophecy that is intended; and that St. Paul means to intimate that a main part of his teaching consisted in proving from this volume that Jesus was the Christ; as indeed we know was his usual practice. (See Acts xvii. 1–3.)

a place in the Canon. It is probable that, at least, one epistle of St. Paul—we must suppose an inspired composition—disappeared soon after it was written (1 Cor. v. 9);[1] and there may have been others. If so, we see that the principle of *selection* prevailed even amongst inspired books, and that the formation of the Canon was a special work of divine Providence, preserving certain books and permitting others to be lost. But we may be sure that any lost writings of the Apostles, if such there be, would, if discovered, add nothing essential to what we already possess; that our existing Scriptures are *sufficient* in all respects to make us wise unto salvation. From the preceding observations, too, it seems to follow that though the question of the authorship of a book is not, as regards its canonicity, a fundamental one (otherwise that of the Epistle to the Hebrews would not have been left in doubt), it is not a matter of indifference as regards its inspiration; for the authorship involves the question of the *age* of the book. Now, as far as appears, the inspiration to write (to confine our attention to the New Testament) was confined to the Apostolic age; if, for example, the Epistle to the Hebrews had been a work of the second century, the evidence for its *inspiration* would, notwithstanding the excellence of the book, be defective, and it could not form a part of the Canon. It was, therefore, important not merely to prove that the *contents* of a book were in accordance with the oral teaching of the Apostles, still fresh in the minds of their converts, but to ascertain with all due care the name of the author, and, where this was impossible, at least to attempt to fix the age of the book.

And now to examine a little more closely the nature and extent of inspiration as thus defined. It is obvious that the nature of the operation of the Holy Spirit on the mind of a writer is a matter quite beyond our ken: the result is all that is cognizable by, or concerns, us. The result, then, in the case of the inspired writings, is such a combination of divine with human agency as renders them at once divine and human.

The older theory of plenary inspiration, which makes the sacred writers to have been merely amanuenses, or passive organs, of the Holy Spirit[2]—the theory which in modern times has received the name of mechanical—has not been able to

---

[1] After all that has been written on this subject it is difficult to understand the Apostle otherwise than as having addressed a third epistle to the Corinthians, which is no longer extant. It may, indeed, be maintained that no such lost book *could* have been inspired; and then "canonicity" and "inspiration" will be coextensive terms.

[2] Omnia et singula verba, quæ in sacro codice leguntur, a Spiritu S. Prophetis et Apostolis inspirata, et in *calamum dictata sunt*. Hollaz de S.S., 217.

maintain its ground. In all acts of creative power it is only the first entrance of the divine agency into the world that is properly independent of natural causation; afterwards the two co-operate and can no longer be distinguished. Thus, in the work of regeneration, the first quickening of the soul is an act of grace in which the subject has no share; but in the subsequent stages man co-operates with God, and by a mixed agency, divine and human, the work of sanctification is carried on. By analogy we should suppose that while the primary communication of the inspiring Spirit would be independent of the human instrument, the subsequent process of exposition would be conducted in conjunction with, and by means of, the natural faculties. This conclusion is confirmed by the confessed differences of style which the inspired volume exhibits. The writings of the several authors are strongly marked by the peculiar colouring which the abilities, education, or natural temperament of each were calculated to impart: an epistle of St. Paul could never be mistaken for one of St. John, and St. Peter, in his manner, resembles neither of those apostles. Each has his own peculiar (shall we say favourite?) topics, and expresses himself in his own way. The very compositions themselves seem to have been the offspring of circumstances, and do not exhibit on the part of their human authors any preconceived plan. We must suppose, then, that the sacred writers, when under the influence of inspiration, were under no constraint in the exercise of their faculties, but wrote as men to men—that the result, therefore, as it is the Word of God, is also, in a very real sense, the word of man. The Person of the Redeemer presents an analogy: He was truly God and truly man; his manhood was no docetic phantasm, but a reality (1 John i. 1): but the mode of union is a problem which Christian speculation can hardly be said to have as yet solved.

On the other hand, we must believe that the preternatural influence was so exercised as to exclude the contingency of human error or inadvertence, at least where the latter might be of serious moment. The Holy Ghost made use of natural, or acquired, faculties, but effectually guarded the *result* from adulteration. Less than this would render the whole doctrine of inspiration nugatory. Be it remembered that it is not with the occult deposition in the writers' minds that we are concerned, but that the stream should issue from its source uncontaminated: it is the *written* Word of God that is to be a lamp to our feet and a light to our path (Ps. cix. 105). Therefore, we must hold that the language used, as well as the thoughts embodied, was the subject of the Holy Spirit's guardianship: the writers may not have been "pens," or "amanuenses," of the Holy Spirit, but their mode of expression, and even words, must have been sub-

ject to His control. We argue this not merely from the statements of Scripture (1 Cor. ii. 13): not merely from instances in which the argument turns upon the use of a word (Gal. iii. 16); but from the nature of the case. The thought, or sentiment, of another is nothing to us until it is expressed in words; it is they that give it form and permanency. If, therefore, inspiration had extended merely to the thoughts of the writers, while in the expression of those thoughts they were left to themselves, what guarantee should we have that improper or erroneous expressions had not been used as the medium of communication? It must be borne in mind that in this case, to a considerable extent, a *theological language* had to be created as the vehicle of Christian ideas.[1] Missionaries tell us that one great difficulty in preaching to the heathen, or translating the Scriptures, arises from the lack of terms in the native languages to express the ideas peculiar to Christianity—*e.g.*, faith, holiness, humility, even the idea of God: it takes a long course of training before the native mind can be brought to attach the Christian meaning to such words. Now, in the case of our New Testament writers themselves, such a language was already, in some measure, formed for them in the Old Testament Scriptures in which they had been nurtured; and a great advantage it was to them in preaching the Gospel to their fellow-countrymen, who had enjoyed a similar advantage. But they were to preach also to the heathen, and they were to write to the heathen in their native Greek; and to frame all at once, in what was to them a foreign, if not an unknown, tongue, a vehicle perfectly adapted to convey the varied and mysterious revelations which they had received, seems a task beyond human power, unless aided by a special superintendence from above.

Furthermore, we must hold that inspiration extends to *all parts* of the Bible (the history as well as the morality or the doctrine), and in an equal degree to all. For if some portions are inspired and others not, or in an inferior degree, while no oracle is at hand to discriminate between them, it is obvious that the whole becomes involved in doubt, and we stand not upon a rock, but upon shifting sand. The rule has been propounded,[2]—the more closely a book is connected with Christ, the higher the degree of its inspiration. But who is to decide the measure in which a book is connected with the Christian redemption? Judgments on this point are very likely to vary with the notions enter-

[1] It may be said this applies to the Apostles' oral as well as to their written teaching—that is, not to the latter exclusively. No doubt it does: but this does not seem to affect the argument.

[2] Twesten, "Vorlesungen," i. 388. Previously enunciated by Luther—"The true touchstone to try any book is to see whether it treats of Christ or not; if not, it is to be rejected, whether professing to be the work of

tained respecting the nature of that redemption, which we know to be various; some making the essence of Christianity to consist in its pure and elevated morality, others seeing in it a remedial appointment from sin and death: to the former, the Sermon on the Mount would probably seem inspired in a far higher degree than St. Paul's epistles. In short, it would ultimately depend on each man's private judgment which was to be considered the more, and which the less, divine element in Scripture. But, it is urged, to transcribe the annals of the Jewish nation, or to write memoirs of Christ, was a task within the compass of human power, and needed no divine assistance. It is forgotten that Scripture contains but a *selection* of historical matter; and what mere human power would have been adequate to the task of selection? Out of the mass of the national records those portions were to be taken which had a special bearing on the scheme of redemption, as it advanced to maturity; and ignorant as they were of the ultimate purposes of God (1 Peter i. 11), even prophets could not have fulfilled this task without divine prompting and superintendence; even they wrote, or compiled, without fully knowing why this was to be omitted and that supplied. The same principle of selection pervades the New Testament. St. John tells us that he recorded only a portion of what Christ said and did (John xvi. 25); in their epistles the Apostles omit many things which it seems natural for them to have alluded to or enjoined, many details which uninspired writers would probably have enlarged upon; what guided them in this choice and treatment of topics? We perceive now the wisdom of these omissions, but we can hardly ascribe the procedure to human wisdom.

The statement, then, that the Bible is not, but contains, the Word of God, which is but another mode of stating this theory of partial inspiration, cannot be deemed a satisfactory one. The stream of inspiration meanders, it is admitted, through the sacred volume; but of what advantage is that to us if we have no infallible guide to enable us to track its course? If the volume, as a whole, presents itself to us as inspired, we have no need to enter upon an investigation so hazardous and so little likely to lead to useful results.

Had the term inspiration, when used in reference to *Holy Scripture*, been confined, as it should be, to the act of writing, some objections that have been taken to the doctrine in

---

St. Paul, or St. Peter, or not" (Preface to the Epistles of St. James and St. Jude). He, Luther, himself was to be the judge how far a book had relation to Christ; and accordingly he expunged St. James from the Canon, and arranged the other books according to his own judgment. "The first rank," he says, "is to be assigned to the Gospel of St. John and his 1st Epistle, St. Paul's Epistles, and the 1st of St. Peter;" the others, of course, occupying a subordinate position.

its plenary sense would have been seen to lose much of their force. Can we, it has been said, believe every part of the Bible to have been divinely guarded from error when we read Deborah's approval of the act of Jael (Judges v. 24), or Stephen's mistakes (whether they are mistakes or not is not now the question) in Acts vii.?[1] For Deborah was a prophetess, and Stephen a man "full of faith and of the Holy Ghost" (Acts vi. 5); if any persons could be called inspired they surely were so. The answer is that neither Deborah nor Stephen were the authors of the books which respectively record their addresses. The author of the Book of Judges (whoever he may have been) was divinely commissioned to write the book, and in it to insert Deborah's song; and was guided to record it faithfully: his task was ended when he had done so. This implies no approval on his part, nor on the part of his Divine Prompter, of what Deborah uttered. Why may not her song have been recorded to show that even so eminent "a mother in Israel" was very far from being perfect? In like manner, St. Luke was commissioned to write the book of Acts, and in it to insert Stephen's speech: we may rely on the accuracy of the record, but this implies no endorsement on the part of the author, whether the *primarius* or the *secundarius*, of Stephen's mistakes, if he made any: they may have been recorded to prove that the holiest of men is not secure from lapses of memory. The same principle applies to many similar instances. We meet, for example, with sentiments in some of the Psalms which seem to jar on our feelings as Christians: the inspired collector (whoever he may have been, even if he had himself been a psalmist) may have been commissioned to place these psalms in it, as a warning that even the most exalted rapture of devotion is no safeguard against an admixture of human infirmity. The record of the failings of holy men of old, Abraham, Moses, Peter, &c., comes under the same law of explanation: the inspiration we now treat of belongs not to the men as such, still less to their failings, but to the author of the *writing;* who, not for our imitation but for our admonition, was commissioned to embalm them in an imperishable record. How much more perplexing would the case have been if any approval of such failings had proceeded from the writer's pen![2]

Other objections commonly urged seem to deserve only a

---

[1] Alford, "Com.," i. c. i. s. 6.

[2] Connected with the theory of *degrees* of inspiration is that of different *kinds* of it, as they are supposed to have been variously needed by the writer—"suggestion," "direction," "elevation," &c. (see Bishop Daniel Wilson's "Lectures on the Evidences"). Such distinctions have little Scriptural foundation. The only one of any importance is that between the first impulse of the Holy Spirit to write—or, in other words, to take in hand a subject for the benefit of the Church—and His subsequent superintendence over the act of writing.

brief notice. Objections from alleged discrepancies in the narrative, which usually turn out to be omissions by one Evangelist of what is supplied by another,[1] or inversions in the order of events which are easily reduced into an harmonious whole;[2] objections from alleged inaccuracies in natural science, as that the sun rises in the east and sinks in the west, language which is in constant use among scientific men themselves, and which is the only one that could be used if the writers were to speak as men to men; objections from the various readings of manuscripts, which proceed on the gratuitous assumption that if God originally inspired a writing, He thereby pledged Himself never to allow the slightest variation of reading to slip into subsequent copies, no matter how insignificant the variation might be. Had the variations essentially affected the sense, this objection would have had greater force; but modern research has effectually shown that in no instance has the sense been thus affected. Objections from quotations in the New Testament purporting to be from the Hebrew or the LXX. version, but which differ from the original; which are merely instances of the Holy Spirit's modifying, enlarging, or paraphrasing His own previous statements. From an erroneous interpretation of a passage in 1 Cor. (vii. 10–25) it has been inferred that the Apostle himself in this instance, and as a writer, disclaims the prerogative of inspiration; whereas an attentive examination of his argument will prove that he asserts it. He had no express divine commandment to allege on the subject of virginity as he had on the indissolubility of the marriage tie (Gen. ii. 24); but he, notwithstanding, gives his own judgment, and this judgment, far from possessing only a human authority, he declares to be that of the spirit of God speaking through himself as the human instrument (verse 40).

E. A. Litton.

---

[1] The recorded discrepancies of the inscriptions on the Cross are quoted by Dean Alford ("Com." i. c. i. s. 6) as decisive in favour of his view; but are they "discrepancies" or *imperfect* notices?

Matthew—This is Jesus the King of the Jews.
Mark—The King of the Jews.
Luke—This is the King of the Jews.
John—Jesus of Nazareth the King of the Jews.

Let them be *combined* into one, and we have the full inscription:—This is Jesus of Nazareth the King of the Jews. It must never be forgotten that Scripture (and this remark applies particularly to the *four Gospels*) is to be considered as a *whole* (one work of the Holy Ghost), and not as a collection of independent authors, connected by no supernatural bond; one part therefore supplies what is wanting in another. The men, the *auctores secundarii*, possess only a *relative* interest for us.

[2] As in the ten "discrepancies" discovered by Lessing (or rather the author of the "Wolfenbüttel" fragments which Lessing published) in the accounts of the resurrection.

Art. III.—THE INVASION OF THE CRIMEA.

The Invasion of the Crimea: its Origin, and an Account of its Progress down to the Death of Lord Raglan. By A. W. Kinglake. Vol. VI. "The Winter Troubles." Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh.

THIS volume of Mr. Kinglake's History of the Crimean War, which has for so many years been dragging its slow length along, possesses all the faults and charms of its predecessors. We have here the same fascination of style as of old, the same vivid powers of description, the same clear mastery of details, the same incisiveness of sarcasm; and unfortunately we also have the same partiality of judgment, the same hero-worship which permits no censure to be attached to its idol, the same intolerance, unnecessary aggressiveness and digressions, which do not tend materially to illumine the subject. Eliminate the dissertations upon the war administration of France and the war administration of England, the "Retrospective Inquiry," and the violent and ill-judged attacks upon the *Times*, and the book before us could be compressed into half its size without destruction of, or interruption to, its narrative. To the name of history this work is not strictly entitled. It lacks the impartiality, the thorough sifting of all arguments which lead but to one conclusion; the absence of special pleading, and the broad sympathies of him who seeks to write, in the truest spirit of the historian, the events he describes. In their stead we have a brilliant narrative full of stirring passages, of mordant reflections, of graphic scenes, and of sketches of character which cannot well be surpassed.[1] The truth and purity of history

[1] We append Mr. Kinglake's picture of the late Mr. Roebuck:—

"Mr. Roebuck had a high public spirit, and the honour of his country was dear to him. He had served many years in the House of Commons, and there held a peculiar station. Placing unbounded confidence in himself, and troubling his mind very little about any one else, he had a hardiness beyond other mortals, a compact and vigorous diction, that was quite good enough, yet not too good for his purpose, and, above all, a matchless delivery which made up—much more than made up—for want of stature and voice; because it made him seem like one filled with a sense of his ineffable power. But he had established a yet surer claim upon the ear of the House of Commons by assigning himself a peculiar function. Though apparently endowed with no faculty for mastering a difficult subject, and wanting also those gifts of the intellect and the imagination which enkindle satire, irony, sarcasm, he nevertheless appointed himself to the office of public accuser, and, what is more, clung so fondly to his chosen task as to be rarely engaged in any other. Though always accusing, he still was not what the world means when it points out a man as a slanderer; for he usually adduced no material that could well be called fresh in support of the charges he brought, and based them, if he based them at all, on what men already knew. Like the speakers of the French Convention in the days of the Terror, he con-

may indeed suffer from such treatment; still we are sure that it does not detract from the pleasure of perusal. Where the works of severe and accurate historians will be untouched, the pages of Mr. Kinglake will always be read with avidity.

The volume opens with the camping of our troops on the bleak wold of the Chersonese. The turn of events had made it absolutely necessary that our army should winter in the Crimea, and Lord Raglan had, November 8, 1854, directed the Commissary-General to make the necessary preparations. At the very outset grave difficulties had to be surmounted. The abandonment of the northern side of the Crimea after the battle of the Alma had now forced the Allies to content themselves with pitching their tents and huts upon a barren patch of ground, so small and sterile that it not only was incapable of yielding the soldiers food, but even forage and fuel, "things that rarely before had

---

cerned himself little enough with proof or argument, but advanced transcendentally to his damning conclusions—that is, as the phrase goes, 'called names.'

"By restricting any argument he might use—perhaps one of the sort called 'deductive'—to a quite insignificant space, and confining himself for the most part to naked invective, unladen with statement or reasoning, undiluted by any of the sentences with which others qualify speech, he could bring what he had to say within a very small compass; and the House—loving mischief, yet also valuing time—used to welcome the rising of an accomplished denouncer who was sure to be vicious and brief—used to listen with delight ever fresh for the samples of perfect delivery with which he would point an arraignment and savagely lengthen the hiss of some favourite little word, such as 'sham.' He had seemingly neither the power nor even the wish to persuade; and was not only without a chief, and without a party, but even without a comrade, without a disciple, without a follower of any kind; yet he was not morose; and if the play of his countenance could be trusted—more especially after making a speech—he gloried in his state of isolation, sitting happy, and, like Brahma, absorbed in the contemplation of his own excellence. From the beginning to the end of the brief, entertaining interlude in which he thus now and then acted, he had the ear—the rapt ear—of the House, but still was without any weight in it; and, although he did not see this himself, a main part of the amusement he gave was amusement at his own expense; for he could not exert his power without so disclosing his vanity as to make the exhibition he gave seem partly, if not wholly, comic.

"In the country at large he was much more gravely regarded; for the light quiet smile in which the House used to indulge when observing a vain brother's foible was a subtle, impalpable thing that could hardly be seized and borne off to a world out-of-doors by even the most skilful journalists; and—conveyed without any such gloss in full-printed reports—the orator's point-blank attacks, unencumbered by wearisome proofs, unshrouded by the language of satire, went so straight to the understandings of politicians numbered by myriads, as to make him in their eyes a great tribune of the people who alone dared to use plain speech."

been wanting to the victorious invaders of a country in which hay and wood-stores abounded." No other spot could be selected, for the enemy, owing to their two flank marches of September 25, had compelled the Allies to encamp upon this uninviting locality, or else to abandon the Crimea altogether. Whilst the Russians had their immense flocks of sheep "under the eyes of our outlying sentries, and showed to any observers who chose to put up their field-glasses their stacks of forage piled up in ranks that seemed miles and miles long," the English and French, deprived completely of the resources of the invaded country, were wholly dependent upon supplies brought by sea. The forage for the cattle and the provisions for the men had to be shipped across the stormy waters of the Black Sea from the stores piled up on the shores of the Bosphorus. And now a series of terrible blunders occurred. The goods required to fill the store-houses on the Bosphorus had to be conveyed straight either from England or France, and it was soon discovered that the strain thus suddenly put upon the transport service was greater than it could bear, and that our supply of merchant vessels and steamers was inadequate to convey the mass of articles necessary for a winter campaign. Cargoes were left rotting on the quays because there were no ships to carry them to our ill-clad and half-famished soldiery. Tents and blankets, so useful on the bleak heights of the Chersonese, remained still housed on the Bosphorus on account of the lack of transports to ship them to Balaclava. Wanting food, wanting serviceable clothing, wanting proper medical attendance (for even drugs were not at hand), our men had not only to face the frosts and snows of a Siberian winter, but still to keep to their work in the trenches, and carry on the siege of Sebastopol. Gradually the awful results of this mismanagement began to assert themselves. From time to time reinforcements landed at Balaclava, yet they failed to effect a sustained augmentation of the number of men under arms, for the new-comers, all at once subjected to the rigours of a winter campaign, fell sick with appalling rapidity, "so that even within a few days the fresh troops became rather a superadded assemblage of hospital sufferers than an actual accession to strength." Our author supports his statements by terrible facts. After disembarking at Balaclava, the 9th Regiment at once marched up to the camp awaiting it on the Chersonese table-land; but there the regiment sickened so fast, that of men fit for duty, after only a few days of campaigning, but a small remnant were left. The Guards had received some strong draughts of recruits sent fresh from England, yet when January came to an end the three battalions, which lately had constituted a splendid brigade, could only muster for duty 312 men. The main body of the Scots Fusiliers,

comprising at the time seven companies, was assembled one day with all its effective strength to greet the return of its colonel, and the whole force thus turned out to welcome their commander consisted of under one hundred men. "The 63rd Regiment," remarks Mr. Kinglake, "may almost be said to have disappeared." The sufferings which caused this decimation were indeed of the bitterest character. Our army was not only threatened with reduction, but with virtual extinction. "In proportion to the numbers," writes Mr. Kinglake, "the English army was undergoing at one time a fiercer havoc than that which ravaged London in the days of the great plague; but no awe, like the awe of a city that is silenced by plague, possessed the English camp. The camp, it is true, was quiet, but the silence maintained by our soldiers was the silence of weariness, the silence of men bearing cold and hardships of all kinds with obstinate pride." The courage of our men was indeed, as the Sebastopol Committee declared, "unsurpassed in the annals of war." As long as they could keep themselves out of the sick list they cheerily went their rounds, mounted guard, or worked during those bitter nights in the trenches. A bite at a biscuit, a sip of whisky, and dressed anyhow, provided warmth could be obtained, the men blithely obeyed all orders, and no sounds of murmur or discontent were heard. They imagined that the siege going on portended a not distant result, and, according to the judgment of one who well understood them, their spirit was sustained by a belief that they would soon be breaking into Sebastopol. It was in mercy that the future was veiled before them.

In turning over these fascinating pages it is the most piteous reading to see how utterly incapable were the transport and commissariat services to make any headway against the difficulties which surrounded them. Funds they had in abundance, but experience proves that a Government, buying things for an army from traders at home, may have, in spite of all their command of money, to wait a long time before the articles required are ready for delivery. Tents for our troops on the Chersonese were among the most urgent of all their wants, yet it took seven months before the 3,000 tents ordered in November had been landed at Balaclava. "If commerce was thus slow in London, the greatest mart in the world," cogently remarks our author, "much more might it be expected to baffle the Commissary-General, when labouring to effect purchases of those supplies—such as horses, bullocks, vegetables, sheep, hay—which he sought from the Levant." Take another instance, which is, perhaps, the best illustration of the collapse of the transport system that the "winter trouble" affords. The Prince Consort, seeing that our army was likely to winter on the heights before Sebastopol, had

conceived the graceful idea of sending out to his brother officers of the Grenadier Guards a supply of fur coats. This warm clothing was promptly despatched, yet it did not reach the Grenadiers till the spring of the following year, when already a warmth as of summer had caused such hot things as furs to be simply objects of loathing to the eye! And even when goods reached the harbour of Balaclava, there was the difficulty, it appears, of having them carried up to the camp. "For want of means to land or transship goods which had reached their destined ports," says Mr. Kinglake, "they too often remained on board during lengthened periods; and, apparently, it now and then happened that a vessel left the port she had reached without having completely discharged her cargo, yet continued to go on plying so that stores and munitions long moved to and fro on the waters. In one ghastly instance, the body of an Irish officer, despatched for interment at home, was somehow 'mislaid,' like the Prince Consort's furs, and apparently it must have voyaged, like a troubled spirit, from shore to shore, for the utmost labour of official investigators proved absolutely unable to trace it." As if our troops, shivering in an Arctic cold, torn by hunger and worn by toil, had not enough to test their temper and endurance, a terrible storm, one of the fiercest that had ever visited that district, broke out shortly after winter quarters had been assigned the men. It was an awful tempest of wind, thunder and lightning, heavy rain and blinding snow, which raged both on shore and sea. It wrecked no fewer than twenty-one of the vessels freighted with munitions and stores for our army. On the heights tents were rent to pieces and swept away utterly, with all the things they contained. Horses broke loose and fled wildly in all directions. Wagons were overturned, and of those stores of food and forage which had been brought up with so much labour to the camp, and which were so precious, great quantities were destroyed or spoilt. The hospital marquees had been the first to fall, and beneath them lay the sick and dying, exposed all at once to the pitiless blast and the thickening snows. The trenches were quickly flooded, and the men on duty were unable to cook their food, for no camp-fires could be lit. More than one brave fellow, we learn, laid himself down on that terrible night, starved and benumbed, to find on the frozen snow his shroud and grave. Unfortunately, among the vessels wrecked in the Black Sea was the *Prince*, a ship containing everything that was most wanted—warlike stores of every description, surgical instruments, guernsey frocks, stockings, boots, shoes; in short, all that foresight could devise for the equipment and comfort of the troops. Certainly, during the months of the winter of 1854-5 the endurance of English soldiery was tried more seriously

than it had ever been tested since the days of the Walcheren expedition.

And yet what made men's hearts fierce with indignation was the fact that in the French camp matters had been differently organized. There the soldier had his rations served out to him with regularity, he was well clothed and stoutly housed, his sanitary condition was well looked after, and he lacked for nothing which a soldier required when in face of the enemy. "Why," it was angrily asked in London, "should there be such grave mismanagement in the English camp when France was setting us such a totally different example?" Mr. Kinglake answers the query by attributing the blame to the various war departments which then existed, and which were each independent of the other. To use a homely proverb, it was a case of "too many cooks spoiling the broth." Before her feud with Russia, England possessed the Horse Guards, and in addition a couple of departments which connected themselves with the grave affairs of war by "three quaintly distinctive prepositions." There was the Colonial Minister, who was also the Minister *of* War, or, in other words, the Secretary of State *for* War; whilst the head of the War Office was the Secretary *at* War. Each of these Ministers had his own independent duties to perform, and as it appeared to be the rule of the department for no colleague to consult his fellow, a great amount of ignorance prevailed, and confusion necessarily arose. When the English nation became informed of the state of her soldiers in the Crimea, and of the unnecessary privations they had been made to endure, a violent outcry against the Government was raised. A pamphlet was circulated with the title "Whom shall we Hang?" and indeed, in the temper the country was in, vindictive measures would have been almost popular. The Aberdeen Cabinet was arraigned at the bar of the House of Commons, and resigned. Lord Palmerston came into power, and to the amiable but incompetent Duke of Newcastle Lord Panmure succeeded as Secretary at War. The new Minister was the exact opposite to his predecessor in office. His early life, owing to the vindictiveness of a tyrannical father, had been passed under conditions which had caused him to grow up a churl. He was rough-tongued, rough-mannered, and being utterly devoid of all sensitiveness, was never so happy as when attacking. He had scarcely accepted the Seals when he plainly showed the course he was to pursue. There had been the grossest mismanagement in the control of military details; revelations had been disclosed which should not have been made; mistakes had occurred proving the most culpable negligence; the supervision of the army was greatly at fault: to the mind of the new Secretary the one to whom blame really attached was the Commander-in-Chief. Lord Raglan was at the head of

military affairs; it was his duty to inquire into all matters connected with the *personnel* and *matériel* of the army; he lacked foresight in not having sooner come to the conclusion that it would be necessary for the troops to winter in the Crimea; clearly, in the opinion of the Secretary at War, the Commander-in-Chief was responsible for the blunders that had been committed. Lord Panmure wrote a severe letter to Lord Raglan. It is here that Mr. Kinglake displays his special pleading. Lord Raglan is his hero, and he will not permit a single accusation to be levied against him; he hotly vindicates his idol from all the charges brought against him, and attributes all the blame connected with the "winter troubles" to the authorities at home; and especially is he indignant that at such a season of grave crisis a Commander-in-Chief should have been harassed by such an unpleasant official correspondence. "Those who at all know," says Mr. Kinglake, "the value of a commander's buoyancy of spirit, and of his time and brain-power in the midst of an anxious campaign, will scarcely help thinking angrily of a Secretary of State who, whilst keeping Lord Raglan in the command of our army and involved in close strife with the enemy, could also lay upon him a task so hateful, so barren, so depressing as that of having to avert his glance from the enemy, and face round for an encounter of words with the Government of his own Sovereign." Lord Raglan in his reply clearly refuted all the accusations brought against him; yet we cannot place him, as Mr. Kinglake places him, among generals of the first rank. He was doubtless the victim of circumstances; yet it would appear most certainly that under his control of the troops upon the Chersonese heights there were a want of system, a want of personal supervision and of the quick seizing of practical advantages, which do not compare favourably with the tactics of General Canrobert. Still we must ever bear in mind that the one was well supported at home whilst the other was the very reverse.

Into the wide question of how far correspondents attached to newspapers should be allowed to accompany an army, we cannot here enter. Mr. Kinglake is very bitter against the *Times* for publishing the letters of Mr. Russell, its war correspondent. He asserts that the revelations those letters disclosed of the sad condition of the army were of benefit to the foe and greatly calculated to assist him in his operations against the Allies.[1] We can only reply that the Russians failed to avail themselves of the opportunity, if it ever existed, and that if it had not been for the *exposés* in the *Times* the Aberdeen Ministry would have

[1] For the refutation of these strictures, see Mr. Russell's articles in the *Army and Navy Gazette* for November.

in all probability been still allowed to continue its course of blundering and incapacity.

We owe, however, a debt of thanks, whilst on this subject, to our author. It is always interesting to be taken behind the scenes, and to watch the inner lives, veiled from the public gaze, of those who have attained to celebrity. Mr. Kinglake admits us not only into Printing House Square, but leads us upstairs into the very sanctum of the editor's room. During the crisis of the Crimean War, the *Times* was at the height of its power and popularity: its censure could then shake the stability of a government; its praise or abuse could make or crush the person selected; its intelligence became one of the necessities of the day. The proud position it then occupied was due in a great measure to the tact and foresight of Mr. Delane, the accomplished editor of the *Times*. From the contents of one waste-paper basket, which Mr. Kinglake gives us, we can judge how worried and badgered from all quarters was this important individual—the Jupiter Tonans of the press. "I demand the name," writes an angry concert singer, "of the musical critic who says I have lost a note." "Have come straight from our Chief," jots a private secretary down upon his card; am authorized to tell you all." "Only one moment—last importance." A divine, haled before the Judicial Committee, sends up his card desiring an interview: "I have brought a few books," says this worthy, "to show that the Privy Council is guilty of heresy." A distinguished officer, invalided from the Crimea, pens a few hasty lines, preferring this modest request, "Travelling straight round by Ireland, I have come home on sick leave to ask for the command of the 'flying column.' Please just say it would be profligate to appoint any man except me." An anxious wife, mindful of the privations that her beloved has to endure on the Chersonese heights, pencils on the card she sends upstairs by the messenger, "Seeing how careful you are about parcels and things for our army, I have come with supplies of fresh linen and eight hampers for my husband in the horrid Crimea. Having lost all confidence in the Government, I send these things out by the *Times*." Then, woman-like, she despatches a second card with the invariable feminine P.S. "An editor of your well-known sagacity will see at a glance which end of each hamper must always, please, be kept uppermost." An author who attributes to treachery what in all probability is only due to his own incapacity, writes on his pasteboard, "I propose to lay bare the conspiracy which prevents the sale of my poem." Some hurried politicians drive up to Printing House Square and send in their cards. "Give me only two minutes! the fate of the Government is at stake." "One minute!" says another; "the fate of the party." "A moment!" writes a third; "the fate of the country." The

divine, irritated at waiting, sends up a second card with, "I am still outside with my books, and what's more I won't go away until you solemnly promise to let the Privy Council be smashed." A wife, evidently a case of the grey mare being the better horse, drives into the square and hands in these eager words—"I come straight from the Commons and left my husband still speaking; thought him weak; I trust only in you to make his speech seem nice and forcible; both our 'Whips' in a flurry; my little French maid here—yes, yes, sir, I come with my maid—would certainly manage men better; division not expected till nearly 4 o'clock; please come down and speak to me at the door of my carriage." Second card from the same: "You say *impossible?* Fiddlestick! how dare you keep me waiting out here at 2 o'clock in the morning, in this absurd Printing House Square? come down, I tell you, at once!" Who can estimate the number of eager words written in pencil upon cards and leaves of pocket-books which in stirring seasons the porters of the *Times* had to take up to the Editor's room—or to say they had taken up?

We now turn to that episode in the war which stands out as one of the brightest chapters in the history of humanity. No sooner did it become known to the population of our towns that there were Englishmen in a distant land, fighting for the honour of their country amid all the rigours of the severest hardship, and deprived of the necessities of life, than a great cry arose that something must be instantly done for the brave and unfortunate soldiery. If the Government had blundered, and the Commander-in-Chief had been lacking in prescience, that was no reason why the country should follow their example. Committees were held, funds were raised, provisions and clothing were collected, and soon steamers and transports were pressing through the Dardanelles to unlade their rich cargoes at Balaclava.[1] But assist-

[1] Here is a sketch of one of the agents administering the relief-fund in the Crimea: "The division of labour adopted by the two honorary agents threw, mainly, it seems, upon one of them that part of the duty which aimed at wringing work from the Croats [the name given in the camp to some Asiatic hired labourers]. Tower was not only a man of indomitable activity, and addicted more than other frail mortals to painful, resolute 'forethought,' but moreover was so grandly constituted as to be capable of enthusiastic devotion to a 'cause;' and the 'cause' of our glorious soldiery having fiercely laid hold of him—laid hold of him heart and soul—the torrent of his energies was a force too strong to be withstood, too strong to be even confronted by Asiatic men. Reducing his 'Croats' to sheer slavery, yet studying with thoughtful kindness their wants, their wishes, their habits, ascertaining and procuring for them the exact kind of food—mainly bread and dried fruit—that best would nourish their strength, and the most beloved sort of tobacco with which to reward a day's toil, he respected all their best feelings—except their love of repose—and proved able to make them get through the whole quantity of labour required. Soon, beside Kadiköi, on the road between camp and port, there

ance of another and of a more sacred character was also to be despatched. To assuage the pain of suffering, to keep gentle but vigilant ward over the sick, to soften and check the impetuosities of the invalid, have always been the especial province of women. Therefore, when every household in our midst had learnt how our troops had fought, and how pitiless was their condition as they lay dying and wounded in want of proper medical aid and attention, the hearts of many noble women "were stirred with a heavenly thought, impelling them to offer and say that if only the State were consenting, they would go out to tend our poor soldiers laid low on their hospital pallets by sickness or wounds." The Government, so far as all hospital purposes were concerned, was represented by Mr. Sidney Herbert. This gifted Minister had formed a strong belief in the advantages our military hospitals would gain by accepting womanly aid, and he had sent out to the East some chosen bands of ladies and salaried female attendants accustomed to hospital duties, requesting that they should be employed where their presence would be the most felt and appreciated. To such a man this offer of nursing, and from the tender-hearted ladies of England, was most welcome, and gladly accepted. Thus it was that now, at this sad time, there went out from us angel-women, resolved to confront that whole world of horror and misery that can be gathered into a military hospital from camp or battle-field; and their plea, when they asked to be trusted with this

---

sprang up wooden storehouses, and stacks of bales and chests, and there, too, men observed as they passed that under some motive force newly reaching Crim-Tartary, there had been generated a seething activity; mules, horses, carts coming in laden, and finding men to unload them; splendid sailors—the men of the yacht—bringing strength and resource from on board; men entrenching the ground to find shelter for hampers and bales; interpreters lightly bridging the gulf between the mind of the East and the mind of the West; strong barbarians carrying loads; and—propeller of all—his great eyes flaming with zeal, his mighty beard, laden or spangled like the bough of a cedar on Lebanon with whatever the skies might send down, whether snow, or sleet, or rain—an eagle-faced vehement Englishman, commanding, warning, exhorting; swooping down in vast seven-leagued boots through the waters and quagmires upon any one of his Mussulmans who, under cover of piety (when wanting a few moments of rest), stopped kneeling too long at his prayers. If any wayfarer, passing between camp and port, sought to learn what all the stir meant, he might be told, perhaps, Orientally, by some of the bearers of burthens, that 'the will of Allah—his name be it blest!—had made them the hard-driven slaves of the sacredly bearded commander, the all-compelling, the sleepless, the inexorable Father of boxes—the Father of boxes more numerous than even the seed of Sheik Ibrahim after ninety and nine generations;' whilst the answer to any such question, if drawn from an English officer, was likely to be altogether neglectful of the spiritual element, and simply explain in five words that the cause of all the commotion was 'Tom Tower working his Croats.'"

painful, this heartrending mission, was simply the natural aptitude of their sex for ministering to those who lie prostrate from sickness and wounds. It was seen that the humble soldiers were likely to be those most in want of care, and the ladies were instructed to abstain from attending upon any of the officers. At the head of this merciful staff was one whose name will ever be fondly remembered so long as human suffering endures. Miss Nightingale had become well versed in the business of hospital management; her tact was consummate; her industry and devotion to the cause she had taken in hand were unbounded; and, above all, she was thoroughly practical in all her actions. She completely understood the dire exigencies of war, and she knew that for affording due care to a prostrate soldier an administrative mechanism both inspired and controlled by authority was a condition of absolute need; thus she was not only a nurse, but a disciplinarian. Her portrait is thus sketched by Mr. Kinglake:—"If the generous women thus sacrificing themselves were all alike in devotion to their sacred cause, there was one of them—the Lady-in-Chief—who not only came armed with the special experience needed, but also was clearly transcendant in that subtle quality which gives to one human being a power of command over others. Of slender delicate form, engaging, highly-bred, and in council a rapt careful listener so long as others were speaking, and strongly though gently persuasive whenever speaking herself, the Lady-in-Chief—the Lady Florence, Miss Nightingale—gave her heart to this enterprise in a spirit of absolute devotion." Of the incalculable benefits that were the result of this system of engaging true Christian ladies to nurse the sick and wounded it is impossible to speak. What number of lives were saved by long and earnest vigils when science almost despaired, no statistics of course can show; still less can we measure or record the alleviation of misery effected by the care and gracious presence of women like Mary Stanley and Florence Nightingale, and the rest of their band of ministering angels. Beneath the influence of these tender delicately nurtured dames the rude rough soldiers were instantly humanized, and their thoughts seemed instinctively to wing back their flight to the earlier and more innocent days of their life, before the dissipation of garrison towns had deadened their minds to higher and purer motives. Coarse expressions and oaths, derived from camp and barracks, died out in the wards as though exorcised by the sacred spell of the presence of kind and gentle women, and gave way to murmurs of gratitude. Often the rude soldier, who had known nothing of religion save to take the Holy Name in vain, to give expression to infamous language, when talking to his lady-nurse, used to speak as though the worship he owed her and the worship he owed to heaven were blending into one senti-

ment. "Oh," said one to the lady he saw bending over his pallet, "you are taking me on the way to heaven; don't forsake me now!" When a man was under delirium the magic force of a pure woman's presence almost always transported him to the home of his childhood, and in the fever of his wandering he ever kept on crying "Mother! mother!" as he looked at his nurse or held her hand. A patient might be refractory, might refuse to take his medicine, might be rude to the doctor or the officer going his rounds; but a word from his lady-nurse was sufficient to restore him to his better self, and render him obedient. "Never," writes Miss Nightingale, "never came from any of them one word, nor one look, which a gentleman would not have used; and while paying this humble tribute to humble courtesy the tears come into my eyes as I think how, amidst scenes of loathsome disease and death, there rose above it all the innate dignity, gentleness and chivalry of the men—for never, surely, was chivalry so strikingly exemplified—shining in the midst of what must be considered as the lowest sinks of human misery, and preventing instinctively the use of one expression which could distress a gentlewoman." Who, after reading these labours in the vast barrack hospital at Scutari, can say that the arena of woman's work is limited, and that there is little scope for the exercise of her special gifts, and of the practical energy with which she is endowed? The suffering and the brutal will, alas! be always with us.

This volume of Mr. Kinglake's teaches us one great lesson—that though it is easy to declare war, it yet taxes all the resources of a nation like ours to be at once, on the call to arms, equal to the business of war.

Art. IV.—THE CHURCH PASTORAL AID SOCIETY.

1. *Report of the Committee.* Read at the First Annual Meeting on the 9th of May, 1836.
2. *Report of the Committee.* Read at the Forty-fifth Annual Meeting on the 6th of May, 1880.

Part I.

THE subject of Home Missions is from its very nature not calculated to excite the same romantic interest as that of missions to the heathen. Not only is the field of labour more circumscribed, but the work itself is not attended with the same attractive features of novelty, with the same accompaniments of travel and adventure. The gloom of our mining and manufac-

turing districts is less agreeable to dwell upon than the gorgeous sunshine of the tropics. The grimy alleys of our crowded towns are not so pleasant to think of as the virgin snows of the boundless plains over which the gospel is now being carried to the Red Indians and the Esquimaux. We prefer to keep before our mind's eye the picture of the sun-darkened skin of the Hindoo to that of the smoke-begrimed countenance of the collier; and the childish superstition of the Chinaman, and blind idolatry of the negro, are less repellent than the drunkenness and vice, and degradation of the lowest classes of our home population. It is, therefore, no matter of wonder that the Church Pastoral Aid Society should fail to arouse so great an enthusiasm, and to be the subject of so many, or such numerously attended meetings as her elder and more wealthy sister, the Church Missionary Society, or to enlist the same army of subscribers and collectors with as large an array of collecting-books, and cards and boxes, and other machinery for eliciting contributions.

While, however, there cannot be two opinions as to the fallacy of the old-fashioned, but now exploded application of the maxim that "charity begins at home" to the evangelization of the world, in the sense that we ought to eradicate all heathenism and ignorance in our own country before undertaking missions to the heathen abroad, it is clear that the opposite extreme is equally indefensible, and that to support foreign missions exclusively, and neglect the existing spiritual destitution at home, would be alike unnatural and unchristian. St. Paul's declaration, that if any man provide not for his own, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel, may well be applied to a church which should neglect her own people, while engaged in endeavours to spread the gospel in other lands. Woe would it be to any Christian nation, of whom it could be said, in the language of Solomon, "they made her the keeper of the vineyards, but her own vineyard has she not kept." We are thankful to say that no such charge can fairly be brought against the Evangelicals of the Church of England. It was at a meeting of about seventy clergymen and laymen, in the offices of the Church Missionary Society itself, that on the 19th of February, 1836, the Church Pastoral Aid Society was formed. The chair was taken on the occasion by Lord Shaftesbury (then Lord Ashley), who has ever since continued the venerated president of the Society; and among those present we find the honoured names of the Rev. Josiah Pratt, Rev. Thos. Snow, Rev. Thos. Dale, Sir Andrew Agnew, Hon. C. Brodrick (afterwards Viscount Midleton), John Labouchere, J. C. Colquhoun, and Hon. Capt. F. Maude. It is difficult for those of us whose personal experience only ranges over the latter half of the period of nearly

forty-five years which has since elapsed, to realize the condition to which our Church had at that time become reduced, through the increase of our population and the growth of our large towns, without any corresponding extension of her parochial machinery. Some idea of the state of things may be formed from the fact, that on Bishop Blomfield's translation to the See of London in 1828, he found thirty-four of the metropolitan parishes, with a population of 1,137,000, in which there were not more than 75 clergy, or one to every 15,000 souls. One of these parishes contained 40,000 inhabitants, under the charge of a single clergyman. The condition of our other great towns was not quite so deplorable, but we shall not be far wrong in estimating, that taking one with another, the average population under the charge of each individual among our urban clergy was at that time between 7,000 and 8,000, or about four times as many as an active clergyman can be reasonably expected to supply with adequate pastoral ministrations. When it is remembered that in those days the assistance of the laity in direct spiritual work was almost unknown, we shall not be surprised that the state of things was such as to call forth the alarm and sympathy of earnest and thoughtful members of our Church.

At the meeting, to which I have alluded, a Statement of the Design of the Society was agreed upon for publication and circulation, with a view to enlisting support on its behalf, and a constitution and regulations for its governance were approved. The object of the founders of the Society, as set forth in the Statement, was to render aid to those clergymen who were anxious to bring the entire population of their parishes under religious culture, but who had not the means of efficiently attaining their wish. It was proposed that the Society should render this aid by contributing towards an increase, both in the number of places of worship and in the living agency. The increase of places of worship would, it was pointed out, require an increase of clergymen; and though, as we shall see, contributions towards church-building were soon abandoned, it seems in the first instance to have been contemplated that the multiplication of buildings and men should proceed concurrently. At the same time, however, it was stated that, as regarded the supply of personal labour, the Society proposed the employment, when sufficient clerical assistance could not be obtained, of duly qualified laymen to act in subordination to the incumbent and under his direction and control. While there was one class of laymen which might be specially available for this purpose, namely, candidates for holy orders, who often completed their university course some time before they were of age for ordination, it was felt that it would be necessary to seek for other duly-qualified laymen, and to engage in many cases the services of professional scripture readers.

The constitution of the Society, as put forth in the original statement, has, with one exception to be mentioned immediately, remained unaltered to the present day. The Society is under the direction of a committee which meets once a month, and consists of a President, Vice-Presidents, Vice-Patrons, Treasurer and Secretaries, twenty-four lay members of the Church of England elected at the Annual Meeting of the Society, and all clergymen who subscribe half a guinea or collect fifty-two shillings annually towards its funds, or have given a benefaction of ten guineas, or made a congregational collection of twenty guineas. It was originally provided that these clerical members might take a part in all discussions of the committee, but should only be entitled to vote if they had attended half the meetings of the committee during the preceding year. This restriction, however, was removed in April, 1841. Within a month after the formation of the Society a sub-committee of management and preliminary correspondence was appointed, consisting of twelve lay and twelve clerical members of the committee to investigate the applications for aid, both when originally made and when coming up for renewal at the end of each year, and to consider and make recommendations to the general committee on all matters of business connected with the Society. This sub-committee has ever since May, 1836, met in the Society's office, with only short stated intervals of vacation, on every Tuesday morning, at eight o'clock, for a two hours' sitting. Except in cases of special difficulty, or when some important principle is involved, the general committee adopts and acts upon its recommendations without question. At the close of each meeting of the sub-committee, the clerical members alone resolve themselves into a committee for reviewing the nominations of the curates and lay assistants who are proposed as occupants of the Society's grants, with a view to being satisfied that they are faithful and devoted men, and are imbued with Protestant and Evangelical principles. That the incumbents to whom aid is to be given are men of this description is as far as possible ascertained by the sub-committee before recommending them to the general committee as recipients of grants.

I have said that it is difficult at the present day to realize the state of spiritual destitution which existed at the time of the formation of the Society. It is equally difficult to realize the jealousy and suspicion with which, at that time, when voluntary Church work was comparatively unknown, any scheme for infusing an extraneous element into the parochial organization, no matter in how orderly a way, or with how desirable an object, was sure to be regarded. It was to no purpose that it was expressly declared by the second of the Society's fundamental regulations that "The object of this

Society shall be to promote the religious influence of the United Church by such methods only as it may be competent to a voluntary society to employ in entire consistency with her discipline and order." The Rev. Hugh Stowell, in the first of the Annual Sermons preached on behalf the Society, alluded to an insinuation which had at the outset been made in reference to it, that its operations would have a tendency to disturb ecclesiastical order, break down the beautiful parochial system of the Church, and interfere with the legitimate position and authority of her constituted ministry. A large portion of the Statement was accordingly devoted to deprecating this suspicion. It was emphatically declared that there was no design of obtruding assistance where it was not desired, nor of infringing in the slightest degree the discipline of the Church. The founders, it was added, were well aware that there were circumstances in those times which might justly cause the authorities in the Church to hesitate in taking the lead in new plans until their beneficial bearing and direction should have been sufficiently ascertained. On this account they did not ask immediately for any avowed patronage of that description, being satisfied that the Society would receive full countenance and support, when it should be seen that the simple principle of supplying to the clergy greater means of usefulness in the discharge of their recognized duties opened a wide field of orderly and beneficial action. This expectation was not destined to be realized so speedily or fully as the founders had perhaps anticipated. Two matters connected with the working of the Society have prevented it from receiving that complete patronage of the episcopal bench which, doubtless, would otherwise have been accorded to it. I allude, first, to the control exercised by the Society over the choice of the labourers whom it supports; and, secondly, the employment of lay agents. The importance of these two subjects demands that we should enter into them somewhat in detail.

Before the Society had been many months in existence, communications reached the committee which showed that the principles of the Society with respect to the appointment of its agents were in many quarters misunderstood. They accordingly, in November, 1836, adopted and published a minute, in which they explained that in all cases in which a grant was made by the Society towards the employment of either a clerical or a lay assistant, the incumbent applying for aid was requested to nominate the person to be engaged, and to give such information respecting him as would afford the Society satisfaction in his appointment, the committee deeming it their explicit duty to be fully satisfied respecting the sentiments and character of all agents supported in whole or in part by the Society. Or should

the incumbent request the committee to recommend an assistant to him, the fullest information would be given respecting the person so recommended, and the nomination entirely submitted to the judgment of the applicant. "All grants," it was added, "from the Society's funds are made to the incumbent." A published statement of this minute gave satisfaction not only to persons who were already friends of the Society, but also to many others who, from erroneous impressions, had previously withheld from it their support. In order, however, to avoid all possible misapprehension in the future, and to give permanence to the statement, the committee recommended a new regulation of the Society in addition to the seven already existing, which was accordingly adopted at a Special General Meeting convened for the purpose on the 18th of April, 1837. This regulation, which has ever since guided the practice of the Society with reference to the selection of the labourers, both clerical and lay, whom it supports out of its funds, was in the following terms:—

VIII. No grant from the Society's funds for the benefit of any parish or district can be made, unless the incumbent himself shall apply or sanction the application for aid, and shall furnish to the committee sufficient proof of the exigencies of the case. The nomination of an assistant shall always be left with the clergyman to whom aid is given, the committee claiming only full satisfaction as to the qualifications of his nominee; who, when approved, will be under engagement only to the clergyman by whom he is employed, and solely responsible to him. Grants from the Society towards the support of an assistant are made to the clergyman to whom aid is given, and are voted for one year.

But misrepresentations on the subject did not thenceforth wholly cease. On the contrary, erroneous allegations were made against the Society that the nominees were examined by, and their testimonials submitted to, a *lay* committee. This, it was said, was a slur on the bishops, who, it was to be presumed, would in every case adequately ascertain the fitness of a candidate for holy orders before ordaining him, and also before approving him for a curacy. If, then, an individual had satisfied the episcopal requirements, what right had a private committee, and particularly a committee composed, at any rate in part, of laymen, afterwards to sit in judgment upon him, and possibly reject him as unfit to be employed as a curate? It was, moreover, an infringement of the rights of incumbents, who ought to have the exclusive power of appointing their own assistants in parochial work, subject only to the control of the bishop. It might have been answered to the first objection that if it was sound in principle, it ought to extend to precluding a lay patron from inquiring into the fitness of any clergyman who

might be a candidate for a living in his gift; and to the second, that an incumbent who was unable to provide himself with an assistant without aid from the Society, could not reasonably object to the Society satisfying itself that the man on whose maintenance its funds were bestowed, was deserving of its approval. In point of fact, however, the complaints were incorrect in substance. The examination of all testimonials of nominees, as we have already seen, has always been confided to a committee composed of *clergymen only*. This was provided for by an express resolution of the committee in 1840. With respect to curates, so far from assuming to set aside the approval of the diocesan, it has ever been the constant desire of the committee, and they have sedulously enjoined it upon incumbents applying for aid, that all necessary inquiries should be made *before* any nomination to the bishop takes place. These points are distinctly brought out in the circular which, from the earliest years of the Society's existence, has been sent to applicants for aid, directing them how to proceed in order to obtain the desired assistance. The fifth clause of that circular runs as follows:[1]—

> If a grant can be made, and you are prepared to nominate either a curate or lay-assistant, you will be pleased to state his name, qualifications, testimonials, references, and other particulars, in a separate letter addressed "to the *Clerical* Secretary," to whom, with the other *clerical* members of the sub-committee, it belongs to inquire concerning nominations, and to report the same to the committee, when satisfactory; *until the result of such inquiry is communicated to you, you are requested not to nominate to the bishop, nor to conclude any engagement.* Correspondence with parties referred to by the nominee is first to be entered into by the incumbent applying for aid, who is then to forward to the clerical secretary copies or extracts of such correspondence, as it is particularly desired that the claim of "full satisfaction," pursuant to Regulation VIII., should not prevent the primary correspondence and satisfaction of the incumbent.

With these limitations as to the mode of exercising it, the committee have ever felt themselves bound, according to the laws of the Society, to enforce their claim to be fully satisfied as to the qualifications of the persons to be engaged by means of its grants, with a view to the maintenance of such as will "zealously and faithfully co-operate with the incumbent."

The employment of laymen as assistants to the clergy in their spiritual work, constituted from the first another ground of suspicion and objection against the Society—being at that time comparatively a novelty. That men whose qualifications had not been approved of by a bishop, and who had not been set

[1] The italics are given as in the printed circular.

apart for the purpose by ordination, should undertake any functions of a spiritual character, was thought to be an unwarrantable infringement of the ministerial office, and a breach of the order and discipline of the Church. The Society endeavoured to overcome the opposition felt to their course in the matter, first by pointing out what they considered to be the absolute necessity for resorting to it, and secondly, by imposing very strict limitations on the duties to be undertaken by the lay agents. In numerous instances sufficient clerical assistance could not be obtained. The choice lay between giving to a parish the aid of a lay agent or none at all. "The employment of lay agency must," it was said,[1] "be considered as affording, in many cases, the groundwork of any success commensurate to the hope and desire of true Christians. It is by such agency, in a great measure, that the mass of the people are to be brought, by the Divine blessing, to become willing and desirous to place themselves under the ministry of the word." But it was carefully added, "the lay agent is to be considered as the visitor of families, and by no means as taking on himself the office of a public instructor or preacher—as, in subordination to the incumbent, leading the people to frequent the house of God, filling the churches already built, or creating a desire and necessity for others."

The objections to the Society in respect of the choice of its curates and the employment of lay agents resulted in the fact that at the end of the second year of its existence only four members of the episcopal bench were found among its vice-patrons—viz., the Bishops of Winchester, Chester, Chichester, and Llandaff. Two others, the Bishops of Salisbury and Norwich, had consented to fill that office but had died during the year. Twelve months afterwards the number of episcopal vice-patrons was six; and from that time it gradually and steadily increased, until, at the date of the last Report, twenty members of the English episcopate, besides one Scotch and several Colonial bishops, were included in the list. The Society first obtained the adhesion of the Primate of all England in 1848. As regards one of the grounds of objection to the Society, however, subsequent events and the current of public opinion of late years have more than justified the action of its founders. The extent to which the employment of lay agency is at present sanctioned and practised in our Church, far surpasses the modest ideas on the subject which they ventured to propound. They probably never anticipated that within about forty years from the time when they were so violently assailed for

[1] See the original "Statement of the Design of the Society" already referred to.

introducing a dangerous innovation, bishops of our Church would avowedly patronize and support associations of lay workers in their dioceses which distinctly put forward the conducting or assisting at services for the poor in school and mission rooms, and in the open air, as one of the kinds of work open to laymen, or that the episcopal bench would unanimously resolve in favour of the institution of an office of reader, the holders of which, being laymen without salary, should, under commission from the bishop of the diocese, render general aid to the clergy in all ministrations not strictly requiring the aid of one in holy orders, and, among other things, read prayers and Holy Scripture with exposition, in places defined by the commission.[1] In fact, the Church Pastoral Aid Society ultimately found itself behind the times in the matter, for until seven years ago the circular of directions to applicants for aid contained a clause calling "particular attention" to the circumstance that, if it was desired to engage the services of a lay assistant, he must be employed simply as a district visitor, tract distributor, and scripture reader, "and by no means as a public instructor or preacher." At length, in June, 1874, the attention of the Committee having been directed to the anachronism, it was resolved that the insertion of the clause in the circular should be discontinued.

The other objection, that, namely, as to the control over the nomination of curates, has not vanished in the same manner. It was dissipated in many quarters when the actual mode in which the control was exercised came to be understood; but ignorance on the subject, either actual or wilful, has continued largely to prevail. Thus, even as late as July, 1867, the *Quarterly Review* could venture on the sneer that the Society "subjects" the curates designated to occupy its grants "to the investigation of a board of 'tryers,' who, if half that is reported of them be true, would not be unworthy of the most palmy days of Puritanism under Cromwell and Barebones." And even when the practice of the Society has been fully understood, we cannot be surprised that it has failed to meet with universal approval. It is doubtless the cause why to this day some of our bishops decline to be vice-patrons of the Society. And ever and anon, when an incumbent, holding a grant for a curate from the Society, has disregarded the explicit directions contained in the circular, and nominated a curate to the bishop before procuring his approval by the Society, and the Society has then declined to allow him to occupy its grant, it has created a temporary soreness and alienation from the Society. Thus, in 1853, Bishop

[1] See Resolutions unanimously agreed to at a meeting of Archbishops and Bishops held at Lambeth on Ascension Day, 1866.

Wilberforce, then of Oxford, resigned his post of vice-patron, on the ground of the Society's veto on curates designated for its grants. He, however, re-connected himself with the Society in November, 1869, on his translation to the see of Winchester, feeling it, no doubt, his duty to do so, on account of the numerous grants from the Society existing in his new diocese. It was the same practice of the Society, too, which mainly led, in the year following its foundation, to the formation of the sister society—the Society for Promoting the Employment of Additional Curates—the principles of which professedly are to grant aid to incumbents of necessitous parishes, without inquiring into their opinions, or into the men whom they intend to employ as curates. So far from feeling any regret at the establishment of this Society, I am sure that all earnest supporters of the Church Pastoral Aid Society must ever regard its existence with unfeigned satisfaction. While we believe our own to be the more excellent way, we cannot expect that all members of our Church should be of the like mind with ourselves; and we rejoice that those who are not should exhibit a similar zeal, and put forth similar efforts, on behalf of the spiritually needy parishes in the land. In fact, when we endeavour to estimate the benefits which the founders of the Church Pastoral Aid Society conferred on the National Church and on the cause of Christ in England, we may fairly reckon not only the work done during forty-five years by their own Society, but also, in a sense, all that has been accomplished during forty-four years by the other Society, for the formation of which their action suggested the idea and supplied the stimulus.

PHILIP VERNON SMITH.

ART. V.—A RELIGIOUS CENSUS.

THE following tables are drawn up from *Whitaker's Almanack* for 1880, a most respectable authority, and give us the nearest approach to a religious census that the Imperial Parliament will allow us to have.:—

UNITED KINGDOM.

I. Episcopal Churches:—

	Bishops.	Ministers.
1. Church of England . . .	30	23,000
2. Church of Ireland	12	1,800
3. Episcopal Church of Scotland . .	7	225
4. Moravian Church		38
		25,063

II. Congregational Churches:—

		Bishops.	Ministers.
1. 2.	Independent { England, Scotland, and Ireland }	3,3~~4~~3	{ 3,205 128
3.	Baptists		1,879
4.	Countess of Huntingdon's Connexion		37
			5,249

III. Presbyterian Churches:—

1.	Church of Scotland	3,139	1,530
2.	Free Church		1,026
3.	United Presbyterian		583
4.	Presbyterian Church of England		278
5.	Presbyterian Church in Ireland		635
6.	Calvinistic Methodists		814
			4,866

IV. Methodist Churches:—

1.	Wesleyan Methodist	2,136
2.	Primitive Methodist	1,138
3.	Methodist Free Churches	368
4.	Methodist New Connexion and Bible Christians	356
		3,998

V. Total:—

1.	Episcopal	25,063
2.	Congregational	5,249
3.	Presbyterian	4,866
4.	Methodist	3,998
		39,176

VI.

1.	Episcopal	25,063
2.	Non-Episcopal	14,113
		39,176

ENGLAND ALONE.

VII. Total:—

1.	Episcopal		23,000
2.	Congregational		5,121
3.	Presbyterian		1,092
4.	Methodist	about*	3,798
			33,011

* Deducting 200 for Irish Methodists.

VIII.:

Episcopal	23,000
Non-Episcopal	10,011
	33,011

We are able by the above tables to estimate, in a rough sort of way, the comparative strength of the different Protestant churches of this country. And whilst there is much to deplore with regard to their existence, and especially with regard to the causes which gave them origin, there are some circumstances in relation to them which are calculated to encourage the sincere Christian. First, all these great bodies hold substantially, if not formally, the Three Creeds. They acknowledge the Trinity, the proper Divinity of the Son, and the Personality of the Holy Spirit. They have, too, a regular ministry. Secondly, there is really no serious difference in doctrine or discipline, with the exception of the Moravians in Table I. and the Baptists in Table II., between the members of the different groups. They are but different organizations pursuing the same end in the same way. Looking at the matter broadly, with the exceptions above mentioned, the Protestantism of this country may be divided into the Episcopal, the Congregational, the Presbyterian, and the Methodist churches.

When we look, however, at the smaller sects we find less matter for satisfaction. But even here the state of affairs, though bad enough, is not so bad as it is usually represented. The Bishop of Manchester, some time since, is reported to have said, quoting the authority from which the tables are taken, that there were above 170 sects in Protestantism. It is true that there are at least 170 sects mentioned in the table of religious sects having places of meeting certified to the Registrar-General. But a careful examination of this table will show that, in addition to the great bodies whose statistics have already been given above, it contains many duplicates, that is, the same body under different names, as Primitive Methodists or Ranters. It contains, too, foreign congregations and sects and non-Protestant bodies. These cannot fairly be put down to English Protestantism. It contains, too, some special missions, such as the Newcastle Sailors' Society, which can hardly come into the calculation. In addition, it has detailed various meetings of Brethren rejoicing in a separate name. If we leave out all these duplicates and extraneous bodies, we find the number of the smaller sects to be about ninety, and familiar acquaintance with their details might still reduce this number. It is, however, sufficiently large.

They are :—

Advent Christians
Advents, The
Second Advent Brethren
Arminian New Society
Southcottians
Benevolent Methodists
Free Methodists
Independent Methodists
Modern Methodists
New Methodists
Refuge Methodists
Temperance Methodists
Wes. Methodist Association
Wes. Reform Glory Band
Calvinists and Welsh Calvinists
Welsh Free Presbyterians
Covenanters
Catholic Apostolic Church
Calvinistic Baptists
Congregational Baptists
Baptist New Connexion
Old Baptist
Open Baptist
Particular Baptist
Presbyterian Baptist
Scotch Baptist
Seventh-day Baptist
Strict Baptist
Union Baptist
Unitarian Baptist
Brethren
Christian Eliasites
Christian Israelites
Christian Teetotallers
Christian Temperance Men
Congregational Temperance Free Church
Christian Unionists
Evangelical Unionists
Free Union Church
Independent Unionists
Protestant Union
Unionists
Union Churchmen
Union Congregationalists
United Christian Church
Church of the People
Church of Progress
Eclectics
Episcopalian Dissenters
Free Church Episcopal
Protestants adhering to Article I.–XVIII. but rejecting Ritual
Protestant Members of the Church of England
Reformed Church of England
Reformed Episcopal Church
Free Evangelical Christians
Free Grace Gospel Christians
Free Gospellers
Glassites
Halifax Psychological Society
Humanitarians
Christadelphians
Unitarians
Free Christians
Free Christian Association
Unitarian Christians
Independ. Religious Reformers
Inghamites
New Church
Order of St. Austin, The
Peculiar People
Primitive Congregation
Primitive Free Church
Progressionists
Protestant Trinitarians
Trinitarians
Providence
Quakers
Rational Christians
Reformers
Recreative Religionists
Salem Society
Sandemanians
Separatists (Protestant)
Spiritual Church
Spiritualists
Testimony Cong. Church
Glory Band
Hallelujah Band
Missionaries
Revivalists
Revival Band
Universal Christians
Unsectarian.

CHARLES SCOTT.

Art. VI.—CHRISTIAN WORK.

THE INDIVIDUAL AND THE SYSTEM.

THERE is no more difficult subject to deal with than that of Christian Work, and how it is to be done. Simple though it seems to do some work for God, and to take up that which appears most suitable to our powers and position, it is by no means so simple in reality. The fact is, that our great enemy uses his power of opposition most particularly whenever any useful work is being done, and endeavours to divert it from its aim by causing every kind of difficulty and hindrance.

There appear to be two dangers, or rather groups of dangers, equally real, and in some senses equally great, which meet us in considering this subject—the one the dangers of too much individuality, and the other the dangers of two much system. The former class lead to isolation, narrowness, and selfishness; the latter have a tendency towards mechanism and unreality—towards the loss of the *spirit* in the *arrangement*.

To go more into detail. The first class of dangers attack both the Worker and the work. And to begin with the Worker. We will suppose some gentleman or lady, conscious of the need of workers in the vineyard, and conscious of a certain power for work, beginning some undertaking entirely by themselves. They are anxious to be quite independent, to have no interference, to have full scope for the powers which they feel they possess, to be able unfettered to follow out their own theories, and to make their own experiments. The first result may be outwardly satisfactory: they may realize the sense of popularity, they may have the satisfaction of succeeding where others have failed, they may attach to themselves a class, or a body of workers, or a district, or a mission; but meanwhile are they not losing the blessing of associated work, and running a great risk of magnifying themselves, and forgetting that they are only the earthen vessels in which the treasure is given for a time, and which at the Master's pleasure are broken or laid aside? Again, there is the danger of thinking the particular work in which they are engaged is the only work. Everything is looked at in its bearing on that work; the undertakings of others are ignored, or it may be even opposed; the advantage of conference is lost; and instead of the thought of our unprofitableness being the prominent one in our minds, it gives place to an idea of our own value, and even to a kind of notion that our Master cannot do without us. Then too we are in danger of using up our own material, for we are living on ourselves; and the more isolated and selfish we become in our work, the less near we draw our Father in heaven and to the one source of all strength.

Nor does the work escape; for, being the creation of one mind guided by no general principles, fenced by no boundaries, governed by no discipline, it is apt to be eclectic and not comprehensive, partial and not complete. Many forget the responsibility of *omission* in any work that they undertake, and are apt to console themselves with what they do, and shut their eyes to what they do not do. And then there is the great danger of interference; for, working apart, it is not easy always to keep clear of ground occupied by another, and so it very often happens that one corner of the field is, as it were, worked twice over, and another is untouched.

And then, if work has been jealously kept in one hand—has been always "my work" and entirely isolated from all others—what is to happen when the Workman begins to fail, and the health gives way or the summons comes to go home. The mantle is not easily left to another, and those who have been attached to one individual, and been taught, perhaps unintentionally, to look upon themselves as apart from other work, not unfrequently break up altogether, and scatter to the four winds, leaving the work of years, as far as the eye can see, without result, and almost as if it had never been.

Or it may be that the prosperity of an individual work excites the jealousy of others who have their own pet schemes, and who are endeavouring to gain all that they can for them; and then follow—it is no unreal contingency—accusations and counter-accusations, revelations and counter-revelations: much made of little mistakes. And the work of God stands still while the Labourers are carrying on their unseemly contention.

But the other side, as we have said, is not without equal dangers. The earnest Worker gives himself up to the arrangements of a system; accepts rules and restrictions, not always wisely laid down; sees an opening here and a path of usefulness there; and is unable, from the machinery with which he or she is surrounded, to take advantage of the one or the other. Thus such a one becomes fretted and harassed, and instead of working freely, and bringing out the powers that they have, the freshness is taken from the work; it becomes a burden, and eventually is laid down with a feeling that the life is gone from it, and that it has ceased to be worth doing, being reduced to a mere piece of machinery. Sometimes indeed it happens that in a work of this kind the Worker is led by the system in which he is involved to do things of which he personally does not approve, and thus his very conscience is wounded in the work which he loves. Cases are not unfrequent in which a work that succeeded admirably as long as it was in one hand, began to fail utterly when laden with the cumbrous paraphernalia of Clergy and Committees and published rules, &c. &c.;

while, on the other hand, many a "private venture" has failed because it has been too exclusively the work of one individual to obtain the confidence of the public.

These opposite difficulties have beset most of those who are really in earnest either about working themselves for the Lord, or about setting others to work in His service. But the question is, How are they to be met?

The first thing that seems to force itself on the mind of any one who undertakes to work for God is the absolute necessity of entirely consecrating the work to Him—not merely intending to do so, but actually doing it. Till this be done, and by God's grace the whole thing be offered to Him as a "living sacrifice," the path is beset with dangers; for "my work" and "my workers" are constantly coming to the front, and even unconsciously the Workman steps somewhat into the place of the Master. Let it then be the fundamental rule of all Christian Work, "they first gave their own selves to the Lord."

This once done, the rest becomes much easier, for a double foundation is laid: on the part of the individual worker that of self-abnegation, and a readiness to lose self in the Master's service—to do what is really best for his service, and, it may be, not even to be seen to do it; and on the part of those who may have to administer any systematic work, whether of a Parish or a Society, to look on that administration as a thing consecrated to the Lord, and so tenderly and wisely to give the fullest possible scope to individual character and effort.

It seems scarcely necessary to add on this point the great necessity of constant watchfulness that we do not lose the grace of humility in the strength of activity—that we do not let our own personal views and plans blind us to our position of responsibility in offering to the Lord (whose we are) a work absolutely consecrated to His service.

But granted that this foundation has been laid, how is it to be worked out in its details? How are we to apply the principle to the individual difficulties that may beset any who read these pages?

The Lord Jesus himself sent out His disciples "two and two" before His face, which at once gives the principle of association in work; and we find St. Paul leaving both Timothy and Titus to superintend the work in the places where they were appointed. This suggests the thought that any who feel drawn to undertake any share of the Master's work, should first communicate with those who are already occupied with it; and naturally, in the first instance, with the Clergyman under whose ministry they are settled. It is *primâ facie* natural that he who teaches as to life should superintend as to work, and that the hands of the Ministry should be upheld by the work of the Christian laity:

where this may be for some sad reason impossible, then it becomes doubly important that work undertaken should be associated with that of some other Christians, and, as far as possible, in definite connection with our Church.

But then comes the other and equally important point—How is the offer of work to be received and treated? Sometimes a Worker has only the desire for work in general, without any special wishes or qualifications; then the Clergymen must endeavour so far to study the character and powers as to put such a one into that sphere of work that is most suitable, but probably only tentatively; for there are few things more unsatisfactory in working and results than for Christian workers to be engaged in uncongenial work, or that for which their own special gifts do not qualify them. Often again some one has a special gift and special experience in a particular line of things, and in such case it is imperative that whoever has the oversight of the work should leave as much as possible to the individual, and should take care to give the utmost freedom of action that is consistent with united work. It may be, indeed, that ideas as to detail may differ considerably; but then, in the spirit of mutual concession, it seems as if the one who has the greatest experience, and on whom the real responsibility devolves, should decide the course to be pursued—provided, of course, that there be no compromise of principle. One thing is very clear—it is not *office* or position that gives competence, and it is by no means seldom that the crude ideas of some young and inexperienced Clergyman become a great hindrance to some old and tried Worker, and are forced upon such a one from the mere assumption of office; whereas true administration will use to the utmost the individuality of each Worker, even insensibly kept in the gentle guidance of Christian fellowship. On the other hand, again, the zealous worker, absorbed in one particular scheme, may be tempted to look on it as the only thing to be done—to mistake a tiny corner for the whole field, and so possibly forget that others have to take a wider range of view, which entails the modification even of some favourite theories.

The subject is one which is of the utmost difficulty, but at the same time of paramount importance; its true solution lies in "dwelling with the King for His work," in seeking the guidance of the Holy Spirit in everything we undertake, and in keeping very closely united together in the spirit of prayer and supplication with thanksgiving. Consecrated work will be exposed to difficulties from without, and will overcome them; unconsecrated work is exposed to difficulties from within, and will sooner or later be broken up by them.

JOHN H. ROGERS.

Art. VII.—CLERICAL REMINISCENCES.

MY first curacy (writes "Senex"[1]) was in a large manufacturing parish; and, as a young deacon, I joined a young priest, and between us we had the sole charge of about 15,000 souls.

My second curacy was in London: and I had what might be called "sole charge" of 12,000 people! My rector was a good kind able and excellent man, but he could not face them; and, there being no rectory house, he had a right to non-residence, and lived in one of the West-end squares, with every comfort necessary for one who was a bachelor and had been a Senior Fellow[2]. . . . . The only serious and regular duty required from him was a sermon every Sunday morning. In the evening the church was served by a very able and popular lecturer chosen by the parish. In the afternoon, baptisms, churchings, and all parish duties were performed. These last fell on me. . . . . I do not think I preached ten times in the two years I served in this curacy; and it was a great mental relief after what I have gone through in that way. But the parish duty was tremendous. . . . . One incident is still fresh in my memory, and, as illustrating an important text of Scripture, seems worth recording:—

One evening, whilst engaged in study, a card was brought up, and a wish expressed to see me. My assent was followed by the entrance of a young person unknown to me. . . . . I soon learnt that he was desirous of going to College, and had come to me for advice. I was much pleased with his modesty and with the indications of talent that I discerned. Finding that economy was one necessity involved,

---

[1] "Clerical Reminiscences," by "Senex." Pp. 260. Seeley, Jackson and Halliday. 1880.

[2] Here is a sketch of a "City" dinner. "In the hospitable and noble hall of the Goldsmiths' Company," says *Senex*, "a magnificent haunch of venison was served up; but, by some strange chance, it was only half cooked, and unfit to be eaten. Most of the company turned to other things; but one alderman, then well known, was not to be thus baffled. He called for a lamp and a stand, and a deep silver soup-plate; he cut four long, thick slices, with fat to correspond, from the haunch; he mingled two glasses of port wine with the gravy, and then placed all above the lighted lamp. Bubbling soon began; a steamy column arose, and everything indicated that eating-time was come. I happened to sit near, and naturally thought that, as a visitor—I will not say a clergyman, for clergymen never care about eating and drinking (?)—one slice at least would be offered to me. But no! When all was ready, the alderman evidently thought that—not virtue, but cookery was its own reward, and ate all the four slices, nourished with fat, gravy, and port wine, himself! The way in which he afterwards joined in the standing toast of 'Church and Queen' was a sight worth seeing."

I . . . . advised a Sizarship at St. John's, Cambridge, when I found that mathematics was his forte. Our conversation then assumed a religious tone . . . . and we parted with mutual goodwill.

About twelve years afterwards, I was vicar of a large northern parish, and was earnestly called to give a vote on some important contested election at Cambridge. Stipulating, as was then legal, that my expenses should be paid, I went and voted. For the payment of my expenses I was referred to a Fellow of St. John's, and went at once to his rooms. Several persons were present; and he came to me, having received my card, and asked if I was in a hurry, or would wait till his business visitors had left, as he wished to speak to me. I was in no hurry, and waited till we were alone. He then came to me and said that he knew me well, though I evidently did not remember him. I might, however, remember a visit I once received from a young man at Mr. Bumpus', the bookseller. He was that young man. He had acted in every particular on the advice then received. He had entered at St. John's. He had watched and been careful. He had obtained scholarships. And the result was that he had passed safely through his course—that he had been Senior Wrangler—that he was now a Fellow and Tutor of his College—that his aged parents were living in ease and comfort near to him at Cambridge—that he had all that heart could wish. "And," he added, "I owe it all to you." This almost took away my breath; and, after I had listened with silent wonder, I could only say, "Not to me, but all to God's 'goodness and mercy.'" "I meant all to *your instrumentality*," he explained. And then we shook hands, as friends for life. And we have been friends for life . . . ." "A word spoken in due season, how good it is" (Prov. xv. 23).

And now came a change, unsought but serious. Eight times such-like changes have occurred in my life, but always unsought:—

When a letter came from a newly-appointed Indian bishop, saying, "Come to me as soon as you can; I want to speak to you," of course I went at once. The words spoken were these, "I am going out to India as bishop; will you go with me and be my chaplain? If so, I can nominate you as an East Indian Company's servant."

I thanked the spokesman gratefully and said I would ask my father and mother and medical advisers and let him know. They all gave willing assent and encouragement. I accepted the offer promptly, was nominated, went to the India House, signed my name in a great folio, and got down from the stool an East Indian chaplain, entitled to a travelling allowance of three hundred pounds and a prospective income of nine hundred pounds per annum—a serious change, as I have said, for a young curate!

India is before us. . . . . The ship is anchored in the Hooghly, and two small steamers are in sight; the one sent to help the ship up the river, the other bringing Daniel Corrie, Archdeacon of Calcutta, and Dr. Mill, Principal of Bishop's College, with kindly greetings and good wishes:—

Daniel Corrie, as he stood on deck, was tall and stout, with a winning face, white hair, and genial smile, and we soon found that to know him was to love him. He had been the friend of Henry Martyn, and David Brown, and every good man in India, and the helper in all good works. In his character a little gentle humour mingled with deep seriousness, whilst true holiness and perfect disinterestedness walked hand-in-hand. He filled his office as Archdeacon efficiently, though not methodically, for I have seen his writing-desk, so crammed with papers that it would not be shut, tenanted by a mouse, with a comfortable and undisturbed nest full of young ones. . . . . Dr. Mill was in the prime of life, rather undersized, full of intelligence, but somewhat shy in manner. He was a High Churchman, but not then so extreme as in after years.

The friendship of two individuals so eminent for piety and for learning stands prominent amongst the pleasant reminiscences of my Indian life (p. 65).

One reminiscence may excite, perhaps, a smile. I call it "getting the legs down" (p. 81).

In the south of India we came across a chaplain, tall, handsome, young, and somewhat stiff-backed, who had come into very serious collision with the colonel commanding the station. A short official interview led the bishop to decline any active interference.

"I shall be able to do nothing with him personally," he said to me; "manage matters your own way." So that it became a question of brotherhood and not of authority.

"Now, tell me all about this turmoil," I said, when we were sitting side by side. And he told me all about it. The colonel was a godless man, profane, immoral, irreligious. He showed it in every way, but chiefly in church, when attendance was his duty.

"I have said what I could to check all this," the chaplain told me, "and have spoken my mind freely on the subject."

"To whom?" I asked, interrupting him.

"Why, to the young officers, of course," he replied, and then narrated the behaviour in church, which he considered irreverent and insulting.

"He sits in a corner of his pew, with folded arms, and a smile of ridicule on his face during my sermon."

"And what do you do?" I asked.

"Why, I preach about the reverence due to God's house. I take for texts such passages as 'Thou God seest me,' 'This is none other than the house of God," &c. I speak of Uzziah, struck with leprosy in the Temple, and such-like topics, after fixing my eye upon the Colonel's pew."

"And what is the result?"

"Why, would you believe it? For several Sundays past he has been sitting with his legs upon the ledge, amongst the Prayer-Books, laughing at me."

"Ah, well! very sad, very sad! But the problem now to be solved seems to be—how to get the legs down? You have tried one

way; will you promise me, as a brother clergyman, to try another?" He hesitated.

"I only ask for a six weeks' trial. If it fails, follow your own course." Then he promised.

"I have three conditions to make," I said. "First, you are never, under any temptation or chaffing, to mention this matter again to any of the young officers. Secondly, you are never, in church, to cast even a glance at the colonel or his legs. Thirdly, you have, no doubt, old sermons, preached in England, on grand topics, such as 'Come unto Me, all that travail and are heavy laden,' &c., 'Him that cometh unto Me,' &c., 'This is a faithful saying,' &c., 'The Sermon on the Mount,' the love of Christ, the sufferings of Christ, the grace of Christ, &c. Preach these old sermons; and for six weeks never put pen to paper to write a new one. And then, fulfilling these conditions and keeping your promise, write to me six weeks hence and tell me the result."

At the end of six weeks I had a letter from him in the following words:—

"DEAR SIR,—The legs have come down, and all is well. Many thanks. Yours truly, '——— ———'"

His course in India afterwards was prosperous and useful; he obtained official rank and the general control over others, as the result, under God, of taking well-intentioned advice himself.

Now, the scene changes, and as in a dissolving view, the sunny plains of India, its heathen temples, and Christian churches, gradually fade, and give place to a pleasant town on the borders of the Wiltshire Downs. . . . . The vicarage was mine, valued at £90 per annum, and a house with four rooms and brick floors—rather a change from £900 per annum and a palace! But still it was a pleasant change, for I rejoined my wife and family. Sickness had driven me from India, and I was sent home on medical certificate for three years' furlough. . . . . The parish had been greatly neglected. This in 1840, when all was life in the Church, could only be excused by the fact that the vicar was very old:—

There was no service on wet Sundays; when a sick person wanted a visit the vicar sent a shilling, and said that would do him more good than his prayers: the Holy Communion had not been administered for eighteen months; and every one seemed to do what was right in his own eyes.

The machinery of this Wiltshire parish was at once set to work, and schools, Bible-classes, and parochial visitations, were carried on with good effect.

The time drew near for me to leave. All things were in order. . . . . The furlough granted me by the East India Company, with its allowance of two or three hundred per annum was nearly at an end. . . . . A letter was delivered to me from the vicar of a large parish in the North, saying he was about to

resign, and wished me to be his successor. . . . . I only followed, as God seemed to lead. I was invited to come and judge for myself. I consented. I then learnt how it all came about. One of his great friends was a Fellow of St. John's College. . . . . Now this Fellow had never seen me but once. He had been "best man" at a wedding which I had performed. That was all; and that, in God's overruling Providence placed me in charge of 55,000 people; gave me the patronage of seven incumbencies, made me Rural Dean of thirty churches, and kept me hard at work, through good report and evil report, for fifteen years! (p. 97.)

And now fifteen years began to tell, and health began to fail (p. 152). . . . . Extra medical aid was sought, and the decree was passed—"Lock up your desk and live; stay as you are and die." The desk was locked, and the parish left. . . . . Then through God's mercy, health returned, and my large northern parish, which had been well served in my absence, was exchanged for a small and quiet one in Kent.[1]

* * * * * *

The preceding extracts, abridged from "Clerical Reminiscences," will serve, we think, to commend the book before us, a book which is in some ways the most interesting work of its kind. Who "Senex" is, few of our readers, probably, will fail at once to discover. He has given us, in a series of chatty graphic sketches, a picture which will repay study. It is full of anecdote,[2]

---

[1] On page 155, in an account of his parish in Kent, our author refers to a certain interesting document in the iron chest of the parish. This document "serves," he thinks, "to settle a question which many hold wrongly as to the meaning of the word 'oblations' in our service for Holy Communion. The document is signed by King Philip and Queen Mary; and gives to the rector of the parish the 'oblations' offered on four 'special Holy-days in the year for his own personal benefit' and increase of stipend. The meaning of the 'sentences' then read, which refer not only to the poor, but also to the workers in the vineyard and the feeders of the flock, is thus made clear. The alms are for the poor; and the oblations are not the presentation of the bread and wine, but a supply, when duly authorized, for the necessities of the minister." The observations of "Senex" on "Parish Terriers" are important. In a proper "Terrier" the "Table of Fees" is mentioned.

[2] From the last chapter, headed "The Resting Place," we take the following:—"I was getting worn and weary with nine years' hard work; and I was often, of necessity, left solitary. The kind Archbishop knew of this, and he sent for me, and offered an eligible rectory outside the diocese. I went to see it, and found a pretty country, and a pleasant-looking church and house. But whilst ascending the hill, on which they stood, I passed two immense dissenting chapels, which, in a small village, startled me. The curate was now the *locum tenens*. He was out, but his lady received me, and showed me over the house. Seventeen pairs of boots and shoes on his side; three babies, three laced cradles, and three well-matured nurses on hers, proved that there was no want in the house. I inquired about the chapels, and learnt that they were central

contains pleasing reminiscences of bishops and other eminent men, touches on many ecclesiastical points of importance, and, above all, shows in simply-told stories of real life the strength and beauty of Gospel truth.

Reviews.

The Foundations of Faith. Eight Sermons, preached before the University of Oxford in the year MDCCCLXXIX. By HENRY WACE, M.A., Chaplain of Lincoln's Inn, and Professor of Ecclesiastical History in King's College, London. Pp. 390. London: Pickering & Co. 1880.

SEASONABLY has Mr. Wace come forward in the Bampton Lectures, not to show, as has often been shown of late years, that the truths and facts of "the Christian Faith" are consistent with the conclusions of Reason and Science, but rather to assert the positive grounds on which our Faith rests, and to enforce its authority. At the present day, in consequence of the prominence of scientific habits of thought, there is great danger of insufficient weight being allowed to the distinct and independent claims of the principle of Faith. Professor Wace has accordingly "endeavoured to illustrate the necessity and supremacy of this principle of our nature, and to vindicate its operation in those successive acts of Faith by which the Christian Creed as confessed by the Reformed Church of England has been constructed." The present work, therefore, properly speaking, is not of an apologetic character. It is, as the learned author remarks, an attempt to exhibit the supreme claim of the Gospel upon our allegiance; and it endeavours to show not merely that the Christian Creed may reasonably be believed, but that we are under a paramount obligation to submit to it.

The words of Hebrews xi. verses 1 and 2—"*Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen: for by it the elders obtained a good report*"—our author takes as the key for opening his subject. If these words, he says, do not amount to a definition of faith, they at least express its most striking characteristic in practice—its power of giving a substantial reality to the objects of hope, and a verification to the invisible. With singular truth and vividness they describe the spiritual life of Israel, the animating principle of the saints of the Old Testament. "It was a life based on the invisible and directed towards an obscure and improbable future. But that invisible world was more real to the elders of Israel than any of the visible things around them." Over and over again the course of Nature had been interfered with in their behalf; and to their view no physical order was unalterable. Though the earth was moved, and though the mountains were carried

---

places of worship for all the neighbourhood around, and were well filled with worshippers. I inquired about the church, and was told that a 'faithful few' continued to attend. I asked what her husband had done, or was doing to amend matters. She said that he had tried 'Evensong,' and was going to try 'Mattins.' Doubting the efficacy of Mattins and Evensong, and seeing that by the acceptance of the charge I should almost have to begin life over again, I gratefully declined it. Another still more eligible offer quickly followed, and was accepted; and this has been the 'resting place' I spoke of, for seven years!"

into the midst of the sea, it was the consolation of Israel to know that the Lord of Hosts was with them and the God of Jacob was their refuge. And as the visible was eclipsed by the invisible, so was the present by the future. When conquered and crushed they were assured of the glorious destiny of the people. In their darkest hours they never doubted that the Messiah would appear to deliver them and to assert His absolute sway. All this was founded on simple faith. They had received certain promises handed down to them from the fathers of their race, and on those sacred words they rested the whole edifice of their spiritual, their moral, and even of their physical life. Now, the same principle of faith is equally, or we may say even in a higher degree, characteristic of the new dispensation. The prophetical element in the New Testament is perhaps stronger; the conviction of things unseen more striking. The unseen God of the Old Testament was a God who by His very nature was invisible, and faith was the only instrument by which He could be apprehended. But the Saviour in whom Christians believe has once been seen and heard; He has worn flesh and blood like ourselves, and in that flesh and blood He passed from earth; and we believe ourselves to be in union and communion with a human nature like our own, as well as with a divine nature. And as with the Jews so with us, the life of faith has been sustained by the statements of men, ὁμοιοπαθεῖς, subject to sufferings (Acts xiv. 15) as we are. "The witness of a few Apostles and Evangelists constitutes the basis on which the whole fabric of Christendom has been reared. They bear testimony to the most stupendous facts, and to the vastest visions of the future."

The Professor, at this portion of his argument, points out that in the religious life of other nations we observe a similar supremacy of the faculty of faith. In Mahometanism, Buddhism, Brahmanism, and in Confucianism, faith, taking the word in a broad sense, has supreme sway. It is important, of course, to distinguish between "faith" in a Christian sense, and an unreasonable submission, mere credulity.[1] Upon faith, in the general sense of the word, "every civilization has been based, and in proportion as such faith has been weakened has every civilization tottered to its fall." In our own day what is the danger?

The most brilliant achievements of this century have been its scientific advances. They have been so continuous, so surprising, so comprehensive, and so beneficent, that they have naturally fascinated, and almost absorbed, the attention of our generation; until the process by which they have been reached, and the temper of mind they foster, tend to assert a predominance over all others. Few things are more deserving of observation in the course of human thought, and in the development of human nature, than what may be called the lack of balance with which they have generally been accompanied. As one principle after another comes into prominence, as one faculty of man's nature after another asserts itself, it overbears all others for a time; it becomes exaggerated, and the whole mind receives a disproportionate development; until some forgotten truth reasserts itself, and then, perhaps, a new disproportion is created. It would be strange, indeed, if under the intellectual excitement which scientific discoveries have aroused in the present day, we had escaped a danger from which every previous age has suffered. But however this may be, there can be no doubt of the fact that the habits fostered by scientific thought have of late been acquiring a predominance which is destructive, not so much of particular doctrines of the Christian creed, as of the essential principle of faith as characterized in the text. Science in its strict

[1] We are sorry that the Professor declined "to examine the various definitions of faith." A Note upon "Faith," in a second edition, would increase, we think, both the interest and the value of the work, particularly, perhaps, with those who, having been vexed with sceptical doubts, anxiously inquire, What is faith, and how shall we obtain it?

application admits no assurance of things only hoped for, and can allow no conviction of things incapable of being tested by the senses. Its claim at every step is for verification—verification, as it is constantly insisted, by plain and practical tests.

A general discredit, in fact, is quietly and deliberately cast upon the whole fabric of our Creed as something which has no adequate basis whereon to rest. It is positively asserted or tacitly assumed, continues Professor Wace, that Faith, as contemplated by us in the general course of human history, is unjustifiable as a principle of action, and that the welfare of mankind is to be pursued by rigidly restricting our beliefs within the limits of that which can be sensibly verified. But evil surrounds us; sickness, sorrow, and dissatisfaction, are facts :—

Now it is precisely in the most mysterious doctrines of our Creed, in those which make the strongest demands on faith, and are the most remote from any possibility of scientific verification, that Christian souls find their support under these burdens of the flesh and these torments of the spirit. The message that "God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but have everlasting life"—this is a message, simple as are its terms, which transcends all philosophy, all reason, all experience, nay, all capacity of comprehension: and yet it is in reliance on this message, and on other assurances of the same kind, that Christians are delivered from all despair, and are enabled under whatever distresses to cling to their belief in the love of their Father in Heaven. When the Christian minister can assure a suffering soul on the bed of death, in misery and pain, that, whatever its agonies, the Son of God in human form endured far worse for its sake as a pledge of the love of its Father, and in fulfilment of that love, He applies a remedy which is equal to any need. The message of the Cross, interpreted by the doctrine of the Incarnation, is thus in moments of real trial the support of the most elementary principle of faith.

In fact, the minimizing theology (which tends to throw into the background everything which is mysterious and perplexing in our faith, and to insist solely on that moral part of it which commends itself to a conscience enlightened by Christian teaching in surrounding society)—this minimizing theology depends for its plausibility upon a simple evasion of the real problems of philosophy and of the practical difficulties of life. The full and explicit faith of the Creeds recognizes those difficulties and looks them in the face. It owns that they are insuperable upon any grounds of mere natural reason, *and it offers supernatural realities and supernatural assurances to overcome them.* Professor Wace continues—

Considerations such as these may suffice to show that it would be vain to attempt any compromise with the scientific spirit by minimizing the articles of our faith. As long as we retain any of them, however elementary, as more than bare speculations, we go beyond scientific grounds, and rest upon assurances which transcend the capacity of mere reason. We rise above Nature, beyond the realm of sight and sense and observation, and we act on the conviction of things not seen. In proportion indeed to the depth and extent of the Christian's experience is his faith transformed into knowledge. We are given "an understanding that we may know Him that is true, and we are in Him that is true." But in the order of the Christian life, according to the old saying, faith comes before knowledge, and we believe in order that we may know.

Now the scientific principle is the very reverse of this. In the scientific sphere knowledge precedes faith, and we learn to know in order that we may believe. Science must know, however, before she can deny. The present attitude, therefore, of scientific philosophy towards religious truth is not one of negation, but of a simple confession of ignorance, or, as it is commonly called, Agnosticism. Science acknowledges its incompetence to pronounce positively for or against the great truths of our faith. If,

then, the principle of faith has been weakened by the influence of the scientific spirit, this result is due to an entirely fallacious impression. It is not the case that the slightest valid presumption has been established against our faith. It is simply that the dazzling blaze of the greatest illumination ever opened to the natural eye has entranced the mental vision of our age, and has made other objects and other sources of illumination seem for the moment dim to men. The apprehension of Bacon has been fulfilled. "Sensus, instar solis, globi terrestris faciem aperit, cœlestis claudit et obsignat." But though the impression be fallacious and unreasonable, we cannot be ignorant that it has a considerable effect. The consequences are felt in other matters besides religious faith. "They are perceptible in a general enfeeblement of the principle of authority, and in an indisposition to submit to restraint in thought, in speech, and in conduct. On the Continent, at all events, the prevalence of this temper is felt to menace society with very grave consequences indeed, and it would be rash to regard our own country as out of the reach of a like danger." What is urgently needed is the revival of the principle of faith, and with it a renovation of that just authority which holds families, societies, and nations together. In this country the spiritual force (God forbid) may by a false rationalism be stifled. It may yet prove the spring of a new life throughout those regions whence all faith and all civilization arose:—

> The Christian cannot doubt that the Faith of the Gospel will thus return to its ancient home and reanimate its chosen people; and when that final triumph of the true Prophet and King of mankind is achieved, God grant that Europe may not have cause to hear in it an echo, or a reversal, of the voice once addressed to the Jews—"Behold we turn to the Gentiles."

We have thus given a summary sketch of the first lecture in the volume before us. In these Bampton Lectures the object has been to offer a contribution towards strengthening the Foundations and elucidating the Elements of Faith, and thus to illustrate the character and the just limits of that Authority, on which, notwithstanding the silence of science and the hesitations of reason, we build our expectations of things hoped for, our conviction of things not seen. The lecturer shows how Faith is founded in the deep convictions of the conscience; he traces the development of its lofty structure under the guidance of revelation; and, lastly, he considers the ground on which it rests in our own Church, and at the present time.

In his second lecture, headed "The Faith of the Conscience," Professor Wace remarks that the first and most momentous of necessary principles, the main principles on which the Christian Creed is built, is Belief in God. Persistent efforts are now made by able and influential writers to undermine this first principle. Distinguished men of science write popular handbooks, in which the most sceptical philosophy of the last century is revived and justified.[1] When we claim faith in a divine revelation, we are challenged at the outset to state what justification we can have for believing in anything which cannot be verified by natural reason and ordinary experience. It is alleged that the elementary article of belief in God is incapable of such verification, and doctrines assuming a revelation from Him are consequently treated as outside the range of practical discussion. Now St. Paul propounds a fact in human nature and a principle of the divine government which throw a vivid and a terrible light upon the history of this first article of faith. He says of the ancient world, *οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν τὸν θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει* (Rom. i. 28). The Greek conveys much more than "*they did*

[1] For example, Professor Huxley's account of Hume.

not like to retain God in their knowledge." It implies that they did not "duly apply themselves to that process of testing, proving, trying—as metals are tried in the fire—the natural revelation vouchsafed to them, and that they thus incapacitated themselves from retaining a true knowledge of God." The knowledge of God was sufficiently open to them, but it was not to be attained without moral effort; and the loss of it is consequently ascribed to a distinct failure of moral energy, which was justly punished by divine reprobation, and which led to deeper moral corruption. The very faculties by which they might have known God being deprived of their due exercise, lost their soundness and their genuineness, and became *ἀδόκιμοι*, base coin, unable to bear the severe tests of life. For the arguments which may afford man a substantial knowledge of God, and lead him to worship Him and to trust Him, continues Mr. Wace, are not simply intellectual. They put a strain upon the moral nature. And if men take the broader and easier road of moral supineness, they at once lose their hold upon God, and are in imminent danger of falling into an abyss of corruption, such as that described in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.

It is an interesting fact, we read, that the philosophers by whom the belief in God has been most strongly maintained—such as Socrates and Plato among the Greeks, and Kant among the Germans—have also been those whose attention has been most concentrated upon moral considerations, and who have done the most to stimulate the moral element in human nature. "The later Stoics," says Dean Merivale, as compared with their predecessors, "had attained a clever idea of the personality of God, with a higher perception of His goodness and His purity. They could not rest in the pantheism of an earlier age." But stoicism was undoubtedly the noblest moral system of the ancient world. Thus, before considering the evidence afforded by Jewish and Christian history, we find, on a broad survey of facts, that morality and a belief in God seem, as the Apostle declares (Rom. i. 28), to rise or fall together. What is the secret of this remarkable connection? It is to be found, says Professor Wace, in the recesses of the conscience; it is a conviction that we are responsible.

The ineradicable instinct of the human conscience compels men to believe that sooner or later, here or hereafter, in one way or another, the claim of righteousness will be satisfied, and that judgment will be executed. Belief in God has been embedded from the earliest centuries in the deepest moral convictions of our race, and a philosophy which is content to criticize beliefs thus authenticated, instead of treating them as the most momentous premisses with which it has to deal, places itself practically out of court.

Having shown in the second lecture that the primary dictates of conscience afford imperious reasons for believing in a living God—righteous, almighty, and personal in His relations to us—Professor Wace proceeds to the next great step in the development of Faith, the belief, namely, that He has given us a positive revelation. And here, in referring to the eliminating tendency of rationalistic theology, the Professor quotes from that misnamed work, "Supernatural Religion." The author of "Supernatural Religion" says that "it is singular how little there is in the supposed revelation of alleged information, however incredible, regarding that which is beyond the limits of human thought." To show the ignorance or carelessness of such a statement it is enough to quote the words of St. Paul: "He hath appointed a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness *by that Man whom He hath ordained.*" Jesus Christ will be our Judge; but the validity of such an article of faith stands or falls with the belief in a positive revelation from God. No conviction of

the moral perfection of Christ can of itself justify the belief that He will hereafter personally judge us. That is a definite matter of fact which we can only credit on His word, or on that of His apostles, and their assurance on such a point can have no validity, unless they speak on the authority of that Supreme Being, who has vouchsafed to make known His will and purposes to us. So, again, with regard to the forgiveness of sins, we are absolutely dependent upon positive Divine assurance. In forcible terms Professor Wace lays down this truth:—

> There are only two remedies for these agonies of the conscience. The one is to administer to the soul the opiate of excuses and palliations for sin; and this is the usual resource of other religions than the Christian, and of the world at large. The other is the express assurance of the forgiveness of sins made on the authority of God Himself.

It is strange, indeed, that it should be necessary thus to insist on the fact that the most vital articles of the Creed are dependent upon express supernatural revelation; but a loose habit of rationalizing the doctrines of the Gospel has, unhappily, spread far beyond avowedly sceptical circles. *It would be inconceivable that the profession of sceptical, and even of infidel opinions, should be regarded with so much indifference, even in nominal Christian society, and that laxity in submitting to the obligations of Christian worship should be viewed so lightly, as is too often the case,*[1] *were it not for the wide-spread admission among us of the original doubt of the tempter,* "Yea, hath God said?" That subtle question, which was at the root of the first temptation, is at the root of every temptation to which the soul of man is subjected. Men are rare who adopt the language of Milton's Satan, "Evil, be thou my good," and who, in the full belief that God has uttered a command, can be indifferent to it. But they doubt, or affect to doubt, whether He has really spoken. It is treated as a matter of speculation, and they are tempted to run the risk of its not being really true.

Further on, in the lecture on Revelation, Professor Kuenen is quoted as admitting that the Prophets were convinced that they had received specific revelations from God. And no critic doubts, as a matter of historic fact, that the Apostle Paul, for example, claimed to have received direct revelations. Professor Wace accordingly inquires whether we are not justified in saying that in view of such considerations the burden of proof is not, as seems often assumed, on the side of those who accept this testimony, but on that of those who reject it:—

> Here are several witnesses, respecting the profound depth of whose moral and religious nature there can be no doubt whatever, testifying to their own experience, in a matter which they know and feel to bear a moral and spiritual import of the most momentous character. Can it be considered reasonable, is it consistent with common prudence, to put such evidence aside on the ground that it transcends our own experience, and is beyond our power of verification? It is not too much to say that this is, to a large extent, a question of the exercise of intellectual and moral modesty. A man must have a very surprising confidence in his own intelligence and moral discernment who can venture summarily to dismiss such statements as St. Paul's as hallucinations; and accordingly it must be observed, as a matter of fact, that the critics who adopt such views display, as a rule, a self-confidence and a serene sense of

[1] We have placed this sentence of the Professor's in italics. We thoroughly agree with him as to the injurious results in daily life of loose habits of rationalizing the doctrines of the Gospel. We would add the expression of our deep regret that sceptical books and publications in which infidel articles are admitted should be found on the drawing-room tables of sincerely Christian families.

superiority, which of itself is sufficient to disable their judgment in the matter. Some of them can treat St. Paul as a tutor would his pupil, can rearrange his thoughts, can point out to him which are important and which are unimportant, can indicate where he wanders from his subject and where he has lost the clue to his own meaning. Others, as we have seen, like the author of "Supernatural Religion," can pronounce that, after all, there is not much beyond the range of human thought in St. Paul's alleged revelations, and that we do not really lose anything by dismissing them as illusions. It is no wonder that men, who can treat Apostles and Evangelists on these terms of mental and moral equality, should reject their claims to supernatural information. But those who feel that, in reading the Gospels and Epistles, they are communing with moral and spiritual conceptions transcending any that are elsewhere to be met with, to whom almost every word brings home a sense of their own feebleness, sin, and ignorance, and of the moral and mental supremacy of the writers—such persons will judge very differently of the claim of the Apostles to be the recipients of a Divine revelation. They will feel that the case completely fulfils the requirement of Hume—that to prove a miracle, "the testimony be of such a kind that its falsehood would be more miraculous than the fact which it endeavours to establish." They will listen to such claims with awe, and they will either accept them with confidence and joy, or will reject them with fear and trembling.

In the fourth lecture, Professor Wace speaks of the grand revelation with which the Book of the Covenant opens, a revelation not so much—properly considered—a revelation of Nature as of God, all the wonders of Nature being reviewed and displayed so as to reflect the power and majesty of that great Being who created them. Professor Wace proceeds as follows :—

Now with respect to the practical effect of the revelation of God thus conveyed to us, we are not left to our own speculation. We can appeal to the evidence of fact in a singularly interesting form. It was the custom in the Jewish Church to read in their synagogues selections from the Prophets illustrating the several portions of the Law. Accordingly, when the opening chapters of Genesis were read, that which we may call the second lesson of the synagogue was from the 5th verse of the 42nd chapter of Isaiah to the 10th verse of the 43rd. We there possess what was regarded by the Jews as the practical commentary on the commencement of the Book of Genesis ; and what is the burden of that great prophecy? It is that of the opening verses, which have been taken as the text of this lecture. It proclaims a message from the Creator :—"Thus saith God the Lord, He that created the heavens and stretched them out, He that spread forth the earth and that which cometh out of it ; He that giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein." So far we have a summary of the first chapter of Genesis, and an application of it to the purpose just indicated—the description of God. But the prophet is commissioned to announce what this Lord, the Creator of heaven and earth, said to His servant, and to the people of Israel so far as they were one with that servant, and to what purpose this revelation of His infinite power and wisdom is to be applied. "Thus," he proceeds, "saith God the Lord . . . . I, the Lord, have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thine hand, and will keep thee, and will give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles." Throughout the Scriptures no grander or more marvellous utterance is to be found. If the opening revelation of the Book of Genesis be overwhelming in its awful majesty, not less overpowering in its graciousness is the assurance here conveyed, that the people of Israel were in covenant with the Almighty Creator, and were privileged to appropriate all that awe, all that might and majesty, as bestowed upon themselves, for their righteousness, their support, and their protection, and that they were thus to become "a light of the Gentiles"—the instruments, as they have undoubtedly been, of an universal moral enlightenment.

The fifth lecture is headed "Our Lord's Demand for Faith." Professor Wace remarks that our Lord's appeal starts from an intense moral

illumination, and the way was prepared for Him by calls to repentance more solemn and penetrating than had ever been heard, even in the course of Jewish history. John the Baptist is the typical preacher of repentance. But Jesus, as a preacher of repentance, probes the hearts of his hearers with depth and severity. It is one of the strangest, and perhaps one of the most characteristic, features of rationalizing writers that this aspect of the Sermon on the Mount is so little appreciated by them. They applaud its "sublime morality," they condescend to pronounce that, in their opinion, no teacher has ever soared to such a height, and they would fain represent its moral teaching as the sum and substance of the Gospel. But unless a man be made in some other mould than his fellows, it is wonderful that he can read the Sermon on the Mount without trembling. In proportion to the beauty and the force of the moral truths it declares, is the spiritual and moral ruin it reveals among us, and the condemnation it pronounces upon every human soul. The Professor proceeds as follows :—

The laws of Sinai, denouncing sinful acts amidst thunder and lightning, and with all the sanction of the terrors of Nature, are as nothing compared with this sword of the Spirit, piercing to the dividing asunder of the soul, discerning the very thoughts and intents of the heart, and denouncing the severest judgment upon mere words and looks and inclinations (St. Matt.) . . . . When the force of this aspect of the Sermon on the Mount is adequately brought home to a man's conscience, his only fitting utterance is that of Job—"I have heard of Thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth Thee. Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes." The wrath of God is revealed from heaven in that discourse with a terrible calm, which leaves a man desperate of all resources in himself, and compels him to cry for some deliverance from the body of death and evil which encompasses him.

Let it next be observed what are the means by which this intense and penetrating moral illumination is produced. We here approach another point in which the Sermon on the Mount, considered as a typical instance of our Lord's teaching, is at the present day most strangely and flagrantly misrepresented. It is the favourite contention of those who impugn the faith of the Church that the teaching of that Sermon is purely moral and independent of theology. "It is undeniable," says the author of "Supernatural Religion," with characteristic strength of assertion, "that the earliest teaching of Jesus recorded in the Gospel which can be regarded as in any degree historical is pure morality almost, if not quite, free from theological dogmas. Morality was the essence of His system; theology was an after-thought." Two pages afterwards this writer states with perfect correctness, but with complete unconsciousness of inconsistency, that Christ's system "confined itself to two fundamental principles, love to God and love to man." But is there no theology involved in teaching love to God? No theology in the belief that God is, and that He is the rewarder of them that diligently seek Him, and that, in spite of all the difficulties, perplexities, and cruelties of the world, He is worthy of the whole love and trust of our hearts! Why, this is the very theological problem which has racked the heart and brain of man from the dawn of religious thought to the present moment. On these two commandments—to which, in the curious phrase just quoted, Christ's system is said to have "confined itself," as though they were slight and simple—on these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets. They are the germ from which has sprung the whole theological thought of the Christian Church, and to which it returns; and no theologian can wish to do more than to deepen his own apprehension of them, and to strengthen their hold upon others. With similar inconsistency, M. Renan declares that "we should seek in vain for a theological proposition in the Gospel;" and yet states, elsewhere, that "a lofty notion of the Divinity was in some sort the germ of our Lord's whole being." "God," he adds, "is in Him: He feels Himself in communion with God; and he draws from His heart that which He speaks of His Father." These are strange inconsistencies.

Professor Wace adds to this comment on M. Renan a criticism on

"Ecce Homo" "one of the most popular of recent attempts to supersede the Church's conception of our Lord's life and work." The writer of "Ecce Homo" started with the assumption that theology could be excluded alike from our Lord's object and from His method, and that it had nothing to do with the purpose and constitution of the Christian Church! "This is, in fact," adds our author, "the primary principle from which attempts to explain away our faith now proceed."

In the lecture on the Faith of the Early Church appear many striking and eloquent passages. The evidence that a new spiritual power had been introduced into the world, we read, is conspicuous in the records of the early Church, and is especially to be discerned in one marked characteristic of Christian life. That characteristic is the intense joy, hope, and enthusiasm by which it is animated. . . . . All around us is a disappointed world —a world of disappointed valour, disappointed justice, disappointed virtue, a world in which suicide had come to be looked upon as a natural and reasonable resource. But in the midst of it the martyrs and confessors, the humblest Christians and the most distinguished alike, display all the energy of hope, of love, and of the complete satisfaction of their hearts :—

> The Christian soul breathes in an atmosphere of light, and grace, and peace, and truth. It is not merely hoping for ultimate salvation. It is living in the light; all things have become new to it in the spirit, and it is assured that they will hereafter become new to it in the body. Read the records of the Church without an eye to controversy, and with a simple desire to apprehend their main characteristics, and you will find them summed up in this description of Christian life by St. Paul :—"Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, ... and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also, knowing that tribulation worketh patience, and patience experience, and experience hope; and hope maketh not ashamed, because the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us."

Now it is from this point of view, continues the Professor, that the Creeds of the Church are to be approached; and when they are placed in this light, all the appearance of mere speculative dogmatism, which is attributed to them by scepticism, at once melts away, and seems scarcely to need refutation :—

> They are not mere abstract statements respecting the nature of God. They embody the most moral, the most human, the most touching and affecting conceptions which can stir the depths of the heart. If the Creeds are the distinctive characteristic of the Christian Church, it is not because Alexandrian metaphysics, or any mere theological speculations, had elaborated theories about the Divine nature. That was the work of the Gnostics, of the Arians, and of similar heretics. It was because, as a matter of certain apprehension and most blessed fact, our Lord Jesus Christ, fulfilling in His life and death and resurrection the promises of the Old Testament, had revealed to men the image of a God of infinite love and light, had brought that God home to them in their very flesh and blood, had assured them of reconciliation and union with Him, had offered Himself as a propitiation for their sins, and in answer to their prayers had bestowed on them a grace and power which they felt in daily experience to be the firstfruits of redemption.

And here we must close this Review, which has already exceeded our usual limits. The work before us is a masterly one and of great value at the present moment. We have preferred to show its character by freely quoting some important passages. For the length of our quotations we need not, we are assured, write any apology. The lecture upon the Reformation, which warmly defends Luther, and the vital doctrine of justification by faith, has an interest of its own. But the special value of

these lectures from a "Liberal" theologian, we think, is in relation to the various types of Rationalism, the shallowness and unreasonableness of which they exhibit, while at the same time they teach the simple all-sufficient truths of the Gospel.

The literary merits of the work, we may add, are of no mean grade. The present work will well sustain the reputation of the Boyle Lecturer of 1874.

Morning, Noon, and Night. A Pocket Manual of Private Prayer, with Meditations on Selected Passages of Scripture, Hymns and Prayers for Special Occasions. By Clergymen of the Church of England. Edited by the Rev. EDWARD GARBETT. Pp. 160. Elliot Stock. 1880.

A REMARK was recently made, in an interesting biography, if we remember right, that comparatively few Manuals of Devotion had been issued by the Evangelicals of the Church of England. However this may be, we very gladly welcome the valuable little book before us, "A Pocket Manual of Private Prayer;" Prayers, together with Meditations on Selected Scriptures, and Hymns. The fact that this Manual is edited by Canon Garbett will serve as a guarantee for both purity and richness of doctrine, But among his co-workers are such divines as Bishops Perry and Ryan, Dean Fremantle, Archdeacon Prest, Mr. Cadman, Dr. Bell, and Canon Clayton. The book comes before us, therefore, under exceptionally favourable auspices; and it will be found, we believe, upon a careful examination, to deserve the warm and unqualified tribute of praise which we accord. Dedicated to Archbishop Tait, "in grateful recognition of his sympathy with all efforts to promote the spiritual life of the Church," the Manual is likely to win its way among devout persons, differing upon matters of minor importance, but agreeing in regard to the great doctrinal and practical truths of Scriptural religion. The object of this work, says the esteemed editor, "is to furnish aid to private devotion in such a form that it may be carried in the pocket and made available in those intervals of leisure which are interposed here and there in the busiest life." It is Dr. Barrow, we think, who remarks that in nearly every business there "are chinks for devotion;" and it is well for all Christians, who can find the quiet leisure, to devote a few minutes to prayer at noon-day. "Morning, Noon, and Night" (Ps. lv. 17; Dan. vi. 16) is the happily chosen title of the book of prayers before us. As to its structure we abridge from the preface—a valuable portion of the work—the following exposition:—

Christian experience naturally begins with Expectation. . . . . Then follows the lesson, without which all spiritual progress is impossible—recognition of sin as the fact to which the redemption accomplished by the Lord Jesus Christ has been adapted. . . . . Hence faith is led onward to the perfect atonement completed in the sacrifice and death of the Lord Jesus Christ, and to the full assurance of acceptance in Him. Lastly, the promise of final triumph in the state of glory will crown all Christian experience with praise. . . . . Thus the four topics are suggested of Expectation, Humiliation, Salvation, and Final Glory, corresponding with the Divine programme of the Spirit's work, that He should convince the world of sin, righteousness, and judgment. These general outlines are in accordance with the Ecclesiastical Year of the Church of England. Advent is the period of Expectation, Lent is the season of Humiliation, Easter seals a completed Salvation with the fact of the Resurrection, and

the Ascension points to the great harvest of the Church Glorified. In these successive celebrations there is also a general analogy with the seasons of the year when they are held, and it is in harmony with these seasons that the plan of the present work is arranged.

We earnestly recommend this book, and we hope it may have a very large circulation, for it cannot fail to accomplish great good. It is well printed, neatly got up, and very cheap. If, on the axiom that a critic should be critical, we ought to make a suggestion, in view of a second edition, we remark—with due diffidence—that in two or three of the prayers sentences might well be shorter (free from quotation), and the language more simple.

As One that Serveth. By the Rev. G. A. CHADWICK, D.D. Elliot Stock. 1880.

Songs in the Twilight. By the Rev. CHARLES D. BELL, D.D., Rector of Cheltenham. Pp. 170. Nisbet.

A VOLUME of Sacred Poetry—a volume which may justly be termed poetry—will always be welcome. And Dr. Chadwick, it is seen at a glance, has many of the true poetic gifts. Several pieces are exceedingly good; and as we have dipped into the volume here and there we have been much pleased with the spiritual fervour and felicitous suggestiveness of the language.

The first portion of Dr. Chadwick's book is entitled "In the Days of His Flesh;" the second, "The Pilgrim."

The following verses picture the raising of the Ruler's daughter:—

JAIRUS.

Beside our dolorous bed
The mighty Master stayed,
A moment bowed His royal head,
And, as we deemed, he prayed,
Then spoke, with measured utterance deep,
"*She is not dead: she doth but sleep.*"

The people laughed aloud,
Yet, o'er my heart like balm,
Flowed, amid all the scoffing crowd,
A changeless, awful calm;
And in her mother's eyes I saw
Woe swallowed up of hope and awe.

They went: we lingered there:
The quiet Master said,
To her, so cold, so still, so fair,—
The Life unto the dead,
Spoke, without wonder, doubt, surprise,
"*Damsel, I say to thee, Arise.*"

With His own hand He raised
Our lost one, and the glow
Bloomed in her cheek, and round she gazed
As one who fain would know
Which world she waked in; and we seemed
For wonder even as men that dreamed.

He doeth all things well;
Great things and small are one
To Him who governs heaven and hell;
So when this deed was done,
The very tones which woke the dead,
Desired us give our darling bread.

The tender thoughtfulness of the Divine Healer and Restorer, who is the Physician of the body as well as of the soul, is well brought out in the last verse. The Lord Jesus, who is very pitiful and of tender mercy, who doeth all things well, considering the physical weakness of the little maid while she gazed—

As one who fain would know
Which world she waked in—

and at the same time observing the father and mother struck with awe and amazement,[1] commanded them to minister to her need. The pitifulness of Him who worked wonders while He was as one that serveth, is, here and in many passages, brought before us by our author.

"Songs in the Twilight," an attractive-looking book, has not reached us in time for the notice in our present impression which a work—whether prose or poetry—by Canon Bell would naturally receive at our hands. Not having leisure to examine it, we must content ourselves with a quotation from the opening verses:—

Here as I sit by the light of the fire,
Far into the night alone,
Watching the flame as in many a spire
It curls from the old hearth-stone,—
Plaintive thoughts come and go,
Now they ebb, now they flow,
Borne in waves from the shore of the long ago.

And many a face of the dead and dear
Looks across from that distant shore,
And many a voice is heard in mine ear,
Now silent for evermore.
And I dream by the blaze
Of the far sweet days,
Which pass in their glory before my gaze.

* * * *

Thus I muse and I dream by the fire alone
Through the shadows to morning grey,
And I feel that the bloom from my life has gone,
And its colour is lost to the day.
Anon, I grew calm,
Hope sheddeth her balm,
And God in the night gives a song and a psalm.

The Early History of the Athanasian Creed, by the Rev. G. D. W. Ommaney, was briefly reviewed in our last impression (page 151). With regard to two points in the Review, we have received an explanation from Mr. Ommaney, which, we are sure, our Reviewer would desire us to insert without delay.

Having stated it to be Mr. Ommaney's conclusion, with a reference to p. 274, that the Commentary on the Athanasian Creed, attributed

[1] St. Mark says—ἐξέστησαν ἐκστάσει μεγάλῃ.

by Waterland to Venantius Fortunatus, was written at "the commencement of the seventh century," our Reviewer added, "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.'" Mr. Ommaney asserts in his letter to us, that the Reviewer "unintentionally misrepresented" the character of his argument. Mr. Ommaney says:—

In proof of my assertion it will be necessary to quote in full the two passages which he quotes in part, or alludes to. On p. 274 my words are:—"*On a former occasion* I have produced reasons for believing the Commentary commonly attributed to Venantius Fortunatus to have been composed before the rise of the Monothelite controversy—*i.e.*, before A.D. 630." And then I have subjoined this foot-note on the words "former occasion":—"Athanasian Creed, examination of recent theories respecting its date and origin, pp. 271," &c. The other passage, which will be found on p. 61, is as follows:—"After reviewing all the instances in which any connection can be so traced between this Commentary and other works of antiquity, it may be confidently denied that in any single case it has borrowed from any source subsequent to the sixth century. There is nothing, therefore, to set against the evidence that it was written in that century or at the beginning of the following one—before the rise of the Monothelite controversy—evidence *which I have endeavoured to show* must be considered sufficient, even admitting the authorship of Venantius Fortunatus to be a matter of uncertainty." And a foot-note is annexed, as in the former case, referring my readers to my earlier work for the evidence in question. It is astonishing to me, how any person could extract from these two passages the proposition which your Reviewer has managed to extract from them. In truth, so far from resting any conclusion respecting the dates of Fortunatus' Commentary mainly, if not exclusively, upon the fact that it contains nothing which can be shown to have been borrowed from any source subsequent to the sixth century, I expressly refer to my former work as stating the grounds of my belief upon the subject. In the second that fact is alleged, not as positive evidence of the date of the Commentary, but as the result of an examination in detail of the several passages in which any connection can be traced between it and other works of antiquity. And I infer from it that "there is nothing to set against the evidence" previously produced, thereby discriminating it from that evidence.

The other particular adduced by our Reviewer to show the inconclusive character of Mr. Ommaney's arguments has reference to the dates assigned by him to the Oratorian and Bouhier Commentaries. Upon this point Mr. Ommaney writes to us:—

He is "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—a fact which disposes Mr. Ommaney to draw from it the conclusion that it is the product of the eighth century." It will be noticed that your Reviewer invests my argument with an air of absurdity by suppressing an essential part of it. What were my words? "Some external evidence is supplied by the fact that the Bouhier Commentary is expressly attributed in Troyes, No. 1979, to St. Augustine. Whatever may have been the cause of this, ... the fact disposes me to regard it as the product of the eighth century, not later. It would not have been attributed to St. Augustine in the tenth century, unless it had then possessed the character of antiquity" (p. 28). It is not, therefore, the bare fact of this Commentary being attributed to St. Augustine (as stated by your Reviewer) which disposes me to regard it as the product of the eighth century, for that could be no evidence of date; but the fact that it was so attributed in the tenth century—a very different thing. "But Mr. Ommaney," continues the Reviewer, "does not rely upon this 'external evidence' only. He has 'internal evidence' also, on which his conclusions are based." It might be expected that he would go on to state my internal evidence, and examine it

on purpose to expose its inconclusive nature. But no! He specifies one particular of it and no more, thereby necessarily leaving it to be inferred that that is the whole, whereas I have adduced two other particulars. And while he rejects the particular which he mentions as inconclusive, he passes over in silence my grounds for maintaining it.

Short Notices.

The Evidential Value of the Acts of the Apostles. By the Very Rev. J. S. Howson, D.D., Dean of Chester. Pp. 170. W. Isbister. 1880.

This is a charming little book, bright, interesting, cogent and suggestive It supplies a want, and in many ways it is likely to do good service. We quote a specimen passage which tells its own tale:—

I have reserved to the last the topic which appears to me of pre-eminent importance. The constant mention of the Holy Spirit, the constant recognition of the supremacy of the Holy Spirit, is more characteristic of this book, as regards religious teaching, than anything else. So conspicuous, so distinguishing a fact is this, that the book has been beautifully and truly termed "the Gospel of the Holy Ghost." The one most remarkable feature in the doctrine of the book is the prominence given in it to the work and offices of the Third Person of the Holy Trinity. The history of the early days of the Christian Church, as told in these Acts, is, so to speak, a specimen of the way in which the Lord Jesus will continue "to do and to teach" from his Royal Throne in Heaven, by the power of the Holy Ghost sent down according to his own solemn words to his disciples, the night before the Cross. "If I depart, I will send the Comforter to you; when He is come, He will guide you into all truth."

The Supremacy of the Holy Ghost.—"This," adds Dean Howson, "is the point up to which I am always led on a careful study of the Acts of the Apostles—the supremacy of the Holy Ghost in our system of doctrine and in the individual life. This, too, is the inner meaning of the harmony of this book with the Gospels on the one hand and the Epistles on the other. If there is one point above all others that I desire to express strongly at the close of the present course of lectures, it is this."

These lectures, the Bohlen Lectures for the present year, were delivered in the church of the Holy Trinity, Philadelphia. John Bohlen, the John Bampton of the United States, bequeathed to trustees, six years ago, 100,000 dollars for religious and charitable objects. The sum of 10,000 dollars was set apart for the endowment of the J. Bohlen Lectureship.

Young England. Volume I. London: 56, Old Bailey.

We have here the first volume of "Kind Words," under the new name of "Young England." The chief fault to be noticed is the lack of a really good serial story. With this exception, "Young England" may bear comparison with any other magazine of its class. Indeed, its prize competitions, we think, are superior to any. Many of the illustrations are excellent: the frontispiece is the *Atalanta*, the ill-fated training-ship. This is an attractive volume for boys and girls.

Pictures from the German Fatherland. Drawn with Pen and Pencil. By the Rev. S. G. Green, D.D., author of "French Pictures," &c. Religious Tract Society.

Dr. Green may be heartily congratulated on his German "Pictures." He has described in a very attractive manner the Rhine, the Black Forest, Northern Germany, the Tyrol, Luther's country, and many places of his-

torical interest. Full of information, the volume has not a single uninteresting page, and from dry handbook description it is entirely free. Well printed, with a very tasteful cover, and rich in illustration, it is worthy in all respects of warm praise. The Religious Tract Society's series of pen and pencil "Pictures" form charming and really valuable gift-books.

My Lonely Lassie. By ANNETTE LYSTER. Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge.

This attractive little book details how a "lonely lassie," daughter of a poor lady of title, becomes a governess, wins the hearts of her charges, gets engaged to a doctor, and after a series of adventures, simply told, becomes a marchioness in her own right, and finally marries happily. The moral tone is good.

My Bible Study. For the Sundays of the Year. F. R. HAVERGAL. *Home Words* Publishing Office, 1, Paternoster Buildings, E.C.

In this tasteful volume are Bible Studies for each week, in facsimiles of Miss Havergal's writing. She was in the habit of sending to a friend, every Sunday, a postcard with text and references written: the collection before us is taken from those postcards, and placed here in suitable form. The volume contains two illustrations, several verses, and an introduction.

Life Chords. By F. R. HAVERGAL. London: Nisbet & Co.

This beautiful edition of Miss Havergal's poems deserve, as to type, binding, and general finish, high praise. The book is divided into six portions—viz., "Under His Shadow," "Chords for Children," "Early Poems," "Miscellaneous," "Loyal Responses," and "Closing Chords." The book is, as we have said, tastefully "got up," and there are twelve really splendid illustrations by the Baroness Von Cramm, one of which—the frontispiece—contains a portrait of Miss Havergal in her ninth year.

Workers at Home. By Mrs. W. H. WIGLEY. Nisbet & Co.

It is stated in the preface to this volume, that it is intended to be a companion to "Our Home Work." It contains useful lessons to "Young Women," "Young Wives," and "Young Mothers," and may be strongly recommended.

Wilfred. At Story with a Happy Ending. By A. P. WINTHROP. John F. Shaw & Co. Pp. 298.

We cannot commend this book so heartily as we would wish. The moral is good; but the tale is weak and carelessly written. The numerous French sentences with which the book is sprinkled, are not very correct; "onbliez" for "oubliez"; "jè" for "je"; "viellard;" a capital A accented, &c. Numerous ill-spelt English words are to be found also—*e.g.* "defense," "worshiped," "practicing," "vender." The mistake of naming the chant commencing "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace" the *Benedictus*, cannot be reckoned a typographical error.

Chinese Stories for Boys and Girls. Edited and translated by A. E. MOULE, B.D. Seeley, Jackson & Halliday. Pp. 80.

As the esteemed author remarks, English children know very little of their Chinese contemporaries. This translation of a Chinese story-book will give them a good insight into the every-day life of Chinese children. The original story-book (two volumes), Mr. Moule tells us, is a very popular work in China.

Far Out : Rovings Retold. By Lieut.-Col. W. F. BUTLER, C.B., author of "The Great Lone Land," "The Wild North Land," &c. Pp. 386. Wm. Isbister. 1880.

In this volume are brought together "scattered papers of travel." We do not always agree with the author; but many of his observations are shrewd and worthy of respectful consideration. His graphic sketches of life in the pine-woods of Canada, on the treeless plains of Natal, in the far-famed Yosemite Valley, and on the pleasant hill-slopes of Cyprus, are interesting to stay-at-home people who admire adventure, or like to read of the ups and downs of human society in distant lands.

We have received from the S.P.C.K. two volumes of "Ancient Philosophies for Modern Reading"—viz., *Stoicism*, by Rev. W. W. CAPES, and *Epicureanism*, by W. WALLACE, M.A. Ably written and interesting books, with tasteful covers.

A charming book for little folks is *The Toy Book* (Religious Tract Society). It has twenty-four large full-page illustrations.—In *The Child's Companion*—volume for 1880—are some pretty pictures of the Months. *The Cottager and Artizan*—yearly volume—is as bright and interesting as usual. We gladly call attention to these two magazines.—From the Religious Tract Society we have also received *A Memoir of the Rev. Henry Watson Fox*, new edition, by the Rev. G. TOWNSHEND FOX, which we hope to notice more fully hereafter.—We gladly call attention to *The Story of Christmas:* short and simple, but suggestive, and thoroughly spiritual. It is a companion to *The Death of the Cross*, a carefully compiled tract which we warmly recommended for circulation before Passion Week last year.

A good volume of the "Cambridge Bible for Schools" series, is the *Commentary on the First Book of Samuel*, by the Rev. A. F. KIRKPATRICK, M.A., Fellow and Assistant Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge. (Cambridge Warehouse, 17 Paternoster Row.)

From the Church of England Sunday School Institute we have received an enlarged edition of *Bethlehem to Olivet*, by Mr. J. PALMER—an admirable work, which has been formerly recommended in these columns.

From the Religious Tract Society we have received *Christmas Carols; The Child's Companion; People's Almanack; The Pocket Book Almanack;* and *The Scripture Pocket Book* for 1881. Also eleven beautiful packets of cards, such as "Bible Truths," "Peaceful Thoughts," "Helping Words," "Christmas Cheer," "New-year Blessings," &c. The "Circling Year" packet deserves special notice; it consists of four large cards, beautifully printed in colours, representing the four seasons.

Retribution—by Mrs. CLARA BALFOUR—(Glasgow: Scottish Temperance League) is a clever story, plainly showing the evils of intemperance.

We have received from Messrs. Nisbet, *Roger Willoughby*, a tale of sea and land in the times of Benbow, by W. H. G. KINGSTON; and *The Lonely Island*, by R. M. BALLANTYNE. The former tale has a peculiar interest, as it contains Mr. Kingston's farewell address to his readers. Mr. Kingston in a few touching words says, that he dies happy in "the loving Saviour who died for me and cleansed me from all sin." Mr. Ballantyne's story is written in his usual graphic and simple style, and possesses great interest, as he depicts the life of those mutineers of the "Bounty" who settled at Pitcairn Island. Varied adventures, interesting descriptions, with useful moral lessons, are happily combined in this attractive book.

From the *Hand and Heart* publishing office we have received the annual of *The Fireside*, of *Home Words*, and of *Day of Days*. Also *What Ireland Needs*, "The Gospel in the Native Tongue," an excellent little book. We gladly recommend these volumes.

From the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge we have received *Bertie and his Sister; Through the Rough Wind;* and *Is it All Right?* These are pretty little story books, of which we think *Bertie and his Sister* the best. *Lizzie Andrews' First Place* is a bright little tale. *The Three Millstones* is a capital book for boys. It relates the adventures of an officer in the Carlist and Crimean wars. The three Millstones, we may remark, were Pride, Intemperance, and Vanity. *Christabel* is a story of a little flower-girl; very pleasantly told. *The Belfry of St. Jude*, viewed from a merely literary stand-point, is one of the best of the tales published this year. The scene is laid in France, and incidents of the Franco-Prussian war are introduced with great effect. The father of the heroine is a *franc-tireur*. Of sound religious teaching we have discovered not a word. *Leo the Great* is one of the Series of "The Fathers for English Readers."

From the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge we have received two editions of *The Churchman's Almanack* and two editions of *The Churchman's Pocket Book*, the value of which is well known; also a packet of very tasteful Christmas and New Year Cards.

Keeping Open House (Shaw & Co.) is a really good little book. A sort of story, it tells how four girls made themselves more useful and kindly; it is, in short, their diary, setting forth their experiences in a pleasing, chatty way. The book is well printed, and has a pretty cover. Messrs. Shaw & Co. also publish *Soldiers of the Cross*, which can be recommended as a thoroughly Christian story, simple and wholesome. The scene is laid at Flamborough Head.

From Messrs. Shaw we have received two attractive volumes, good stories, with bright, neat covers: *In the City* (pp. 188), a story of Old Paris; *In the Sunlight* (pp. 224), a "year of a girl's life story." We can especially recommend *In the Desert* (pp. 189), a tale of those interesting people, the Cevennols; and *On the Door Steps* (pp. 128), a pleasing story of London waifs and strays of the working-class rank, by Mrs. STANLEY LEATHES.

We very heartily recommend a new work by the Rev. F. BOURDILLON, *The Panoply*, an Exposition of Eph. vi. 10–20. (Hatchards.)

We have received No. 1 of the *Universal Instructor*. Ward, Lock, & Co., Warwick House, Salisbury Square, E.C. This is likely to become a very useful publication. With this part is given away a large coloured chart of the History of the World.

From Messrs. Marcus Ward & Co. (67 Chandos Street) we have received *The Parables of Our Lord*, a handsome quarto, with which children are likely to be much pleased. The volume contains coloured illustrations of fifteen different parables, with descriptive letterpress.

From Mr. Stock (62 Paternoster Row) we have received the volume for 1880 of the *Illustrated Missionary News*, a periodical which contains much useful information, and a variety of missionary intelligence. The book is also well illustrated and prettily bound. It is mentioned in the magazine, we notice, that the sale of Mr. Stock's Penny Testament has already reached to nearly 400,000 copies.

THE MONTH.

THE Bishop of Rochester, in a Pastoral Letter to his clergy, remarks that Diocesan Conferences have now passed out of the region of experiment into that of recognized advantage, and that to presume to plead for them would be an impertinence. But he points out the value of conferences as preventing the entire absorption of energies within a limited area, and says that in the larger and fresher air of the diocese frank speech, kindly toleration, quiet self-respect, bright good humour, and simple devoutness might be of general use.

At the Norwich Conference, Sir Fowell Buxton moved a resolution empowering the committee to consider the union of small parishes, not merely with each other, but with any parishes adjoining them. The Rev. W. N. Ripley (St. Giles, Norwich), in seconding the motion, which was agreed to, suggested that there was a special necessity for it in the cathedral city. Canon Nisbet (rector of St. Giles's, London) dwelt upon the insufficiency of clerical income :—

> In 1877 there were 1,500 parishes, with a population of only 220, and an average income of £183. If any young man were to come and consult him about taking orders he should tell him that, unless he had private means, he must be prepared to look anxiety in the face, or enforced celibacy, or, what was worse, an imprudent marriage. In the deanery of Repps there were thirty-six livings with a less population than 400, and nineteen under 250, and not one with an income of £600 a-year. If these parishes were united, and there were eleven instead of thirty-six parishes, there would be an average income of £800 a-year, and yet no clergyman would have more than a population of 1,100. . . . The clergy attached to these small parishes were required in our cities and towns.

On the concerted action of Diocesan Conferences, a Report was presented by a Committee. The Rev. S. Garratt remarked, that when a body was formed as now proposed, it could not but possess great moral weight, and there could virtually be no doubt that it would become, to a great extent, the governing body of the Church. They ought, therefore, to think well and consider long before they introduced a system of which this might be the result. It might be for good, or it might be for the greatest possible evil. What was proposed seemed to be an *imperium in imperio*. Sir W. Jones cordially sympathized with the views of Mr. Garratt. Lord Henniker, however, and Prebendary Meyrick, spoke in favour of a Central Committee. Archdeacons Perowne and Groome expressed doubts; but, ultimately, the resolution was carried by an overwhelming majority.

The Rev. R. W. Enraght, vicar of Holy Trinity, Birmingham, has publicly declared his determination to follow Mr. Dale to prison, and stated that as his diocesan had issued a second set of instructions,[1] after he had obeyed the first, there could be now no hope of a compromise, and he has resumed the points of ritual he gave up.[2]

In the Bishop of Manchester's Charge appears the following passage concerning Ritualistic lawlessness:—

To show what the present temper of extreme men really is, I may quote a paragraph from a letter of the President of the English Church Union, which appeared in the London *Times* of Friday last (Nov. 5):—

The determination (he says) to imprison three clergymen who are certainly acting in obedience to their consciences renders all attempts at conciliation

---

[1] The following is the Bishop's letter to Mr. Enraght:—

"Hartlebury, Kidderminster, Nov. 2, 1880.

"My dear Mr. Enraght,—You will not have forgotten that on July 11, 1879, you undertook, in compliance with my direction and desire, to desist from certain observances of ritual in the administration of Holy Communion in your church, viz.:—

"From the use of lighted candles upon or near the communion-table when they are not wanted for the purpose of giving light;

"From wearing a chasuble and alb;

"From the ceremonial mixing of water with the wine; and

"From making the sign of the cross towards the congregation.

"There are other matters of ritual which have been determined to be contrary to the law of our Church, but which I have received information that you are in the habit of observing.

"I think it necessary, therefore, to order and direct that you shall desist, not only from the above-named observances, but from the following also, viz.:—

"From using in the administration of Holy Communion wafers not being, and instead of, bread such as is usual to be eaten;

"From standing, while saying the Prayer of Consecration, at the middle of the west side of the communion-table, with your back to the people, so as to prevent them from seeing you break the bread, or take the cup into your hand;

"From not continuing to stand during the whole time of your saying the Prayer of Consecration;

"From elevating the cup and paten more than is necessary for compliance with the rubrics;

"From causing the hymn, or prayer, commonly known as *Agnus Dei*, to be sung immediately after the Prayer of Consecration;

"From standing, instead of kneeling, while saying the Confession in the Communion Service; and

"From kissing the Prayer-Book.

"I shall be glad if you will assure me that you will undertake to comply with the directions which I thus feel it to be my duty to place upon you.—Yours very faithfully, "H. Worcester."

[2] On the 20th Lord Penzance, sitting as Dean of Arches, issued his significavit to the Court of Chancery against the Rev. R. W. Enraght, and also against the Rev. S. F. Green, of Miles Platting, Manchester, for contumacy and contempt.

hopeless. It has been therefore resolved by the Council that all clerical members of the Union be recommended no longer to abstain from restoring the vestments prescribed by the Ornaments Rubric where they are desired by the communicants of the parish.

Now, it is an initial fallacy to introduce this idea of "obedience to conscience." A matter of ritual observance, in itself, unless it rest upon a positive command of God, a point of almost absolute indifference—as, for instance, the lighting of candles or the wearing of vestments—can hardly, except by a very circuitous process, be brought under the domain of the moral sense at all. A man may say, "My declaration of conformity binds me to do everything prescribed in the Prayer-book, and my conscience tells me that the wearing of vestments or the lighting of altar-candles is prescribed;" to whom my reply would be, "But the conscience of the Church for more than two hundred years, by not adopting these usages, shows that it did not so interpret this rubric, and the highest appeal court in the realm has decided that it ought not to be so interpreted; and though this may be, as Dr. Littledale declares that it is, "a daring perversion of the law" (*Times*, November 5, 1880), yet plainly your conscience need not disturb itself till the perversion has been proved and the decision of the court reversed, and your interpretation of the rubric established as true. St. Paul's last appeal in a not altogether dissimilar question is to "the custom of the Churches" (1 Cor. xi. 16). Account for the fact how you please, nothing can be historically more certain than that from the date of the Ornaments Rubric in its present form for two centuries there was no such custom known in the Church of England as that which is now pronounced by self-constituted judges to be the only authentic and possible construction of that rubric's terms.

According to a recent vote of the Senate, Greek is not to be deprived of the important place which it has hitherto held in the studies of Cambridge, and candidates for Honours will still have to submit to a preliminary examination in two dead languages.

Peace has not been restored at Guy's Hospital: the senior members of the staff, Dr. Habershon and Mr. Cooper Forster, have resigned. Dr. Habershon, in the letter which he addressed to the Governors, renewed his protest against the nursing arrangements of the last twelve months; he has not changed his opinion as to the mischievous character of the system which has been introduced.

On the 11th, the New Testament Revisers, it is stated, concluded their long labours, that day being the 407th day on which they have assembled, the whole period over which their sessions have extended having been nearly ten years and a half:—

Through the kind thoughtfulness of Prebendary Humphry, the members present on this their last day of meeting assembled at St. Martin's Church, at seven P.M., and joined in an appropriate service, the special Psalms chosen being the 19th, the 90th, and the 122nd; and the special Lesson being Ephes. iv. 1-16. Suitable Collects were

introduced after the Collect for the day; and after the General Thanksgiving, in which mention was made of the mercies vouchsafed to the members in having been permitted to conclude their great and holy undertaking, there was a solemn pause of some minutes for silent thanksgiving and prayer. The Dean of Lichfield read the Lesson out of the Revised New Testament. Doubtless, there went up from that company that evening many earnest aspirations and prayers for the Divine blessing upon their completed work. There were present, besides those already mentioned, the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol; the Deans of Westminster, Rochester, and Llandaff; Dr. Westcott, Dr. Kennedy, Dr. Hort, Dr. Scrivener, Dr. Newth, Dr. Moulton, and the secretary, Mr. Troutbeck.

At the annual *soirée* of the Leeds Church Institute, Lord Cranbrook made a stirring speech. The noble Viscount was followed by Mr. Herbert Gladstone, M.P., who met with a very cordial greeting, and said he stood there as a member of the Church of England, and as a supporter of the Established Church. He was a supporter of the Established Church because it had kept the lamp of truth and morality burning during eighteen centuries. He believed it was dear to the nation, and that in all parts of the world it was doing a great and noble and holy work.[1]

According to a recent report (but reports concerning Dulcigno are not to be trusted) some three thousand of the inhabitants have left the town; the fugitives are said to be principally Christians, and the Mahomedans may co-operate in any scheme of resistance to which the Albanians may incline.

The Grahamstown correspondent of the *Guardian* writes (Oct. 21): The "legal" Bishop of Natal,

> Dr. Colenso, landed at Port Elizabeth last Thursday morning (14th inst.), and in spite of a formal inhibition from Bishop Merriman, which was duly served as soon as he set foot in the diocese, he came on to Grahamstown by train the same afternoon, preached twice in the Cathedral last Sunday, and is holding a confirmation this afternoon.

On the 20th, Sir Alexander Cockburn, Lord Chief Justice of England, died suddenly, aged seventy-eight.

Parliament is prorogued till December 2nd. Rumours have been published concerning dissensions in the Cabinet. The condition of Ireland is most deplorable.

---

[1] The *Guardian* says:—"We see with satisfaction that Mr. Herbert Gladstone ventured to stand on the same platform with Lord Cranbrook, and atone for some former rash utterances by an open profession of Churchmanship and repudiation of a Disestablishment policy."