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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

MARCH, 1881.

ART. I.—REVISION.

FEW subjects are fraught with deeper interest to the English reader than is the history of the successive attempts which have been made from the earliest periods to place the inhabitants of the British Isles in possession of the inestimable privilege of reading the Holy Scriptures in their native tongue. In the Preface to Mr. Baber's edition of Wycliffe's "New Testament," the writer has carefully collected the principal facts which are known in respect of the early Anglo-Saxon versions of any portion of Holy Scripture; and Professor Westcott, in the chapter of his "History of the English Bible," which is entitled "The Manuscript Bible," making, as he informs his readers, free use of the labours both of Mr. Anderson, in his "Annals of the English Bible," and also of the "Historical Account" prefixed to the edition of the English "Hexapla," which was published by Mr. Bagster in the year 1841, has presented them with an admirable summary of the History of the English Bible up to the beginning of the sixteenth century. The same writer has examined with scrupulous care the existing records both of the external and internal history of the English Bible, from the earliest attempts of Tyndale to "cause a boy that driveth a plough to know more of the Scriptures than the Pope did," up to the completion of the so-called Authorized Version of the Old and New Testament, which was the result of a Royal Commission issued by King James in the year 1604, and which appeared from the press of Robert Barker in the year 1611. It is stated on the title-page of that volume (and the statement has been perpetuated from 1611 down to the present time) that this revision is "appointed to be read in Churches."[1] It is

[1] It is not improbable that the printers took these words from the title of the Great Bible of 1540 and 1541, which has the words *This is the*

difficult to understand what interpretation ought to be assigned to this statement, inasmuch as, to adopt the words of Professor Westcott, "no evidence has yet been produced to show that the version was ever publicly sanctioned by Convocation, or by Parliament, or by the Privy Council, or by the King."[2] It is true, indeed, that this Revision carried with it the weight of the King's name, as having been executed in obedience to the King's desire, and inasmuch as the fifty-four learned men to whom the task of revision was originally assigned had been either expressly appointed, or had been approved, by King James. It does not appear, however, as far as any evidence has been hitherto produced, that the work, when completed, obtained any formal civil or ecclesiastical sanction. On the contrary, just as we find Bishop Gervase Babington, in the year 1591, quoting from the Genevan Bible, and even taking his text from it more than twenty years subsequently to the appearance of the Bishops' Bible, which was published in 1568, so we find Bishop Andrews, himself one of the Revisers of 1611, taking his texts, after that date, from the Genevan Bible, when preaching before King James I. at Whitehall, and continuing so to do for many years after the appearance of the Authorized Version.[3]

For a considerable time subsequently to the publication of the English Bible in 1611, no serious attempt was made to amend it; and although new editions of the Genevan Bible continued to be issued, and that version continued to be very generally used, nevertheless the superior excellence and accuracy of King James's Bible became at length so universally recognized, that before the middle of the seventeenth century it had practically superseded all other versions; and thus, as Professor Westcott has observed, "at the very time when the Monarchy and the Church were, as it seemed, finally overthrown, the English people, by the silent and unanimous acceptance of a new Bible, gave a spontaneous testimony to the principles of order and catholicity of which both were an embodiment."[4]

About this time—*i. e.*, on the 26th of August, in the year 1645, Dr. Lightfoot, the Master of "St. Catharine's Hall" (as it was then designated), preached a sermon before the House of Commons at

---

Bible appointed to the use of Churches, a note which does not appear in the Bishops' Bible of 1568. Or, it may be that it was assumed that the original design of King James was carried into effect, and that the new Revision was submitted to the "Bishops and the chief learned of the Church," from them "presented to the Privy Council," and last of all "ratified by his royal authority."

[2] See also Anderson's "Annals of the English Bible," p. 485. 1862.

[3] See Preface to Bishop Andrews's Sermons. Vol. i. p. 7. Oxford. 1841.

[4] "History of the English Bible," p. 158.

St. Margaret's, Westminster, in which he commended to the consideration of the members of the House the expediency of reviewing the Authorized Version of the Bible with the design of conferring upon "the three nations" the great advantage of possessing "an exact, vigorous, and lively translation."[1] In accordance with this suggestion, but not until eight years subsequently to it, and probably as the result of some other influence, the Tory Parliament, shortly before its dissolution, made an order (April, 1653) that "a Bill should be brought in for a new translation of the Bible out of the original tongues," but again nothing was done at that time in furtherance of the scheme. Three years afterwards it was again revived; and a Sub-Committee of the House of Commons conferred often, Whitelocke writes, at his house with the most learned men in the oriental tongues, and some of the latter made "excellent and learned observations of some mistakes in the Translation of the Bible in English, which yet was agreed to be the best of any translation in the world."[2]

In his interesting volume entitled "Our English Bible," Dr. Stoughton observes that some years ago his attention was directed by a friend, to a document in the State Paper Office, which proved to be a Draft Bill for the revision of the English translation of the Bible. Dr. Hill, it appears, had charged the translation of 1611 with making the New Testament speak a prelatical language, and the Bill was framed with a view to the reforming, rectifying, and repairing of the former injury to the new translation, and for preventing of such great inconveniences of such dangerous consequence, and for the furtherance (what in us lieth) and the benefit and education of many."[3]

Notwithstanding these various proposals for the emendation of the Authorized Version, nothing was done in the way of further revision during the Commonwealth, and with the exception of various corrections of typographical and other errors, and some changes in the running titles, marginal references, &c., which have been made at different times, as *e.g.*, by Dr. Scattergood in 1683, and by Dr. Blayney in 1769, the Bibles which are now in common use are printed in accordance with the Revision of 1611.[4]

Some important efforts were made in the course of the eighteenth century, with a view to the correction of the errors of

---

[1] "Works" by Pitman, vol. vi. p. 194. London. 1822.

[2] See "Whitelock's Memoirs" quoted by Professor Westcott in his "History of the English Bible," p. 160.

[3] "Our English Bible," by John Stoughton, D.D., p. 273. The Religious Tract Society.

[4] We may refer those of our readers who desire to become acquainted with the typographical changes which certain words in the 1611 edition of the Authorized Version have undergone, to the work put forth by the late

this Revision, and the production of more accurate versions of different portions both of the Old and New Testament. The general result of these efforts, however, was to bring into clearer light the vast superiority of the Authorized Version, when regarded as a whole, over every earlier or later translation or revision of the sacred text; and it was not till towards the middle of the present century that there appears to have been anything like a general *consensus*, either in regard to the necessity which existed for the rectification of the errors of the Authorized Version, or to the principles upon which a new Revision should be conducted.

One of the earliest, and one of the most important contributions to the work of Revision, was that of the late Professor Scholefield, the first edition of which appeared in the year 1832. In a short Preface prefixed to this work, the learned writer expresses his opinion of the extent to which the work of Revision, if taken in hand, should be carried, in the following terms:—

> Justice, not only to King James's translators, but to a great mass of our population, who have nothing but the English Bible for the DAILY BREAD of their souls, would require that the alterations made in the text should be as few as possible, and that none should be made at all but what after full deliberation should be considered quite necessary.[1]

The same writer directs the attention of his readers to a point upon which a remarkable amount of unanimity has prevailed amongst the most distinguished scholars who have subsequently dealt with the subject of Revision, and that is the importance of preserving a greater amount of uniformity in the rendering of the same Greek words than was deemed necessary or expedient by the Revisers of 1611. "There is one point," he writes, "which would seem important to attend to, which indeed it may appear surprising that our translators attended to so little —uniformity; the uniform rendering of the same Greek word, as far as might be, by the same English word."[2]

---

learned Bishop Turton, entitled "The Text of the English Bible as now printed by the Universities, considered." The second edition of this work appeared in 1833. J. W. Parker and Rivingtons.

[1] Preface to "Hints for an Improved Translation of the New Testament," by the Rev. James Scholefield A.M., Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge, pp. viii. ix., second edition, with Additions. Cambridge, 1836. It is interesting, in connection with the opinion thus expressed by Professor Scholefield, to compare with it the following extract from the Report of the Committee appointed by the two Houses of Convocation for the Revision of the Authorized Version, which was read on the 3rd of May, 1870, in the Upper House: "That in the above resolutions we do not contemplate any New Translation of the Bible, or any alteration of the language, except when, in the judgment of the most competent scholars, such change is necessary."

[2] *Ibid.* Preface, p. ix.

The appearance of the "Hints for an Improved Translation of the New Testament," naturally produced the impression that the author not only contemplated the possibility or probability that such a work might be taken in hand, but further that he himself was favourable to the undertaking. But public opinion was not yet ripe for the work; nor, even in the judgment of those best qualified to arrive at a just conclusion on such a subject, was it deemed desirable to embark at that time in so important and, it must be added, so perilous an enterprise. Accordingly, in his preface to the second edition of the "Hints," which was published in the year 1836, Professor Scholefield observes that in answer to the inquiry which had not unnaturally arisen whether he was really desirous that a new translation of the Greek Testament should be undertaken, he had uniformly replied that such was not the case, and that the real design of his work was "rather to assist towards the understanding of the old translation, than to supersede it by a new one."[1]

Our present limits will not admit of any lengthened remarks upon the merits or defects of this and other works, by which the way was gradually prepared for a complete and systematic Revision of the English text. It will be desirable, however, in order to bring into view the essential agreement of our most competent scholars and divines in many points of importance in connection with the work of Revision, that we should here briefly notice some of those to which Professor Scholefield directed the attention of his readers nearly fifty years ago.

And first in regard to the use of the article. It has been well observed by Archbishop Trench that our translators "omit it sometimes when it is present in the original, and where, according to the rules of the language, it ought to be preserved, in the translation; they insert it when it is absent there and has no claim to obtain admission from them."[2]

Professor Scholefield for the most part restricted his emendations to the former of these two classes. Thus, *e.g.*, in his note on St. Matthew iv. 21, "in a ship," he directs the attention of his readers to the fact that in the Greek the definite article is expressed; and that the rendering should be either, as Bishop Middleton has remarked, *in their boat*, or, as Professor Scholefield thought it a sufficiently accurate rendering, *in the boat*—*i.e.*, in their father's ship. A second example of this defect in the Authorized Version may be noticed, inasmuch as one of the numerous undesigned coincidences of Holy Scripture is thereby obscured In Acts xxiv. 23, we read that Felix "commanded *a* centurion to keep Paul." Now at first sight it might appear either that this

[1] Preface to the second edition, p. xi.

[2] "On the Authorized Version of the New Testament," p. 132. Second edition. 1859.

portion of the narrative had no connection with the preceding chapter, or that it presented some inconsistency with it, inasmuch as we read in xxiii. 23, that the chief captain had committed the charge of St. Paul to *two* centurions. Bishop Middleton, however, "with his usual accuracy of investigation," as Professor Scholefield has remarked, not only solves the apparent difficulty, but points out the undesigned evidence of the truthfulness of the narrative which is here manifested, inasmuch as the two hundred soldiers who were in all probability under the command of one of the two centurions, had proceeded no farther than Antipatris (xxiii. 32), whilst the one remaining centurion was the commander of the horsemen who went on as far as Cæsarea.

Another error of translation connected with the use of the Greek article, and one which applies to several passages, arose out of want of attention to a principle which is now generally understood—viz., that when the article is not repeated before the second of two nouns which are connected by the copula, the same person, not two different persons, is denoted. Professor Scholefield has noted this error in such passages as the following:—(1) Ephes. v. 5, which should be rendered "in the kingdom of Christ and God;" and (2) Titus ii. 13, which should be rendered "our great God and Saviour."

Another class of errors in the Authorized Version to which Professor Scholefield directed attention is that which arose from the imperfect acquaintance of the Revisers with the exact force of the Greek tenses.

Thus, for example, in their rendering of St. Luke v. 6, "their net brake," they failed to observe that the tense of the Greek verb denotes that the nets "were breaking," and not that they had actually broken. So again, in 2 Cor. v. 15, the words which are there rendered "then were all dead," should be rendered, "then (or therefore) all died." And, once more, in 2 Cor. xii. 2, 3, the verb which is rendered in the Authorized Version, "I knew," and which never admits of a past sense, should undoubtedly be rendered, "I know."

We find, in the Authorized Version, instances of one more class of defects which are noticed in the work of Professor Scholefield—viz., the inaccurate rendering of the Greek particles. Thus, *e. g.*, a direct blunder is introduced into St. Luke, iv. 26, 27, by the rendering there adopted of the εἰ μὴ *save* and *saving*. It was overlooked by our Revisers that εἰ μὴ is used not only in the sense of *limitation*, but also in that of *exclusion*, and that the passages in question should have been rendered "unto none of them was Elias sent, *but* (or *but only*) unto Sarepta," and "none of them was cleansed, *but* (or *but only*) Naaman the Syrian."

Many other instances of defective or incorrect renderings

might be adduced under each of the heads to which reference has been made, about which no difference of opinion will be found to exist amongst competent scholars at the present time, as, *e.g.*, in regard to Heb. vi. 7, which should undoubtedly be rendered "meet for those *for* (not *by*) whom it is dressed." There are others, as, *e.g.*, St. Matt. xx. 23, where it is still a matter of doubt whether ἀλλ' οἷς should be rendered, as in the Authorized Version, "but *it shall be given to them* for whom" &c., or whether, omitting most of the words printed in italics, the rendering should be, "except to those for whom" and the passage thus brought into correspondence with Rev. iii. 21, "to him that overcometh will I give to sit with Me on my throne," &c.

Inasmuch as Professor Scholefield has abstained from formally laying down the principles on which, in his judgment, a revision of the Authorized Version should be conducted, we can only gather those principles generally from the manner in which he has dealt with particular passages. It appears, however, from the passage which has already been quoted from the preface to his work, that in regard to the very important question whether the same Greek word in the same context should be rendered by the same equivalent, or by some synonym, Professor Scholefield's views were in harmony with those of the most distinguished Biblical scholars of the present day, rather than with our Revisers of 1611, who advisedly and systematically adopted a different mode of procedure. Thus, *e. g.*, in his note on St. James ii. 2, 3, Professor Scholefield objects to the variation arbitrarily introduced into the Authorized Version in the rendering of the same Greek words by "goodly apparel," in verse 2, and by "gay clothing," in verse 3. He might have extended his objection to the threefold rendering of the same Greek word in the same context by three English synonyms—viz., *apparel, raiment,* and *clothing,* variations which, it must be generally admitted, add nothing to the force of the Apostle's censure, whilst they place the English reader in the disadvantageous position of not knowing that the same Greek word is employed throughout both these verses.

But whilst it is satisfactory to mark the general agreement which exists between the earlier and the later works of competent Biblical critics in regard to some of the principles upon which a thorough revision of the Authorized Version should proceed, it is more important in regard to our present object, and in prospect of the early publication of the Revised New Testament, in which so large a number of our ablest scholars and theologians have been engaged during the last ten years, that we should notice not only the extent to which the principles adopted by earlier Revisionists have been subsequently carried, but also the important results of the

systematic study of the principles of textual criticism, which has made such rapid strides during the last half century.

It is impossible to take up such works as those of Archbishop Trench, of Bishop Ellicott, and more especially that of Bishop Lightfoot on the subject of Revision, and to compare their criticisms on passages of the Authorized Version of the New Testament which call for emendation with those of Professor Scholefield, and not to be struck with the great advance which has been made during that period in the science of Biblical criticism generally. But that which betokens even yet more plainly the vantage ground which Biblical scholars now occupy in regard to the long meditated Revision of the Authorized Version, is the increased facilities which are now afforded for ascertaining the true state of the original text, and the important results which have crowned the indefatigable labours of those who have devoted themselves to this study. The contrast which is presented in this respect between the work of Professor Scholefield and that, *e.g.*, of Bishop Lightfoot, is remarkable indeed.

In the former work we not only find no allusion made even to the spurious character of additions such as that which occurs in St. John v. 7, but further, in regard to some of the very passages which the learned Professor selected as instances of incorrect renderings, his criticism, whilst just as applied to the *textus receptus* which the Revisers of 1611 adopted, will not bear the test of comparison with the readings generally adopted by the ablest textual critics. Thus, *e. g.*, whilst Professor Scholefield's correction of the Authorized Version of St. John xviii. 15, "another disciple," for which he substitutes "the other disciple—viz., St. John," is amply justified on the assumption that the original Greek has the definite article, that criticism falls to the ground when it is observed that in the best MSS. the definite article is wanting.

Again, whilst in regard to some passages the force of the learned Professor's emendation is weakened or destroyed on a comparison of the *textus receptus* with the best MSS., there are other cases in which his "Hints" would have been of greater value had he possessed and employed the aids which are now within the reach of every Biblical student. Thus, *e.g.*, in his note on Col. ii. 2, he substitutes for the words, "of God, and of the Father, and of Christ;" "of God and the Father, and of Christ." Professor Scholefield rightly observes that the *textus receptus* expresses clearly two persons, whilst the Authorized Version as clearly expresses three. He does not appear to have been aware that there is good authority for the reading, **τοῦ Θεοῦ Χριστοῦ**, of God, *even* Christ. Again, in his emendation of St. James iii. 9, "God, even the Father," for which Professor Scholefield substitutes "Our God and Father," it is evident that he was not

aware that the reading adopted by the best textual critics is, not *τὸν Θεὸν καὶ πατέρα*, but *τὸν κύριον καὶ πατέρα*, "the Lord and Father."

Our object in this Paper has been mainly to show, (1), that by the general consent of all competent judges, there is sufficient ground for a Revised Translation of the New Testament; (2), that there is a considerable amount of unanimity amongst our ablest critics in regard to the principles on which that Revision should proceed; and (3), that the rapid strides which have been made both in textual criticism and in Biblical criticism generally, warrant the expectation that in the forthcoming Revised New Testament, which will represent the fruits of the combined labours of a large number of the ablest English and American scholars and theologians, the English reader will obtain a clearer insight than has been hitherto within his reach into the true meaning of that volume in which God has been pleased to impart to mankind the richest treasures both of wisdom and of knowledge.

C. J. ELLIOTT.

ART. II.—THE CHURCH IN NORTHUMBERLAND.

THE Diocesan Conference held in the cathedral city of Durham in the autumn of 1880, under the presidency of the Lord Bishop, may be looked upon as inaugurating an era of renewed activity for the Church in the north-east of England. It would be difficult to speak too highly of the tact and judgment displayed by the President. The selection of readers and speakers reflected great credit upon the Committee of Management. The subjects treated were of a varied and useful character. They were assigned to clergymen and laymen thoroughly competent for the task; and while irritating questions were carefully avoided, discussion was lively and open. It is not too much to say that of the very large[1] assembly of members, no one had reason to regret that his time has been ill-spent, or his countenance afforded to the movement.

The subject of organized lay work in the Church occupied an important place in the first day's proceedings. The Diocese of Durham, from the immense population of its various parishes, is one in which such agency seems especially needed, and it was gratifying to hear no discordant note in the harmonious welcome

[1] The platform was occupied by noblemen and gentlemen of the highest position in the two counties. His Grace the Duke of Northumberland supported the Bishop of the Diocese on the first morning of the conference. The Marquis of Londonderry was also present.

given by all, to the offer of lay help from every available source. The present and future of our "Church schools," entrusted to the Archdeacon of Durham, could not have fallen into better hands. His long experience as Chairman of a School Board, his intimate acquaintance with the working of very extensive schools in his own parish, lent such weight to his observations as those who know him well can readily imagine. The statistics the Archdeacon furnished, prove that the condition of Church schools in the Diocese is encouraging. In the county of Durham the proportion of children receiving elementary instruction is 1 in 7 (the best in the whole country), the proportion for the rest of England being 1 in 10; and in the sister county of Northumberland the superior education of the children is proved by the fact that 1 in 3 of its scholars are presented for examination in the three higher subjects; the proportion for the rest of England being only 1 in 4½. The cost of each child in Church schools is £1 14*s.* 7*d.*, that of each child in Board Schools, £2 2*s.*—an excess of 7*s.* 5*d.* That Churchmen in the North still value the privilege of retaining schools under their own management, may be inferred from the fact, that the accommodation provided by Churchmen during the last seven years has exceeded 800,000—a full 100,000 more than has been provided by all the School Boards together, including all the schools unfortunately transferred to them.

The Conference on the second day's session was enlivened by some well-considered Papers and speeches on the subject of Church Patronage; and next followed a discussion on the best mode of retaining the young and moving population under religious influence. This is a topic familiar to those who take an interest in the proceedings of the Church Congress, the Diocesan Conference, or the Clerical meeting. It has a special interest for us in the North. Our manufactories, at one time in brisk work, attract their thousands of hands, and afford them plenty of work with ample wages. At a few weeks' notice, often less, a trade dispute or commercial depression may scatter the majority in various directions. It is no unfamiliar sight to see a small town of untenanted houses in the vicinity of some large works which have closed owing to the failure of the firm or the cessation of a demand. I have known a prosperous mining village deserted in a few months, its schools closed, its pastor glad to leave his parsonage, and take some work elsewhere to relieve him from the melancholy duty of going round his parish to see a "deserted village." The time for a clergyman to deal with his parishioners is short, his opportunities are few. In prosperous days every tenement will be crowded with able-bodied men and lads; and it is no easy task to gain an influence with such. The married men with families are obliged to take refuge

in any place that offers itself, often without any appliance for comfort or decency. It is only a visit late in the evening, or on a Saturday afternoon, that will give a clergyman the chance of an interview with the working man. Many of us have gained access to large works and factories at the dinner-hour, and under favourable circumstances have had a brief service in the open air or under cover of some shed or workshop. We have gathered, it may be, hundreds of men together, and in many cases the use of God's ordinance of preaching the Word has been blessed. But there remains very much to be done; and it is to aid the clergy in this great field of Christian labour that lay agency is so urgently called for.

From the years 1871 to 1875 the prosperity in the iron and coal trades of the North of England was unparalleled: commercial enterprise advanced by leaps and bounds. Profits were enormous; wages were in proportion; extravagant modes of living ensued—luxuries unthought-of hitherto by masters and workmen became almost necessaries. Intemperance grew more prevalent, gambling became a passion, ensnaring hundreds. The genius and energy of Bishop Baring led him to take active measures to stem the tide of ungodliness. During the five years ending with 1876, forty new churches, permanent or temporary, were erected in the Diocese at a cost of £111,900, and no fewer than forty-nine churches were enlarged or restored; and happy indeed was the providence that prompted such active efforts. The tide of prosperity at length began to ebb, at first slowly; but as the years 1876–77–78 passed by—each one more disastrous in its commercial results to the trade of the district than the preceding—all sources of beneficence were exhausted. Bankruptcies and liquidations were of weekly occurrence, thousands of men were thrown out of work, wages diminished, and the gloom cast over the whole district became intense. At this time the benefit of the subdivision of parishes and the increase in the number of clergy became apparent. Every church was the centre of benevolent effort in the neighbourhood—the clergy exerted themselves, and enlisted much sympathy on behalf of their poor neighbours; and it is not too much to say, that during the years of trouble and distress more real spiritual good was effected than in the days of prosperity and wealth.

With such difficulties depending upon the uncertainties of our commerce, it will always be the lot of our clergy to contend. These will occur, too, at such times as to carry off a goodly number of children from our schools, just before the annual inspection, and thus deprive the managers of a portion of a hard-earned grant; or break up our Bible classes, or take away our candidates for confirmation. Perhaps, when the tide is

turned a complete new set of parishioners will settle down with us, or an immigration of some hundreds of navvies, pitmen, or iron workers be attracted by the opening up of new works; and among these strangers we have to do the best we can, although too often their unsettled habits have distracted their minds from all religious observances.

It need not surprise any one that the returns of our numbers in actual communion with the Church are far from being satisfactory. The church accommodation in our large towns is still quite incommensurate with the needs of the population. In the county of Durham the proportion of church sittings to population is 1 to 7; in the south or thickly populated part of Northumberland it is 1 to 7·32; while in the northern archdeaconry of Lindisfarne, almost exclusively rural, the disproportion sinks to 1 to 3·5.

It is with a view of imparting a new and healthy impetus to Church work in the northern county that the Bishop of Durham is giving so much attention to the scheme for the division of his populous diocese, the Act for which was passed towards the close of the session of 1878. By the will of the late Thomas Hedley, Esq., a sum of money amounting to nearly £18,000 became available for the endowment of a new see; a munificent donation of £10,000 from the Duke of Northumberland, and another of £3,000 from the present Bishop of Durham, formed a substantial addition to the Endowment Fund; the total amount of which, exclusive of the legacy, now exceeds £31,000. To this must be added the value of £1,000 per annum to be deducted from the future income of the Bishop of Durham, reckoned at thirty years' purchase; and the sum of £80,000 may be considered as good as realized for the establishment of the new bishopric. This is a satisfactory pledge of the completion of the project at no distant date. In pleading for help towards the accomplishment of his design; the Bishop of Durham said in his opening address at the Conference:—

> All that self-denying zeal, long experience, and exceptional business capacities could do, Bishop Baring had done. But a diocese which extends for more than a hundred miles from north to south, and comprises a million and a quarter of human beings; a diocese widely heterogenous in its character—including extensive and sparsely inhabited parishes under the Cheviots on the one hand, and the thronged sea-ports and pit villages of Durham, with their dense and growing populations, on the other; a diocese, moreover, presenting exceptional difficulties, owing to the rapid aggregation of its masses, had far outgrown any one man's capacities. It was quite impossible that any bishop, however energetic, could exercise due supervision and influence over so large an area under circumstances so adverse.

It would be superfluous now to commend to the majority of

the readers of THE CHURCHMAN the affectionate memory of the late Bishop Baring. The See of Durham has been occupied by many a bright ornament of the English Church. The work of the great Bishop Butler will never be effaced from the history of the Church of England; the munificence of Bishop Barrington, the learning of Bishop Maltby, the cheerful piety of Bishop Longley, have not passed into oblivion; but the lot of Bishop Baring was cast in no easy and luxurious days, at all events for the bishops. The calm delights of literary seclusion were not for him. He plunged with all the ardour of his warm heart into the work that God had given him to do. Regardless of the world's praise or blame, he selected for favourable notice the men he believed to be best fitted for benefices that fell vacant. As for gifts towards the building of churches and schools, his liberality compelled him to adopt a small and inexpensive style of living during the greater part of his episcopacy. His deeds of kindness, in helping the poorer clergy and supporting them in their arduous work, will never be forgotten. Within a few weeks of his utter collapse, and subsequent resignation, he was employed in delivering his episcopal charge, of great length and of a most exhaustive character, full of affectionate counsel and well-timed warning, and at last succumbed to a disease, aggravated by mental and physical toil. He resigned his preferment about eight months before his decease. It is due to his memory to say that he was induced in the last two years of his life to view with approval the proposed division of the Diocese, and admitted its necessity for the proper discharge of episcopal functions.

The regret that will be felt by Churchmen, both lay and clerical, at being separated from the historic and noble See of Durham will be keenly felt in some quarters, and in none more, perhaps, than in those which are remote from the cathedral city. The cradle of the Christian Church in the North will be honoured once again with the dignity of having an episcopate of its own; but hundreds of years have associated the two counties so intimately, that neither to the north nor to the south of the Tyne can we look for unmixed feelings of satisfaction at the proposed division. Nevertheless, there is something extremely interesting to the student of our ancient ecclesiastical history in the prospect of the establishment of an English bishopric in Northumbria. Lindisfarne, or Holy Island, lying upon the coast, stretches from north to south little more than three miles; washed by the restless waves of the German Ocean on the east, it is separated from the mainland by a narrow channel almost dry at low water. Holy Island was selected as early as 634 A.D. as the seat of a bishopric by the pious Aidan, on his favourable reception by King Oswald. "They chose," says the

Venerable Bede, referring to Aidan and his companions—"they chose for their habitation the most dreary situations; no motives but those of charity could drive them from their cells, and if they appeared in public it was to reconcile enemies, to instruct the ignorant, to discourage vice, to plead the cause of the unfortunate. The little property they held was common to all, poverty was esteemed as the surest guardian of virtue, and the benefactions of the opulent they respectfully declined, or instantly employed, relieving the necessities of the indigent." This indefatigable apostle of the North baptized, it is said, 15,000 persons in the course of seven days. Such estimates, however, were not in early days subjected to the criticism of statisticians of the modern type, and the numbers may be regarded as open to some suspicion, without involving us in the charge of decrying the mighty effect of the Gospel as preached by Aidan and his companions. He had the post of honour for seventeen years, and was succeeded by Finan, whose episcopate lasted ten years, till 661 A.D. Two royal converts, the kings of Mercia and East Anglia, were said to have been baptized by his hands. At his death succeeded Colman; and on his resignation, in consequence of a dispute with the adherents of the Romish system about the tonsure, Tada succeeded him. But real historic interest centres in the great Cuthbert, the Saint of Northumbria.

Born of obscure parents, and in his youth a shepherd, Cuthbert is said to have been favoured with a beatific vision of Aidan ascended to heaven. This moved him to apply for admission to holy orders at the Abbey of Melrose, where he lived for fourteen years in great love and esteem. Subsequently he removed to Lindisfarne, and was elected prior. He governed the priory for twelve years. His zeal often prompted him to undertake missionary journeys into the wild and mountainous parts of the adjacent counties, where the Cheviots support at this day their thousands of sheep and cattle. The district is almost as bare of human habitations as in the days of St. Cuthbert. With a strange *penchant* for solitude, however, he built himself a cell, suited for an anchorite, on one of the Ferne Islands, where it is said his presence brought fertility to the rocky soil, which henceforth, in the words of the poet,

Miratur novas frondes et non sua poma.

But many years' residence here, far from effacing the memory of his labours, only opened for him an avenue to higher distinction. He was called to fill the vacancy in the See of Lindisfarne in the year 685 A.D. Two years later he expired, after giving charge to his brethren to secure his bones against desecration by removing them in their flight before any pagan invasion.

Eighteen bishops of Lindisfarne appear in succession, and then

the Danish invasion sweeps like a tempest over Northumbria. A more secure retreat is found at last inland; the bones of St. Cuthbert are carried by the fugitive monks. Chester-le-Street, in the county of Durham, is selected as their new home, and here for a time the northern bishopric is established; but the widely extending ravages of the Northmen reached them even there after another century and a half. Flight to Ripon offered the only chance of safety; and it was not till 1070 A.D. that the bones of St. Cuthbert were permitted to repose in quietude under the newly founded cathedral church of Durham.

Such a brief sketch of the early history of the Church in the North will explain the strong sentiment existing in favour of uniting Lindisfarne with Newcastle in the title of the new bishopric. Modern convenience, however, seems to have guided the framers of the Act more than mediæval sentiment, and the See of Newcastle-on-Tyne will probably be established under that designation and no other, before many months are past, and the ancient name survive as an appendage to the archdeaconry of the extreme north.[1]

The results of the activity of the Established Church during the past few years have most happily roused but little opposition on the part of Nonconformist bodies. Of these the

[1] "I have said that I have never wavered in my opinion; but I cannot say that I have never entertained any passing regrets. I trust I am the last person to undervalue grand historic memories. The truest aspirations in the present are built upon the noble associations of the past. The Church of Christ more especially is typified by a temple raised layer upon layer, each part dependent on the other for the symmetry and stability of the whole. Our sentimental feelings must necessarily receive a deep wound from the partition of this ancient diocese. I know that the feeling is felt by many in Northumberland: I reciprocate it most sincerely myself. It will be a consolation to both to feel that the regret in parting is mutual. If it costs Northumberland a pang to separate from the great see of Durham, with its magnificent cathedral and its nine centuries of historic tradition, the Bishop and diocese of Durham will feel not less regret in relinquishing the largest and fairest portion of their inheritance, and with it the cradle of the see, the birthplace of Christianity in northern England, the Iona of the eastern shores, the Holy Island, rich with the memories of Aidan and Finan and Cuthbert. But if this be, as I believe it to be, a measure of the highest moment, bound up with the best interests of the Church of Christ in these northern counties; then no sentiments or feelings, however sacred, must be allowed to stand in its way. Historic associations and local attachments were intended to be stepping-stones; we must not convert them into barriers. When once historic sentiment flings itself across the path of an urgent practical need, then away with it in the name of God. We shall plead in vain some lingering regret over a waning past as an excuse for holding back. The voice of a higher Authority is heard summoning us forward on the path of a larger future; 'let the dead bury their dead'—dead traditions, dead historic associations, the dead past in all its forms—'and follow thou Me.'"—*Extract from the Bishop of Durham's Opening Address at the Diocesan Conference.*

most important in our large towns are the Presbyterian. In the villages approaching the Scottish border they probably outnumber all the other religious sects together. In the town of Newcastle they have several congregations, and are represented by many earnest and godly ministers. The various sections of the great Wesleyan community certainly press very close upon the heels of the Presbyterian bodies. They comprise many of the wealthier middle class, and work in harmony with their Presbyterian neighbours. It is not, I believe, the indulgence of too sanguine a hope to look forward to the day when those who attend no place of worship, without any prejudice for or against the National Church, may be won to attend her services. But there must be the bold and faithful preaching of Christ, there must be consistency of life in ministers and religious leaders, there must be zeal in good works on the part of those who aspire to be somewhat, there must be simplicity and reverence combined in the conduct of our public devotions, or the people of the North of England will not be gained over.

The new bishop, when appointed, will have a noble sphere of duty open to him. He will have but little Church patronage with which to tempt the rising and talented men of our old universities across the Tyne. The attractions of the older diocese, with its many associations and select society—its magnificent cathedral—moreover, with its rich livings—will fascinate many a northward-bound curate, and secure the offer of his services in the Diocese of Durham. Northumberland, the ecclesiastical Galilee, with its dense population on the banks of the Tyne, or its scattered herdsmen on the Cheviot slopes, will offer but few attractions. Nevertheless, if the bishop should prove himself a man of real piety and substantial worth, with a capacity for organizing, with the gift of being able to win the confidence of the wealthy laity and to interest them in Church work, with a hearty and complacent spirit towards all who differ from him, and a kindly sympathy with the wants and aspirations, the troubles and perplexities of working men, he may and will do much to raise to a high standard the Church of Northumbria. But, above all, it is essential, for the permanent success of his work, that people should know exactly "where to find him." Men of the North always entertain greater respect for a man they can understand, whether they agree with him or not. They are generally open to reason, with little that is impulsive in their nature, the very reverse of demonstrative, and somewhat hard to please; but once establish friendly relations with them, and they will prove staunch friends and useful helpers.

A magnificent church, lately restored under Sir Gilbert Scott's supervision, and capable of holding nearly two thousand persons seated, will need but little in the way of outlay to com-

plete its interior fittings in conformity with the honour assigned it of being the cathedral of the new diocese. No family of note in the northern county but has its name upon those ancient tablets, or its arms upon the monumental slabs or on the costly mural monuments that adorn its interior—the honoured names of Collingwood, Ridley, Askew, are naturally read with interest within the precincts of the church where once King Charles I. is said to have worshipped, where Knox is known to have preached, and where, by God's good providence, after many vicissitudes and changes, we may hope that there will be continued the faithful ministry of God's Word through a long future—undimmed by the cloud of superstition, unassailed by the malice of the destroyer.

H. J. MARTIN.

ART. III.—WORDSWORTH.

1. *Poems of Wordsworth.* Chosen and edited by MATTHEW ARNOLD. Macmillan & Co. 1880.
2. *The English Lake District, as Interpreted in the Poems of Wordsworth.* By WILLIAM KNIGHT. David Douglas: Edinburgh. 1878.
3. *English Men of Letters: Wordsworth.* By F. W. H. MYERS. Macmillan & Co. 1881.

THERE is no poet about whom there has been such an ebb and flow of opinion as Wordsworth. There is none who has had more passionate and indiscriminating worship from his admirers, and there is none who has been more coldly treated by the general public. He has never been what may be called a popular poet, winning the suffrages of all ranks and ages and of all classes and conditions of mind. He has had his rises and falls in the estimation of the people, who, after all, are the final court of appeal as to what constitutes popularity. The cultured critic may decry the public taste; yet it is public taste that sets its stamp on the things which are to live or die. It is not that which pleases the critic in his study, and which from his chair he pronounces to be good work, of intellectual ability, and spiritual purpose, that is stamped with success; but that which stirs the great heart of the nation, and whose breathing thoughts and burning words inspire men with the patriot's courage or the martyr's zeal. Wordsworth has never been popular as Shakespeare is popular, or as Scott and Byron are popular, or as Burns and Tennyson are popular. The estimation in which he has been held has waxed and waned, and waxed and waned

again and again. Mr. Matthew Arnold, in the preface to his delightful "Selection of the Poems of Wordsworth"—a volume which, as the compiler says, "contains everything, or nearly everything, which may best serve him with the majority of lovers of poetry, nothing which may disserve him"—says that "Wordsworth has never, either before or since, been so accepted and so popular, so established in possession of the minds of all who profess to care for poetry, as he was between the years 1830 and 1840, and at Cambridge. From the very first, no doubt, he had his believers and witnesses. But I have myself heard him declare that, for he knew not how many years, his poetry had never brought him in enough to buy his shoestrings. The poetry-reading public was very slow to recognize and was very easily drawn away from him. Scott effaced him with this public, Byron effaced him." We learn from the biography of the poet that between the years 1807 and 1815 there was not one edition of his works sold. He was sneered at in the Reviews. Jeffrey lashed him by his satire. Byron tried to annihilate him in "English Bards and Scotch Reviewers." All remember his well-known contemptuous lines—

> A drowsy, frowsy poem, called the Excursion,
> Writ in a manner which is my aversion.

When Cottle, a Bristol bookseller, made offers of his stock to the Messrs. Longmans, and an inventory was made of the several volumes, there was one book noted down as worth nothing. This was a volume of the "Lyrical Poems of Wordsworth," published in 1798. Though Cottle had only ventured on an edition of 500 copies, yet the greater part remained unsold. In 1800, nothing daunted, Wordsworth published a second volume, and although it contained not only Wordsworth's justly celebrated lines on "Revisiting Tintern Abbey," but also Coleridge's weird poem of "The Ancient Mariner," yet the book met with little success. The death of Byron, and the dedication of Scott's genius to the novel, gave Wordsworth an opportunity of catching the ear of all to whom poetry is a pleasure; but his growth in general favour was gradual and slow. He never, on one particular morning, "awoke to find himself famous," as did the poet of "Childe Harold." When Tennyson dawned as a new star in the poetic firmament, and by his perfect literary form, his melodious measures, his exceeding beauty and sweetness, as well as by the great human interest which of itself lends an incomparable charm to his poems, gained the public ear, Wordsworth seemed to decline. But only for a time—again his genius was recognized.

One of the first manifestations of another change in public feeling, and the prelude to a more general recognition of his

greatness, was the honorary degree of D.C.L. conferred on him by the University of Oxford in the summer of 1839. Keble, as Professor of Poetry, "introduced him in words of admiring reverence," to quote the words of Mr. Myers; "and the enthusiasm of the audience was such as had never been evoked in that place before, except on the occasion of the visit of the Duke of Wellington." The collocation was an interesting one. The special claim advanced for Wordsworth by Keble, in his Latin oration, was that "he had shed a celestial light upon the affections, the occupations, the piety of the poor."

In October, 1842, Sir Robert Peel, as Prime Minister, gave him another token of the estimation in which he was held by bestowing on him an annuity of £300 a year from the Civil List for distinguished literary merit; and when Southey died, in March, 1843, he was offered the office of Poet Laureate, in a letter from Earl de la Warr, the Lord Chamberlain. This he at first respectfully declined, but he was afterwards induced to accept the office on a repeated request from the Lord Chamberlain, and influenced, no doubt, by a letter from Sir Robert Peel, who gave expression to the national feeling in the matter.

> The offer (writes Sir Robert) was made to you by the Lord Chamberlain with my entire concurrence, not for the purpose of imposing on you any onerous or disagreeable duties, but in order to pay you that tribute of respect which is justly due to the first of living poets. The Queen entirely approved of the nomination, and there is one unanimous feeling on the part of all who have heard of the proposal (and it is pretty generally known) that there could not be a question about the selection. Do not be deterred by the fear of any obligations which the appointment may be supposed to imply. I will undertake that you shall have nothing required from you. But as the Queen can select for this honourable appointment no one whose claims for respect and honour, on account of eminence as a poet, can be placed in competition with yours, I trust you will not longer hesitate to accept it.

Of late years the hold of the poet on the world has strengthened; his works are more widely read and appreciated than ever they have been, and his name is constantly before the public. A school of "Wordsworthians" has sprung up, who regard with equal love and reverence everything the poet has written, and who see the same beauty in "Peter Bell" and the "Thanksgiving Ode" as in "Michael" and the "Solitary Reaper." Mr. Matthew Arnold, a most discriminating critic, and far from being "a Wordsworthian" in the sense just spoken of, pronounces him to be "one of the very chief glories of English poetry." "I firmly believe," he says, "that the poetical performance of Wordsworth is, after that of Shakspeare and Milton—of which all the world now recognizes the worth—

undoubtedly the most considerable in our language, from the Elizabethan age to the present time." "Dante, Shakspeare, Molière, Milton, Goethe, are altogether larger and more splendid luminaries in the poetical heaven than Wordsworth. But I know not where else, among the moderns, we are to find his superior." This is, indeed, high praise; and whether we agree with the eulogium or not, the poet of whom such words can with any justice be used must ultimately obtain that recognition which is his due. Professor Knight is the author of a most interesting volume, "The English Lake District as Interpreted in the Poems of Wordsworth," and has lately formed a "Wordsworthian Society," to promote the reading of the poet's works, and to advance the principles which he advocated in his poems with such simplicity of motive and directness of aim. Professor Knight also promises a new library edition of Wordsworth's poems, with a new life, which is, I believe, to contain some letters and some new matter never before published. We have proof, in the attention which is now paid on all hands to Wordsworth, that the recognition which was once doubtful is secured, and that Southey spoke but the truth when, in reference to some boast of Byron that he would "crush the 'Excursion,'" the author of "Thalaba" burst out into the indignant words, "He crush the 'Excursion!' He might as well attempt to crush Mount Skiddaw!"

I have no intention in the present paper to criticize Wordsworth's poems: that would be simply presumptuous, considering the many and competent critics who have weighed his merits and given their estimate of his genius. If, however, I may be permitted to give my own thoughts on the matter, I question whether Wordsworth will ever become a popular poet in the wide sense of that word—whether his poems will ever become "familiar as household words" to the mass—whether, while he is appreciated by the refined and cultured few, he will ever be anything but *caviare* to the less refined and less cultured many. If, indeed, it be true, as the critic who sees neither "sweetness, nor light" in the English people tells us with pleasant frankness that "our upper class is materialized, our middle class vulgarized, and our lower class brutalized," how can a poet who appeals to principles which touch only what is highest and purest and most unworldly in our nature, ever be generally popular? Wordsworth appeals to those who love nature and humankind, and have reverence for God. He wished either to be considered as a teacher or nothing; and he is therefore simply beyond the understanding of men who live for the world, and who care for nothing but so far as their vanity or selfishness is concerned.

But yet, again, as far as my observation goes, he is not popular with the young; those with whom in early life poetry is a

passion, turn elsewhere to find the poetry which is congenial to their imperfect and undisciplined taste. What they enjoy is "the stirring incident by flood and field;" the romantic adventure; the thrilling story of love or war; the melodious flow of the rhyme; the sounding and sonorous verse. It is only when "the years that bring the philosophic mind" are upon us, and we seek for rest and repose in meditative thought, that we feel the charm of poetry that deals with delicate and subtle feelings, and of poems that are designed to be "in their degree efficacious in making men wiser, better, and happier."

And, once more, there is, as it appears to me, too little of human interest, as a rule, in the poetry of Wordsworth to allow of its ever becoming widely popular. Nature, however pure is the source of such inspiration—however we may love her glorious scenes and admire her ever-varying moods—however high the pleasure we may derive from her woods and waters, her mountains and her lakes, has not the same power over the heart as the joys and sorrows, the laughter and the tears of our common humanity. Though in a certain and limited sense Wordsworth does deal with life, the life of the simple peasantry of the Westmoreland hills and dales, yet there is little in his poems of "the pity and the terror by which the passions are purified and refined;" nothing of the tragic emotion which thrills while it subdues, and holds the mind enchained and entranced; and his harp is wanting in some strings to whose touch the heart almost unconsciously vibrates and responds. His poetry is that of a man neither cold of nature nor weak in feeling—far otherwise, as we learn from his letters and his life; for he was capable of the strongest impulses and the profoundest emotion; but at the same time it is the poetry of one whose career was placid, and whose outward circumstances, with the exception of some sorrows which fall to the lot of all, were successful and happy. Nothing of his "is written as if in starfire and immortal tears." "His study," as one of his female servants informed a stranger, "was out of doors." He murmured out his verse in the open air, in sight of the hills and lakes which he loved, and not unseldom in the presence of intimate and sympathizing friends. Lady Richardson says:—

> The Prelude was chiefly composed in a green mountain terrace on the Easdale side of Helm Crag, known by the name of Under Lancrigg, a place which he used to say he knew by heart. The ladies sat at their work on the hillside, while he walked to and fro on the smooth green mountain turf, humming out his verses to himself, and then repeating them to his sympathizing and ready scribes, to be noted down on the spot and transcribed at home.

It is a pleasant scene that is here placed before the mind's eye—the poet, amid the stillness and glory of the hills, and in

the presence of near and dear friends, walking thoughtfully up and down, and murmuring out some of those exquisite stanzas which have delighted us by their interpretations of Nature and the subtlety of their thought. But perhaps these sweet and tranquil surroundings were not favourable to any great intensity of passion, or to that divine tenderness of pathos which melts the heart and makes the eye overflow with tears.

The Lake country must have had an added charm to its wondrous beauty when it was the home of so many men known to fame—when Southey was at Keswick, and Professor Wilson at Elleray, and Wordsworth at Rydal, and Dr. Arnold and his family spent their vacations at Fox How. De Quincey, too, lived for many years in the district, and Quillinan who married Wordsworth's daughter Dora, also resided there for a time, while Hartley Coleridge made his home at Nab Cottage, on the borders of Rydal Water. These and others were attracted to the district in order to be Wordsworth's neighbours. Here lived also many of the poet's intimate friends—amongst the number, Mrs. Fletcher and her daughter, Lady Richardson, and Mrs. Davy. All the men of note just mentioned had passed away before the writer of this paper became acquainted with the Lake country. Sir John and Lady Richardson were, however, still at Lancrigg; and Dr. and Mrs. Davy (he a younger brother of Sir Humphry) were living at Lesketh How. Of these, too, it must now be said, "the place that knew them knoweth them no more." Lady Richardson passed away lately, after a calm and happy old age,

> To where beyond these voices there is peace.

All these used to talk of Wordsworth with great reverence and affection. Mrs. Arnold, when she spoke of him, always called him "dear Mr. Wordsworth." She was one of his chief friends and a great admirer of his poems, into whose spirit and philosophy she was well fitted to enter. She used to tell with pride and affection how Wordsworth had suggested to Dr. Arnold the way in which the fine trees and beautiful shrubs that adorn the garden and grounds of Fox How should be planted, with an eye to the greatest picturesqueness and effect. And now *she* is gone, passed into the Father's home, to join those whom she loved, while hills and lakes remain, their beauty untouched, their charm as fresh as ever. And does not this make the very irony of life?—

> Our crown of sorrow this—its heaviest pain—
> Loved ones must go, and only *things* remain.

> Here flows the Rotha that she loved so well;
> Here rise the hills, her friends for many a year;

Here spreads the Intack on her own sweet Fell;
Here are the scenes she ever held most dear.
Here, where her children rose to call her blest,
She passed in peace to her eternal rest.

Was Wordsworth a Christian poet? There can be no doubt as to the answer; though we may not be able to say he was a religious poet—that is, not in the same sense that George Herbert, or Cowper, or Keble are religious poets. The poems of Wordsworth are decidedly Christian, but not in any sense theological, though his fine Sonnet to Laud might lead the reader to think him a High Churchman. His letters to Lady Beaumont—in which, while he explains to her the reason why his poetry could never be popular with the world of rank and fashion, he tells her the object he had in writing his poems—prove that these are Christian in the truest sense of the word:—

It is an awful truth (he says) that there neither is nor can be any genuine enjoyment of poetry among nineteen out of twenty of those persons who live, or wish to live, in the broad light of the world, among those who either are or are striving to make themselves people of *consideration* in society. This is a truth, and an awful one; because to be incapable of a feeling of poetry, in my sense of the word, is to be without love of human nature and reverence for God. Upon this I shall insist elsewhere; at present let me confine myself to my object, which is to make you, my dear friend, as easy-hearted as myself with respect to these poems. Trouble not yourself upon their present reception; of what moment is that compared with what I trust is their destiny?—to console the afflicted, to add sunshine to daylight, by making the happy happier, to teach the young and the gracious of every age to see, to think and feel, and therefore to become more actively and securely virtuous—this is their office, which I trust they will faithfully perform, long after we (that is, all that is mortal of us) are mouldered in our graves.

Professor Wilson ("Christopher North") in an interesting paper on Sacred Poetry says:—

In none of Wordsworth's poetry, previous to his "Excursion," is there any allusion made, except of the most trivial and transient kind, to revealed religion. He certainly cannot be called a Christian poet. The hopes that lie beyond the grave, and the many holy and awful feelings in which on earth these hopes are enshrined and fed, are rarely, if ever, part of the character of any of the persons, male or female, old or young, brought before us in his beautiful pastorals. Yet all the most interesting and affecting ongoings of this life are exquisitely delineated; and innumerable, of course, are the occasions on which, had the thoughts and feelings of revealed religion been in Wordsworth's heart during the hours of inspiration—and he often has written like a man inspired—they must have found expression in his strains; and the personages, humble or high, that figure in his repre-

sentations, would have been, in their joys or their sorrows, their temptations and their trials, Christians. But most assuredly this is not the case; the religion of this great poet, in all his poetry published previous to his "Excursion," is but the religion of the woods.

And even in the "Excursion," Professor Wilson says, "while religion is brought forward in many elaborate dialogues between priest, pedlar, poet, and solitary, the religion is not Christianity." "The interlocutors, eloquent as they all are, might, for anything that appears to the contrary, be deists." It is true that Wordsworth, in many of his earlier poems, may be charged with Pantheism, for he speaks of Nature and her forces as if they were the only living soul of the universe. Have we not the very germ of Pantheism underlying those beautiful and familiar lines "On Revisiting Tintern Abbey"?—

> And I have felt
> A presence that disturbs me with the joy
> Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime
> Of something far more deeply interfused,
> Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
> And the round ocean and the living air,
> And the blue sky, and in the mind of man;
> A motion and a spirit that impels
> All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
> And rolls through all things.

But we must remember that the poet, who, in the earlier part of his life, saw the impersonal God everywhere, and who spoke of the Living Being that created the universe as "a motion and a spirit that impels all thinking things," did afterwards write as a Theist, and spoke of a personal God whose greatness and goodness are to be seen in all His works. But if this were all—if he advanced no further, if there were nothing in his poems of the awful mystery of the cross—he could not with any justice be called a Christian poet. Is there any truth in the charge made by Mr. Ruskin against him in one of his articles in the *Nineteenth Century* on "Fiction, Fair and Foul," that Wordsworth was "incurious to see in the hands the print of the nails?"

Let us look at some of his poems, and see if there be not in them the utterances of Christian faith and love and hope, and if he does not at times find his inspiration in the waters of that "river, the streams whereof make glad the city of God."

Can we do better than begin with the splendid ode on "Intimations of Immortality," in which he chases away the sad thought, that the present can never be as the past?—

> The things which I have seen I now can see no more;
> But yet I know, where'er I go,
> That there hath past away a glory from the earth:

by the sense of the joy that is around him—the birds singing a joyous song, the young lambs bounding, all the earth gay. Then after some beautiful stanzas about childhood he returns to the idea that "the glory and the freshness of the dream" are departed, but again dispels the mournfulness of the thought, not by the gladness of Nature, which continueth the same however we change, but by the consciousness of what still remains, and by the hope that brightens the future.

Another passage shall now be given in which we see how the poet uses Nature as a handmaiden to lead the mind to God. All are familiar with the exquisite little poem, "The Primrose of the Rock," a poem that is fragrant with the spirit of true piety. I give the four last stanzas in full:—

I sang—Let myriads of bright flowers,
  Like thee, in field and grove
Revive unenvied;—mightier far
  Than tremblings that reprove
Our vernal tendencies to hope
  In God's redeeming love;

That love which changed—for wan disease,
  For sorrow that had beat
O'er hopeless dust, for withered age—
  Their moral element,
And turned the thistles of a curse
  To types beneficent.

Sin-blighted though we are, we too,
  The reasoning sons of men,
From one oblivious winter called
  Shall rise, and breathe again;
And in eternal summer lose
  Our threescore years and ten.

To humbleness of heart descends
  This prescience from on high,
The faith that elevates the just,
  Before and when they die;
And makes each separate soul a heaven,
  A court for Deity.

Let me now take a verse or two from the poem to Lady Fleming, on seeing the foundation preparing for the erection of Rydal Chapel:—

O Lady! from a noble line
  Of chieftains sprung, who stoutly bore
The spear, yet gave to works divine
  A bounteous help in days of yore,
(As records mouldering in the Dell
Of Nightshade haply yet may tell;)

Thee kindred aspirations moved
To build, within a vale beloved,
For Him upon whose high behests
All peace depends, all safety rests.

How fondly will the woods embrace
This daughter of thy pious care,
Lifting her front with modest grace
To make a fair recess more fair;
And to exalt the passing hour;
Or soothe it with a healing power
Drawn from the Sacrifice fulfilled
Before this rugged soil was tilled,
Or human habitation rose
To interrupt the deep repose!

Well may the villagers rejoice!
Nor heat, nor cold, nor weary ways,
Will be a hindrance to the voice
That would unite in prayer and praise;
More duly shall wild wandering Youth
Receive the curb of sacred truth,
Shall tottering age, bent earthward, hear
The Promise with uplifted ear;
And all shall welcome the new ray
Imparted to their sabbath-day.

Wordsworth was not a hymn writer, but could any hymn breathe a more evangelical spirit on the power of prayer than these two stanzas taken from "The Force of Prayer; or, the Founding of Bolton Abbey":—

And the Lady prayed in heaviness
That looked not for relief!
But slowly did her succour come,
And a patience to her grief.

Oh! there is never a sorrow of heart
That shall lack a timely end,
If but to God we turn, and ask
Of Him to be our friend!

How beautiful is "The Labourer's Noonday Hymn," with its touching prayer for pardon and grace—

Up to the throne of God is borne
The voice of praise at early morn,
And he accepts the punctual hymn
Sung as the light of day grows dim.

Nor will he turn His ear aside
From holy offerings at noontide.
Then here reposing, let us raise
A song of gratitude and praise.

What though our burthen be not light,
We need not toil from morn to night:
The respite of the mid-day hour
Is in the thankful creature's power.

Blest are the moments, doubly blest,
That, drawn from this one hour of rest,
Are with a ready heart bestowed
Upon the service of our God!

Why should we crave a hallowed spot?
An altar is in each man's cot,
A church in every grove that spreads
Its living roof above our heads.

Look up to heaven! the industrious Sun
Already half his race hath run;
He cannot halt nor go astray,
But our immortal spirits may.

Lord, since his rising in the East,
If we have faltered or transgressed,
Guide, from Thy love's abundant source,
What yet remains of this day's course:

Help with Thy grace, through life's short day,
Our upward and our downward way;
And glorify for us the west,
When we shall sink to final rest.

I have no doubt that the following sonnet, from the Italian of Michael Angelo, expresses his own thoughts on Prayer:—

The prayers I make will then be sweet indeed,
If Thou the spirit give by which I pray:
My unassisted heart is barren clay,
That of its native self can nothing feed:
Of good and pious works Thou art the seed,
That quickens only where Thou say'st it may.
Unless Thou show to us Thine own true way.
No man can find it. Father, Thou must lead.
Do Thou, then, breathe those thoughts into my mind,
By which such virtue may in me be bred,
That in Thy holy footsteps I may tread;
The fetters of my tongue do Thou unbind,
That I may have the power to sing of Thee,
And sound Thy praises everlastingly.

That Wordsworth was not "incurious to see in the hands the prints of the nails" we may learn from one of his Ecclesiastical Sonnets on "Temptations from Roman Refinements":—

Watch and be firm! for soul-subduing vice,
Heart-killing luxury, on your steps await.
Fair houses, baths, and banquets delicate,
And temples flashing, bright as polar ice,
Their radiance through the woods may yet suffice
To sap your hardy virtue, and abate
Your love of Him upon whose forehead sate
The crown of thorns; whose life-blood flowed, the price
Of your redemption. Shun the insidious arts
That Rome provides, less dreading from her frown
Than from her wily praise, her peaceful gown,
Language and letters; these though fondly viewed
As humanizing graces, are but parts
And instruments of deadliest servitude!

That Wordsworth was one who loved and honoured the Word of God appears again and again in the thoughts scattered through his works. He exalts the lively oracles as the only remedy for the sins and evils that prevail in the world:—

Let Thy word prevail,
Oh, let Thy word prevail, to take away
The sting of human nature; spread the Law
As it is written in Thy Holy Book
Throughout all lands; let every nation hear
The high behest, and every heart obey.

Once more:—

O then how beautiful, how bright appeared
The written promise. Early had he learn'd
To reverence the volume that displays
The mystery, the life that cannot die.

But indeed the Christian spirit and tone pervades Wordsworth's poetry; and though he does not put prominently forward the doctrines of our faith, or deal with religion dogmatically, yet does he, through hills and flowers and streams, sunshine and storm, lead the mind up to that Invisible God whose "tender mercies are over all His works." The birds—Nature's choristers, singing in their leafy choirs their hymns of grateful praise—suggest the thought—

There lives Who can provide
For all His creatures, and in Him,
Even like the radiant Seraphim,
These choristers confide.

So all sights and sounds—the roaring blast, the murmuring stream, the shadowy lane, the moving or motionless clouds, the wind-swept meadows, the dreary winter, and the joyous spring—all lead the poet to reflection, to penitence, to praise.

To those who he fears may think him reserved on the subject

of religion he offers this apology. In a letter written to a friend he explains his feelings in the words that follow:—

> For my own part I have been averse to frequent mention of the mysteries of Christian faith, not from a want of a due sense of their momentous nature, but the contrary. I felt it far too deeply to venture on handling them as familiarly as many scruple not to do. . . . . Besides general reasons for diffidence in treating subjects of Holy Writ, I have some especial ones. I might err in points of faith as (he says) Milton had done ("Life," ii. pp. 364–5).

To those who wish to see Wordsworth at his best, and disencumbered of much that is dull and uninteresting—albeit it may be extolled as presenting "a scientific system of thought"—I would recommend the volume alluded to before, "Poems of Wordsworth, chosen and edited by Matthew Arnold." And they will find in "Wordsworth," by Mr. F. W. H. Myers, the story of the poet's life, some admirable criticisms on the limitations of Wordsworth's genius, and also a chapter full of charm on "the English Lakes." In this beautiful district of England, where the poet lived and died, his memory is fragrant still, and will be while the mountains that he loved remain in their beauty and grandeur, and the streams from which he drew his inspiration continue to flow. While poetry is loved, and its influence continues; so long as England honours nobility of thought and simplicity of life; so long as her men and women are unworldly enough to reverence "plain living and high thinking;" so long will pilgrims find their way to Rydal Mount and Grasmere churchyard. At Rydal Mount Wordsworth spent the larger part of his life, and here he passed away, and at Grasmere is his lowly and simple grave. His end was peace. The last time he attended divine service in the chapel at Rydal was Sunday the 10th of March. The next day he paid a visit to Mrs. Arnold at Fox How, and on the following afternoon he caught a cold as he was calling at a cottage on the road to Grasmere. He sat down on a stone bench to watch the setting sun; the evening, though bright, was cold; a chill and an attack of pleurisy was the consequence, which kept him to his room, and finally confined him to his bed. On the 20th of April he received the communion from his son, and then passed into a state of passive unconsciousness. At last Mrs. Wordsworth said to him, "William, you are going to die." He made no reply at the time, and the words seemed to have passed unheeded; indeed, it was not certain that they had been even heard. More than twenty-four hours afterwards one of his nieces came into his room, and was drawing aside the curtain of his chamber, and then, as if awakening from a quiet sleep, he said, "Is that Dora?"

On Tuesday, April 23, 1850, "as his favourite cuckoo-clock struck the hour of noon," his spirit passed away. His body was laid, according to his wish, under the turf in Grasmere churchyard, near the children whom he had lost, under the shade of the old sycamores, and close to the Rotha, which had often made such music in his ears.

He had not lived in vain. With all truth could he who succeeded to the post of Laureate after the poet's death say that he had received

> The laurel greener from the brow
> Of him that uttered nothing base.

There is every reason to believe that Wordsworth's own words concerning his poems will be fulfilled. "They will co-operate with the benign tendencies of human nature and society, and will in their degree be efficacious in making men wiser, better, and happier."

CHARLES D. BELL.

ART. IV.—*IN MEMORIAM.*

EDWARD AURIOL.

"A BEAUTIFUL ending of a beautifully holy life" was the observation of a Christian brother on hearing the account of the last end of dear Mr. Auriol. No words could be more accurately descriptive of his life and of his death.

The following opinions were collected shortly after his decease as the testimony of some who for many years had known him well and observed him closely:—"He was the same to the last." "He never changed his views." "Always kind." "Ever ready to help his brethren." "No selfish end in view." "No hesitating counsel when called to advise." "Exercising discernment and sound judgment." "Speaking always with encouragement to younger brethren." "Delighting in Christian converse." "Evincing a supreme desire to know the will of God, both in His revealed Word and in the intimations of His Providence." "Acquiescing in that will, when once ascertained, with steadfastness, composure, and thankfulness."

Perhaps all this testimony might be summed up in three words: Consistency, Humility, and Acquiescence, as the fruits of personal faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. Two short extracts from statements that appeared in the *Record* newspaper may illustrate the influence which these qualities enabled him by the grace of God to exercise. In one of these an interesting

account is given of a custom of Bishop Waldegrave on an Ordination Sunday to repeat at the breakfast-table a text of scripture suited to the occasion, and then to call on those present to do the same:—

When it came to Mr. Auriol's turn, there was a pause of a moment or two, and then it was seen that the old veteran was overcome by emotion. At last he began, "Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints;" here his voice completely gave way, and he wept like a child; but afterwards recovering himself he went on, his voice gaining strength as he proceeded, "is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ." The effect was indescribable. The thought was forced on one, if such are the feelings of one who has spent so many years in his Master's service, and who has been so highly honoured of Him as His minister in holy things, what ought to be the depth of the humility and the casting away of all thought or dream of self-reliance of us younger men. A hush of reverential awe stole over us as if the Good Bishop of Souls was very near to us. For myself, I may say, that the good old man's confession, in the presence of a score of young recruits, of his own nothingness, and of his Master's supreme excellency, taught me a lesson in theology, which I trust, by God's grace, has never been forgotten.

Another writer, speaking of his kindness to the younger clergy, and of his ripe judgment, and kindly sympathy, testifies that he was always accessible, and ever ready to afford advice and counsel:—

He was one to whom a younger man could open his mind. He did not require immediate acquiescence in his own views and opinions, even on matters of primary importance, but dealt with you as one who had passed through himself what you then felt and experienced, and so was able to feel with you. And then there was no assumption of superior wisdom and goodness, but the gentleness of his spirit and humility of his heart gave to his words a force and influence which led to prayerful communing with your own heart, and a diligent study of that Word which was his sheet anchor, and had enabled him to weather many a storm and now to rest in peace and confidence.

Such was his life. His end was peace. Brought at length to the conviction that his strength was failing, there was no murmuring, but only the simple remark in answer to inquiries: "I think it seems to be the will of God to call me. My strength is failing, but I feel happy. I am simply waiting." Waiting as he afterwards explained, not idly, but as a servant upon his master.

Within less than an hour of the moment when his spirit rose to the call of that Master, he had given his opinion and advice on matters of duty for which he still felt responsibility, with the greatest possible clearness.

The true state of his mind may be gathered from what was well-nigh his last conscious utterance, as with holy fervour he exclaimed :—

> What we must seek for is more power in the consciousness of Christ's redeeming love, more simple dependence upon His merits for the pardon of *all* our sins, more conformity to Him, that we may be dead with Him, that we may rise with Him, that we may sit with Him in heavenly places, that we may be with Him when He comes again in glory.

In cherishing the memories of such a life, and such a death, we do not magnify the man, but seek rather to glorify God in him.

It may be both interesting and for the glory of God, to mark the chief steps of the way by which Edward Auriol was led through the more than three score years of his earthly life.

We pass by the circumstances of his birth and early youth ; simply remarking that his family had been affected by the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes ;—that at the time of his birth in 1805 his father was living in London ;—that his early thoughts were associated with the ministry of the Church from the circumstance of the plans formed by a twin sister to live with him in his future rectory. The loss of that sister when she was twelve years old—his school days at Westminster—his college course at Christ Church, Oxford, where he formed friendships which lasted for life, were all regarded by him in after life with humility and thankfulness.

On the details of these it is not necessary to dwell. It is more to our present purpose to remark that it was with a strong sense of duty, but without that spiritual enlightenment which he afterwards attained, that he proceeded to Hastings with the view of reading for holy orders. The first rising in his soul of a sense of the responsibility he was incurring in taking orders began at this time while attending the ministry of the Rev. Mr. Olive, who then had the temporary cure of St. Mary's. The thought that he was undertaking to instruct others, led to a determination to study the Bible with care and earnestness.

As the result of this, before taking deacon's orders, his mind was set on being "a *good* clergyman," though his ideas on the subject were but ill defined. Every good intention was strengthened, not hindered, by his engagement with his future wife which was now formed. He lived to mourn her loss, and always, when he could bear to refer to her, spoke of her as the greatest earthly blessing of his life.

His first curacy was at Roydon, Herts, of which he had the sole charge, his rector being absent. Soon after going there, on a ball being given in the neighbourhood, he and Mrs. Auriol

thought they "ought to go to meet their neighbours." It was probably the last they ever attended. His sermons, full of plain statements of truth, were becoming from week to week more earnest. He began to attend the clerical meetings which were held in the house of the late Rev. E. Bickersteth, and was led to understand and take interest in the efforts that were being made for the spread of the gospel at home and abroad—an interest which during the whole of his after life grew and strengthened.

On the death of his rector he had to seek another sphere of labour, for the owner of the advowson presented his son to what he described as "not a living, but a starving." The Bishop of London, Dr. Blomfield, received his application for employment very kindly, and offered him the curacy of Little Horwood, Bucks. It proved to be a place connected with so much spiritual blessing, that the recollections of it were always tenderly cherished. Here, as at Roydon, Mr. Auriol sought the society of the most devoted clergy. He found in a neighbouring parish an old friend (Rev. C. Childers), who, like himself, was growing in grace and devotedness. He discovered that others —clergy and laity—were like-minded with himself, amongst whom Sir Harry Verney and his excellent sister were prominent, anxious to do everything in their power to forward the cause of God.

But the chief blessing which he always felt he enjoyed in Little Horwood, was the converse and heart fellowship of some deeply taught poor parishioners. He often came from their cottages, warmed, comforted, and with strengthened faith. Full of quiet gladness, he and his wife while attending to their parish, and specially interested in their Sunday-school, were conscientiously "following on to know the Lord."

Up to this time Mr. Auriol had felt that he could never like a town parish. But circumstances occurred under which the curacy of the two old churches of Hastings was offered to him, and after some hesitation accepted. A very happy six years followed; the congregation was large and attentive; he had a lecture to the fishermen twice a week, and many were benefited by his preaching, and cheered by his Christian friendship.[1]

At Hastings, as at Horwood, he sought the society of kindred minded clergymen. He had special enjoyment in the counsel and friendship, of the venerable Dr. Fearon. Between the aged

[1] One instance came to his knowledge of one who departed this life in hope of a joyful resurrection, who told of herself that when constrained by a relation to attend his ministry, she felt so irritated by his penetrating message, that as she walked up the aisle of the church she kept saying to herself "I hate you."

servant, and the younger one, a most affectionate friendship sprung up.

Many excellent and pithy sayings of the good old man were treasured up by his younger brother.[1]

While alluding to the opinions Mr. Auriol had been led to form, mention may be made of Goode's "Better Covenant," published in 1833, as a book to which he always referred as having greatly helped to establish him in the faith.

One of the acts of his last year of life, was to buy many copies of the last smaller edition to give to younger friends, and to young men about to enter the ministry.

When speaking of theological study in his last illness, he said that the subject to which he felt he had given the most earnest study, was the way by which sinful man could be just before God. Certainly this subject was a marked feature of his preaching. He felt the power with which it had been treated by puritan writers, and usually had one of them at hand for reading.

But we are anticipating. Referring back to his prosperous work at Hastings, in 1837, news reached him which eventually led to his becoming rector of Newton Vallence. The living had come to him in consequence of the carrying out of the provisions of his father's will, and he had sought in vain to escape from the responsibility of its spiritual oversight. His way was hedged in, and he felt that the Providence of God directed him thither.

In the summer of 1838 he went, and soon found that there was plenty of work in the two villages over which he had now the spiritual oversight and in an outlying small district. In Hawkley especially, the new rector was warmly welcomed.

[1] Some of them are worth recording, seeing that they left a marked impression upon the memory as well as proved a great help in spiritual difficulties, before the attainment of a full rest in believing. One of these remarks, the influence of which marked the thoughts of Mr. Auriol to the close of his life was, that "weak appreciation of the evil of sin lay at the root of every form of error in doctrine." Another saying to which he would sometimes refer was, "My dear friend, if Satan cannot make a child of God do a wrong thing, he will try to make him do a foolish thing." Another was—that the doctrine of "election" was to be always and only used as an encouragement, and that as such it was presented in the Scriptures. "Be careful," he would say, "how you bring the doctrine of election before a heart not truly humbled. For a time after reading the ninth of Romans I had no religion." The friendship which led to the treasuring up of such sayings as these, undoubtedly met the needs of a heart deeply wounded by conviction and tried by conflict in a way which few would suspect. His experience of conflict may be gathered from a remark in his last illness, to one who expressed a fear that Satan was always to a painful degree the tormentor of many children of God, in their last days. "I have had many conflicts with Satan," he said, "but I have always found that in times of deep trouble he has been restrained, and I believe it will be so to the end."

Nonconformists flocked to church, and the Word of God seemed to be ministered with much blessing. Three miles of deplorable road had to be travelled, but in all weathers he was seen going to the meetings and services which he had started. Aided by a resident gentleman, he restored neatness and order to the Church at Newton. He built a school in the parsonage grounds, and appointed an able mistress, the children of his parish not having previously had a school within three miles. Here again precious friendships were formed. The Venerable Samuel Maddock was at Ropley; Bishop Wigram, then Archdeacon, at Tisted, a neighbouring parish; and Bishop Sumner at Farnham, full of kindness. Enjoying such friendships, no thought of removing from Newton ever occurred till about 1840, when the claims for more work, which his own energy had created, made him question whether there ought not to be a curate for Hawkley and more Sunday services. But while deliberating this question, a proposal was made that he should exchange livings with Mr. Snow, the rector of St. Dunstans-in-the-west, at that time numbering 7,000 population in two districts. This proposal was at first declined, on the ground that as the Providence of God had guided him to Newton against his own will, he ought not lightly to leave it. But on the proposal being repeated, and strongly urged some time afterwards, he was led, after taking serious and prayerful thought, to accept it, and the exchange was effected in 1842.

The history of his life at St. Dunstan's is written in the heart of many a parishioner, and in the memory of many who now affectionately testify to the value of his counsel in many of the efforts for the spread of the Gospel which were then rising into strength.

More than thirty years of work and usefulness lay before him at St. Dunstan's, and in the committees, where constantly present, he was ever regarded as a faithful and wise counseller, and during which, we may well say with thankfulness for the grace given to him, he served his generation, and left a bright and consistent example for the generations to come.

His last sermon was preached on Jan. 4, 1880, and from the same text with which he had commenced his ministry at St. Dunstan's in 1842:—"This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." His anxiously-expressed wish to the last was that his church might continue to be a church where every one might be sure to find, in all the arrangements of worship and preaching, the simplicity and fulness of the true Gospel of Christ.

Reference to his London work would be incomplete without a distinct notice of the Societies in which he took great interest.[1]

[1] When the Church Association was formed Mr. Auriol felt that he could conscientiously support it. He thought he saw a necessity for its action,

The Church Pastoral Aid Society from the first won his affectionate regard, and for more than thirty years he was scarcely ever absent from its committee, usually meeting on Tuesday morning at the early hour of eight o'clock. The Church of England Sunday School Institute he helped to organize. The London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews he always loved, and took a great interest in a working party which met at his house for sending garments to the schools at Jerusalem.

The Church Missionary Society was perhaps his greatest delight, and nothing was suffered to interfere with his attendance at its committee; but the list would be a long one of all the Societies in which he was interested, and to which he subscribed, such, for example, as the Lord's Day Society, The Church Home Missions, The London Aged-Christian Society, The Army Scripture Readers, St. John's Hall, Highbury. But distinct mention must be made of the London Clerical Education Society, of which for more than thirty years he shared the joint secretaryship with the Rev. F. J Spitta. The whole correspondence and accounts were undertaken by the two secretaries, and a committee met monthly at his house.

In this work he delighted, not grudging any time or toil, but manifesting a fatherly interest in the young men who passed under his care, the examination of candidates for this and other Societies, which he was often requested to undertake, being probably work which involved a great amount of self-denial, in respect of personal ease and domestic enjoyment.

With respect to the delicate subject of common action with our dissenting brethren, he would in quite early days have been much more inclined to enter upon it than he was afterwards. He was wont to repeat that, in his early days, he had heard with great surprise the saying of his friend, Dr. Fearon, to a worthy Nonconformist in his parish, who said, "My dear sir, we mean the same thing," "No, no, my friend, we do not mean the same thing at all—you go your way and I go mine, and we must both do our best." But as years unfolded the political enmities and efforts of the Nonconformists, and the unfair statements which occur in their publications, he thought it impossible to work together in any matter of personal ministry, and was thankful that there were still such institutions as the

---

because of its simple object to ascertain the true state of the law on disputed and important particulars. He regarded the carrying out of this simple object as a valuable help to our bishops in maintaining their position as fatherly overseers in the church, and disapproved with extreme dislike, from whatever quarter it came, any approach to disrespectful remarks on the conduct of the bishops, whose difficulties he fully appreciated.

Bible Society and kindred societies which gave opportunities for joint effort and support.

In estimating the value of his labours, his interest in the various trusts to which he had been appointed ought not to be overlooked. The righteousness with which he exercised his trust was apparent to all who had to do with him, and the hope of doing good in this way without any selfish or party motive, but simply for the honour of Christ and the edification of His Church, lay so near his heart, that in the last hour of his earthly life it occupied his matured thought, and formed the subject of conversation with one who only took leave of him as he entered the valley of the shadow of death.

Having marked the chief features of the personal history of this "good minister of Jesus Christ," it may be well to reply to a question that has been asked as to the chief means by which his spiritual life was maintained. Among these may certainly be enumerated the spirit of watchfulness in daily life; his habit of early rising and study of the Scripture; his carefully chosen reading of other books, and not least, his deep love and reverence for the Lord's Day. With reference to the last he would often say: "Men remember that they need the grace of the Holy Spirit to keep the other commandments; we need it peculiarly for this one."

The prevailing tone of his mind will be best gathered from his own language. Speaking to one who remarked with reference to his illness, "All will be well," he said, "Yes, oh yes, hoping in Jesus, resting on Jesus, looking to Jesus, being with Jesus, all *will* be well." And again, with reference to having been found of the Good Shepherd, and brought into His fold, "Ah yes, but that does not alter the need for daily cleansing, daily washing, daily finding, daily obeying. The Bible gives us no occasion for thinking lightly of sin. There is too much in this day of putting it away, gliding over it. It is *daily* cleansing that is needed. It is not that I do not feel my sins covered, but that does not alter the need of daily forgiveness." "We must beware," he said to a younger brother in the ministry, "of forgetting the judicial character of God. It is in these days left far too much out of sight and forgotten."

It was this prevailing tone of mind which gave a kind of melody and sanctity to his unaffected life. For himself and for others he seemed constantly watchful that there should not be any dependence on any source of life and strength except that which the gospel reveals. It was this source of strength from which he drew his daily supplies of wisdom and power and strength. Can we wonder that he walked humbly with God, acknowledging "I am but a lump of sin, all unrighteousness, O Lord my righteousness, let Thy righteousness be for my un-

righteousness, Thy strength for my weakness"? Can we wonder at his simple faith? The promise is "him that cometh," "whosoever believeth," "then it is for me—I know I come." And again, "Righteousness I have none, none of my own. I wish every one to know that this is my conviction, nothing of my own, I have hope that Christ's righteousness is mine, the righteousness of God which is unto all, and upon all, that believe—upon *all*—then upon *me*, for I do believe with all my heart, all my soul, all my mind." Can we wonder at his acquiescence? He had been trained to this by the trying and solemn bereavements which he had sustained in the loss of his son and his wife. To the last day that he was downstairs his eye would fall on desk and pictures with quiet looks which told that regret and submission and thankfulness were all working in his inmost soul, and so working the peaceable fruits of righteousness, that in his last illness he could say, "I do not know what God's will is for me, I lie here, I do not get on, I lie low, low in God's hand. In everything may I desire, yes, and I do desire, O Lord, that Thy will may be done—don't let another thought stir." Can we wonder, that seeking daily pardon, and strength, and guidance, he was enabled to perceive and know what things he ought to do, or that grace and power were given to him faithfully to perform the same? Can we wonder that one who lived under his roof could testify that after forty-two years not a single echo could be remembered of an unwise or unkind word?

Faults and failings no doubt he had. It has not been our business to search them out. They are known to his God. They were deplored by himself. But they were not conspicuous to his fellow-men. By the grace of God he has left behind him the influence and bright example of a good conversation. We do not praise the man; we glorify God because of the grace bestowed on him, enabling him to be consistent in conduct, wise in counsel, faithful in his ministry.

Nor can we close these remarks more suitably than in his own words: "Let none praise me, let them praise God who had mercy on me, called me out of frivolity and sin, led me, taught me, brought me to Himself, guided me to one (his wife) who was such a blessing to me, kept me, preserved me to this day, and will preserve me to the end."

WILLIAM CADMAN.

ART. V.—ON THE APOSTLES TEACHING AND PREACHING JESUS CHRIST.

WHILST preparing a volume of Memorials of that eminently faithful servant of God, Charles Pettit M'Ilvaine, the late Bishop of Ohio, I have had the privilege to receive from his family some of his note-books, in which he recorded his thoughts from time to time on important subjects which were engaging his attention. The following remarks on preaching Christ, written at an early period of his ministry at St. Ann's, Brooklyn, will not be without interest or value to the readers of THE CHURCHMAN. The pattern of Apostolic preaching here described was ever present to his mind for imitation. I may add to his valuable remarks an extract from a letter which in after years he addressed to me on the character of the preaching in England, and the need of a higher tone and more attention to the *foundations*.

WILLIAM CARUS.

This morning, while walking my study in meditation and prayer, my mind was drawn to that verse (Acts v. 42)—"And daily in the temple, and in every house, they ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ."

From this we learn—(1) What constituted the whole burden of the ministry of the Apostles—*teach and preach Jesus;* (2) Where—*in the temple;* but not only there—*in every house;* (3) Their diligence and devotedness in the work—*daily they ceased not.*

Hence arise the following heads of reflection :—

I.—*The whole business of a minister is to teach and preach Jesus Christ.* Whatever will directly or indirectly further the knowledge and reception of Jesus on the part of sinners, is part of his work. Whatever will not, he has nothing to do with. On this his heart must be singly set; to this his talents and life devoted; for this he must study and pray. Whatever he may be—however learned, excellent, eloquent—if he does not teach and preach Jesus as his Alpha and Omega, he is nothing.

What is implied in this?

One may preach truth unmingled with error; and yet not preach Jesus.

One may preach very serious, solemn, impressive sermons; and yet not preach Jesus.

One may preach boldly and plainly the strictness of the law, the holiness required of the Christian, the necessity of renouncing the world, the awful misery of the lost, and the certainty of damnation to the impenitent; and yet not preach Jesus.

One may *sometimes* preach Jesus—he may occasionally exhibit Christ as He should be presented—every sermon may have some reference to Him; and yet his ministry may not be of such a character,

habitually, as that he may be said to be *characterized* as teaching and preaching Jesus.

What then is implied in this?

1. Preach *what Jesus is* to sinners.

Our wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. That in Him alone is deliverance from the condemnation and power of sin.

2. *How* Jesus is made unto us these blessings.

Through His cross, by His spirit, in the use of the means of grace.

3. *Why* Jesus is made unto us these blessings.

Man's ruin and condemnation by sin, in his native depravity and actual transgression, his need of regeneration and justification, his helplessness to regenerate himself, the worthlessness of all his works of righteousness to justify himself.

4. The manner in which a sinner is to seek all in Jesus.

He is freely invited; he must *freely* come, without money and without price. He must be urged to come. All to come—all accepted when they come.

5. What Jesus will have a sinner thus coming to do.

Thus Jesus is a centre to which and from which everything in preaching must lead and issue; when we preach the state of man, we must follow it up till it leads to Jesus as the only remedy. When we preach the duty of man, we must follow it up till we find in Jesus the great motive to do it, the great encouragement to persevere in it, the only power by which to love and perform it. There is not a point in the whole circle of Gospel truth from which we may not and ought not to draw a straight line to the centre, Jesus. There is not a spot within the horizon of Christian doctrine and duty whence the eye cannot see that Sun, and whence the preacher ought not to direct the eye of his hearer to that great central light and power as the source of all his life and strength and guidance. . . . . Thus will our preaching be the power and wisdom of God. This it is which the King delights to honour, the foolishness by which he confounds the wise, the weakness by which he subdues the mighty.

II.—*Where we are thus to preach.* Not merely in the temple, the pulpit, but everywhere—wherever we can, by all means. If we preach *officially* merely, we shall be satisfied with the pulpit. If we preach to please men, we shall do it in as many places as public opinion requires. If we preach under the influence of the love of Christ and of souls, we shall be glad of every opportunity in any place to teach or preach Jesus.

III.—*The diligence with which we should preach Jesus. Daily they ceased not.*

We should be active in this work,

Energetic,
Undaunted,
Unwearied.

How much should we aim at variety? We should vary *in* preaching Jesus, but never vary *from* preaching Him. We should go all round the circle of which He is the centre but never out of it. We must not always arrive at the centre or proceed from it by the same radii.

We may have them innumerably—all different, but all equal; all taking different directions, but all uniting in one point; infinitely diversified, but all alike. He that desires more variety than can be found within the bounds of always preaching Jesus, desires what cannot profit, and ought not to please him. We must seek variety; but still *never cease, for a single discourse,* to teach and preach Jesus Christ.

Application.

How shall we learn more and more the blessed art of teaching and preaching Jesus?

1. The lowest and least effectual means I mention first. *The study of Gospel truth* as a practical experimental system intended to affect the heart, the study of it in *its parts,* but especially in the connection of every part with Jesus. United with this, the study of the ministry, the preaching and the labours, the private history and public efforts of those who have been most blessed in the conversion of sinners.

2. The study of the Bible, with the Holy Spirit for our Commentator, especially noting the brief sketches of the discourses of the Apostles, the truths they most insisted upon, the manner of putting them, their spirit and faith.

3. *Much prayer.* There is much to learn in this matter which no book can give. It is only to be learned of Jesus himself and by prayer. The Bible will not profit without prayer. After we have learned the system of truth, the manner of presenting it, and have acquired the secret of varying our method and matter, but not our object, we may yet fail totally. We may have none or little *of the Spirit,* in and by which alone we can preach Jesus truly. This is a large department in the study of divinity—requires more attention than any other. We must study it on our knees. Jesus must be our subject and our teacher, we must learn *Him* and of Him. The mind we need is not the mind of a theologian or orator, but the mind that was in Jesus Christ. This was the attainment which Paul went into Arabia to study.

4. *High attainment in personal piety.*

No one can be an eminent preacher of Christ without being an eminently faithful disciple of Christ; nothing instructs the mind in this work so well as a devout zealous heart. "The heart of the wise teacheth his mouth, and addeth learning to his lips" (Prov. xvi. 23). "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him, and He will shew them his covenant." It is easy to preach what we live. If to us to live is Christ, we shall easily be able to say the same of our preaching. What doctrines, what duties to exhibit, how, when, in what spirit, our hearts and experience will easily find out. "Grow in grace and in the knowledge of Jesus Christ"—this is the most important of all directions in the effort to preach more and more faithfully and successfully Jesus Christ.

The following is the extract from the letter referred to above—

CINCINNATI, *Nov.* 17, 1865.

. . . . You speak of an article on preaching. Certainly the aspect of the times should modify the preaching. But *how?* Of course not

in the matter; that is, the pure, direct, simple Gospel. Christ and all pertaining to His person and work must not be less prominently, or less simply, or less constantly preached. Paul said, "The time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine." What then? "Preach the *word*, be instant in season, out of season." But with what modifications? Of course the question must be answered with regard to evangelical men, who essentially preach the truth. Of all the rest the answer would be *legion*. But of the preaching of evangelical men: my impression has always been, in England, that, taking the *mass* of such men together, and not forgetting the *many great exceptions*, the preaching has too much of a *perfunctory* aspect. There is too little evidence of a *decided*, studious effort of *mind* in the preparation. The intelligence of the congregations (not speaking now of the peasantry) is undervalued. Not enough effort is made by an animated and cultivated delivery to create and hold attention. It is too much taken for granted that the hearer believes the great matters, and has only need to be guided in the application of truth to himself, and aroused to diligence. I do not think it would improve the usefulness of preaching to inculcate on preachers *generally* the need of going out in their discourses into matters which Rationalists bring up, *except by teaching the opposing truth, without reference* to the controversy. Leading minds should do this, but rather in occasional *courses* of sermons or lectures, than as an usual or common thing. I believe a more thorough teaching of the *foundations*, instead of taking the knowledge and belief of them for granted, is much needed.

Art. VI.—THE RULE OF FAITH.

Part V. Scripture and Tradition.

IT has been seen that, as regards the question of interpretation, no hermeneutical tradition either exists, or is necessary, to enable us to ascertain the meaning of Scripture. But there is another kind of tradition, to which indeed the name is more usually assigned, and which the Church of Rome asserts to be of equal authority with Scripture—viz., *additions* to the written Word, supposed to have come down from the Apostles by an independent channel. The traditions of the Church, the Council of Trent affirms, whether relating to faith or practice, are to be received with the same reverence as Holy Scripture itself.[1] There is an unwritten,[2] as well as a written, Word of

[1] "Pari pietatis affectu et reverentia." Sess. IV.

[2] Not that it *never* was committed to writing, for it is supposed to be found in the Fathers, &c., but that it was not committed to writing, like Scripture, by the first inspired author. "Vocatur doctrina non scripta, non ea quæ nusquam scripta est, sed quæ non scripta est a primo auctore, exemplo sit Baptismus parvulorum."—Bellarm. "De V. D.," L. iv. c. 2.

God; and the former was intended to run parallel with the latter, both conjointly forming the Church's Rule of Faith. As in the former section the perspicuity, so in the present, the sufficiency of Holy Scripture is the question in debate. The Reformed Churches admit no such co-ordinate source of faith, practice, or discipline. Ecclesiastical practices which have been handed down from antiquity, and are not repugnant to Scripture, they do not indiscriminately reject; the decisions of Councils they do not undervalue; the three Creeds they accept as venerable monuments of the faith of the early Church; but none of these can claim to be the Word of God in the sense in which Scripture is. "It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies," of the kind just mentioned, should "be in all places one or utterly like; for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners" (Art. XXXIV.); which they could not be if, *e.g.*, they stood on the same footing as the two sacraments ordained by Christ and prescribed in Scripture: the decisions of Councils in things necessary to salvation "have neither strength nor authority unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture" (Art. XXI.): the Creeds themselves are to be received because "they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture" (Art. VIII.). "No Word of God," says one of the latest Protestant Confessions, "at the present day exists, or can certainly be ascertained, concerning doctrines or precepts necessary to salvation, which is not written, or based on the Scriptures, but has (as is alleged) been committed, by unwritten tradition, to the custody of the Church."[1] In short, "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of Faith" (Art. VI.). Very different is the decision of the Tridentine Fathers; and the statement of the principal theologian of their Church:—"The controversy between us, and heretics" (Protestants) "consists in this:—that we assert that all necessary doctrine concerning faith and morals is not expressly contained in Scripture, and consequently besides the written Word there is needed an unwritten one; whereas they teach that in the Scriptures all such necessary doctrine is contained, and consequently there is no need of an unwritten Word."[2]

The first question that naturally occurs is, Where is this unwritten Word of God to be found? When we speak of the Bible, we mean a certain collection of writings, well-known and defined; the unwritten Word, it should seem, if it is to be of any

[1] "Decl. Thorun. de Regula Fidei."
[2] Bellarm. "De V. D.," L. iv. c. 3.

value, ought to be capable of a similar identification. And the answer to be given is precisely the same as in the case of hermeneutical tradition—viz., that whether this unwritten Word ever existed or not, it cannot now be ascertained with any certainty. Certain tests, or notes, are given by Bellarmin, whereby we are to judge whether a tradition is entitled to the dignity of a portion of the unwritten Word; as regards a traditionary *doctrine*, not found in Scripture (*e.g.*, purgatory, or the immaculate conception), whether it has been accepted by the Church universal; as regards traditionary *practices* (*e.g.*, infant baptism, the forty days Lenten fast, the use of holy oil at baptism), whether they can plead a similar universal acceptance, or can be traced up to Apostolic times, or in the unanimous opinion of the Doctors of the Church can be so traced, or are practised by a Church which can prove a succession of Bishops up to an Apostle; which last prerogative belongs to the Church of Rome alone.[1]

The skill of the controversialist is here seen in classing things together under the idea of an "unwritten Word," which are not of a common nature. The Word of God properly means something to be believed, a revelation of doctrine; and this is what Protestants mean when they affirm that nothing of the kind is to be found outside Scripture. Rites and ceremonies, which can only plead ecclesiastical tradition, may or may not be agreeable to Scripture, may or may not be probably Apostolical, but they are not "Articles of Faith," or, in any sense, "necessary to salvation;" which is the proper idea of the contents of an "unwritten Word of God." Would Bellarmin himself have contended that the Lenten fast, the use of the holy oil, or even the practice of *infant* baptism as distinguished from adult, are things necessary to salvation? The Church may have adopted, with a substantial unanimity, a practice such as infant baptism, without ever intending to class it otherwise than as under things in themselves indifferent; or pretending that it is part of an Apostolical tradition not contained in Scripture. Hooker long ago maintained, with signal success, against the Puritans, that it is not necessary to adduce express warranty of Scripture for every practice or modification of an Apostolic practice, which the Church, or a Church, may, on what seems to it good grounds, choose to introduce into its practical system.[2] What is more to the point, a Church may retain such traditionary rites as it does retain, *e.g.*, infant baptism, on a ground altogether different from a supposed esoteric tradition—viz., on the ground that though it may not be commanded, or

[1] "De V. D.," L. iv. c. 9.
[2] "Eccl. Pol.," Bks. II. and III.

indeed mentioned in Scripture, it is yet "agreeable to the institution of Christ," or the general spirit of the Gospel dispensation. Traditions, therefore, in the sense of traditionary rites or ceremonies (Art. XXXIV.), should be put out of view altogether in this question: from their very nature they do not need the foundation on which they are made to rest, and therefore to assign that foundation to them is an arbitrary hypothesis: they rest, where not unscriptural, on their own reasonable ground—viz., the inherent power of the Church to adapt her polity or ritual to changing circumstances, provided always that such regulations are in harmony with the spirit of the genuine Apostolic tradition as it is preserved in Scripture. She possesses no such liberty in respect to what may properly be called doctrines.

It may not be, however, superfluous to remark that, as a matter of fact, no points of ritual or polity, except those which we *retain in common with the Church of Rome*, can make any pretence to evidence, even historical, of Apostolic appointment. And it is obvious that the opinion of the Doctors of the Church cannot supply the missing links of history; much less a succession of Bishops, even though the Church of Rome alone should be blessed with it.

Confining our attention then to such tradition as may be termed the Word of God, that is, necessary to be believed unto salvation, we do not hesitate to affirm that whether or not the Apostles taught more or otherwise than what is recorded in the Canonical Scriptures, no Church or individual is now in a position to adduce a syllable thereof with certainty. Bellarmin makes a threefold division of such traditions into those of which Christ Himself was the author, those which the Apostles delivered, and those which the Church has made such;[1] nothing under any of the divisions can be produced which can establish its claim to be received as a gift to the Church, supplementary to what is conveyed in Holy Scripture. Can we suppose that if an unwritten Word of God were intended to be a co-ordinate authority with the written, the evidence for its existence would be left in such a state? The third division expresses the real state of the case: the Romish Church makes its doctrinal traditions Apostolical, just as it claims the power to *make* a book Canonical: historical evidence is a superfluity when infallible authority can affix its stamp.

The point at issue should be clearly understood. The nature of the vehicle of transmission is immaterial, provided we have the same certainty in either case. The inspired oral teaching of the Apostles stood exactly on the same footing as their inspired

[1] "De V. D.," L. iv. c. 2.

written teaching: we pay no superstitious reverence to a book *as such*, that is, as distinguished from instruction conveyed orally. Let the tradition of the latter be authenticated as Scripture is, and we are ready to assign to it the same authority. It is not because they are unwritten, but because they cannot certainly be proved to be Apostolical, that traditions affecting faith and morals not found in Scripture or deduced therefrom, are to be rejected. The sufficiency of Scripture is to be inferred from the fact, not that the words were traced with a pen, but that it is really the only Apostolical tradition which can with certainty be pronounced such. St. Paul tells the Corinthians that what he had received of the Lord he had delivered to them (1 Cor. xi. 23); he exhorts the Thessalonians to hold the traditions which they had been taught, whether by word or epistle (2 Thess. ii, 15), and Timothy to hold fast the form of sound words which he had heard (2 Tim. i. 13); either these have irretrievably perished, or (as is the fact) they have passed, in another form, into the written Word, so that the Bible comprehends both the written and the unwritten Word of God, and we need not look further. In short, no Apostolical teaching is extant, except that which is embalmed in the New Testament; and if any such were to be disinterred, it would be equivalent to the discovery of a new Canonical book.

The first Christian Church was, no doubt, founded by the oral teaching of the Apostles, and continued for some time dependent on that oral teaching; never, however, wholly without a written Word, for it had the Old Testament, and the Apostles were always careful to connect their teaching, as far as might be, with the Jewish Scriptures (Acts xvii. 2, 3; xviii. 28; xxviii. 23); but still, certainly, without New Testament Scriptures. And if it had been provided that a succession of Apostles, of men inspired as St. Paul or St. John were, should continue to the close of this dispensation, the Church could have been perpetuated, and preserved from error, as it was during the Apostles' lifetime, by oral teaching. This, however, was not the appointed plan. The men were to drop off, in the course of nature, and in succession; and an Apostolate of the written Word was to take their place, the men surviving in their writings. This work commenced in due time, and continued through a series of years; one Apostolical writing proving itself on and by another, until the Canon was complete. These writings may be obscure, or defective; but whatever their quality, it is certain that we have nothing else to rely upon as genuine Apostolical tradition. Let us imagine what would be our condition if, without a living Apostolate, we had nothing but a tradition of oral teaching to depend upon, no authentic written record of what Christ and the Apostles delivered. We need not go far to form an

accurate prediction. The Jews held fast to their written Word, but as soon as ever they attempted to complete it by traditions, it was to make it void (Mark vii. 9). Certain Christian Churches retain, and profess to honour, the written Word, but they have admitted the principle of tradition as a co-ordinate authority; and the practical aspect of their Christianity is not such as to recommend the principle. Every alleged tradition, then, must be judged by its consonancy with what we *know* to be Apostolical tradition, while we are not certain that anything else is; and be accepted or rejected, accordingly.

Pressed by these difficulties, the modern Romish controversialist modifies, by spiritualizing it, the idea of tradition. "What," asks Möhler, "is tradition? It is that sentiment which belongs to the Church, and propagates itself by means of the teaching of the Church; it is the living Word in the hearts of the faithful. To this sentiment the interpretation of Scripture in the decision of doubtful questions is entrusted; or in other words, the Church is the judge of controversies. In an external historical form" (where this is to be found Möhler does not attempt to explain, and in fact, with the exception of the three Creeds nothing resembling it can be produced), "*i.e.*, reduced to writing, this inner sentiment becomes the standard and rule of faith. In every political community a certain national character or spirit distinguishes it from other communities, and expresses itself in its public and domestic life, in its laws and customs, in its art and literature. This is the guardian genius of the community, and as long as it flourishes in spiritual vigour, it preserves the continuity of the national life; either absorbing into itself, or expelling foreign elements, should they make their appearance. When it becomes feeble, internecine factions, and party spirit, split up the body politic, and the latter tends to its dissolution. How much more must this be the case with the Church, which is the body of Christ, His perpetual incarnation, possessing a more refined and delicate organization than any earthly society. Here, to allow private opinions or private interpretations of Scripture to prevail against the common sentiment would be suicide; it is only to the whole body that the promises of the exalted Head belong, and to it alone therefore it appertains to decide." Thus far Möhler.[1]

It is obvious that this is a conception of tradition very different from that of Bellarmin; and, in fact, there is a great deal in it which the Protestant is not at all concerned to deny. For what is this "common sentiment" of the Church of which the gifted author speaks, but the spiritual illumination which is the fruit of the in-dwelling of the Holy Spirit, and which so far are

[1] "Symbolik," Aufl. 5, pp. 360-5.

Protestants from disparaging, that as we have seen (Part II.), they make it a necessary constituent in the argument for Canonicity ?[1] And it is true that this gift belongs to the whole body, and to individuals as supposed to be members of the body. Moreover, it is certainly in its essence "unwritten" tradition, for its primary seat is the heart (2 Cor. iii. 3), from which it may never emerge in spoken or written forms. But is it an absolutely *independent* sentiment? No, for if it is the work of the Holy Spirit it is so through the external instrument specially thereunto appointed—that is, the written Word of God. Through this, as an instrument mediately or immediately applied, the Holy Spirit calls the inner sentiment of the Church into being; dissociated from the written Word such alleged sentiment, as experience amply proves, is apt to become fanatical or worse: it was not produced, nor can it be perpetuated, in its proper purity, apart from the written Apostolic tradition. But what is thus dependent upon another thing can never stand alone; it may, and it does, possess a *relative* independence, but the ultimate test of its genuineness must lie out of itself—viz., in the inner sentiment of those writings respecting which we stand in no doubt that they came from God. But it is worth while to dwell a little longer on this point.

The oral teaching of the Apostles preceded their written, and the Church existed before the New Testament Scriptures. Strictly and formally, therefore, the Church cannot be said to be founded on the Scriptures as a book, but on the doctrine which the Scriptures contain. And what was the order at first is, by providential appointment, the order now; oral teaching precedes the written Word. Children receive the first lessons of Christianity from their parents, catechumens from their instructors, congregations from their pastors; certainly the heathen do so from their missionaries. "The Bible alone the religion of Protestants" is a saying which, most true in its proper acceptation, may be misunderstood; as, for example, if it be supposed to mean that scattering broadcast, translations of the Scriptures[2]

[1] Tradition, therefore, is an improper term to apply to it; being a gift of grace it is incapable of being handed down from one generation to another, as a book, a doctrine, or a practice can.

[2] This is the particle of truth in Archdeacon Grant's Bampton Lectures on Christian Missions. His (imaginary ?) opponent, who is supposed to prescribe "letterpress printing, or type" as the great instrument of evangelization, certainly needed to be reminded that to the Church, as a living body, this office, is in the first instance, committed. Holy Scripture, in truth, always presupposes a Church as in existence; which Church has come into being by oral teaching. Scripture follows, not to found the Church, but to promote its growth in faith and practice, and to eliminate error as it arises. Scripture was a divine gift to the Apostolic Church, already gathered out of heathenism by the living ministry. Scripture is the property and the jewel of the Church, not of the world. And this

is the appointed means of converting the heathen. And thus, no doubt, there may exist, for a time, a pure Christian faith amongst those who have never seen the Scriptures.[1] But not only has this oral teaching, if it is pure, been derived from the Scriptures, but it is the bounden duty of the Church along with it, to place the inspired volume in the hands of the young within her pale, or of her heathen converts; and to do so as soon as possible, in view of the too probable contingency of the enemy's sowing tares. Nay, a considerable part of the oral teaching itself must consist of simple exposition of the sacred text. But as soon as this duty is fulfilled, there commences that healthy interaction between the Church and the Scriptures, which was intended by their divine Author; the Church teaching, the Scriptures proving; the Church speaking no doubt with authority (in the proper sense of the word), but ever appealing to the Scriptures in confirmation of what she advances; and then it becomes impossible to distinguish how much of the common Christian sentiment has proceeded from the oral teaching, and how much from Scripture; still less to maintain that the former could have been what it is, if it is pure, without the latter. The case, then, supposed, as it must be if the argument is to be valid, of an inner tradition or sentiment, quite independent of Scripture and ruling its interpretation, can never arise except in a Church which withholds the Scriptures from the laity, and in so doing disparages Apostolical tradition itself. Where the Scriptures are freely read and habitually expounded, the spiritual perception of the Church is constantly recruited and corrected from them; so that the inner and the written tradition become inextricably intermingled. This is the intended order of things; still it may, in fact, be otherwise. The prevailing sentiment of the (visible) Church and that of the written Word may, as Church history too often proves, come into collision; they did so when on the strength of a very prevalent ecclesiastical sentiment, the Church in the person of Dr. Eck, Luther's antagonist, pleaded for the sale of indulgences, or in the persons of inquisitors demanded that they whose only crime was that they could not believe certain doctrines should be sent to the stake. In such a case, which are we to follow? There can be no doubt as to the answer. The voice of God in His written Word must control and correct the voice of God in the Church (real work

process is still the normal one. All this may be admitted without supposing that there is any special virtue in the Church, considered in its "corporate"—*i.e.*, its externally organized capacity, to promote the cause of missions.

[2] "Irenæus cont. Hær," L. III. c. 4. But, after all, Irenæus may mean no more with respect to the barbarous people of whom he speaks, than St. Paul does with respect to the Corinthians (2 Cor. iii. 2, 3).

of the Holy Spirit as that may be); for while the former was delivered, as we have seen (Part III.) under a special divine superintendence, guarding it from error, the latter enjoys no such prerogative, and is liable to admixtures of human infirmity. But how does the Church of Rome cut the knot? As it can only be cut by that Church. If the Church and Scripture seem to differ, so much the worse for Scripture; the former is infallible, the latter only a book which every reader who fancies he understands it may make what he pleases of; it is the former therefore that must prevail![1]

From the foregoing observations it will be seen that the question: Could a man, left entirely to himself, construct from Scripture a true system of Christian doctrine? is a speculative one. Without affirming that he could not, we may certainly say that he is not ordinarily put to the trial. The Church perpetuates herself by the living ministry, and no one of her members comes to Scripture without a predisposition of doctrine already formed in his mind. This may seem to interfere with freedom of thought, and to be unphilosophical, but it is the appointment of Providence which no one born within the pale of the Church can evade. He comes to Scripture expecting to find therein what in substance he has been taught. And let us ask, if one of Aristotle's pupils after hearing the lectures of his master, or of those commissioned by his master to teach, commenced the study of one of Aristotle's treatises, could he approach it otherwise than with a mind prepossessed, and not a *tabula rasa?*

But, it may be urged, have we not in the Creeds, a Rule of Faith, and one in some measure at least independent of Scripture? Christendom, as a whole, accepts the three Œcumenical Creeds; and, moreover, each Church has its own symbol, which to it seems practically its Rule of Faith; the Romish Church, the Decrees of Trent, and its Catechism; the Anglican, its Thirty-nine Articles; the Lutheran, the Confession of Augsburg; the Swiss Churches, the Helvetic Confessions. If these are not, respectively, Rules of Faith, what are they? The question is not unimportant.

The reply, then, is, Although these formularies may for certain purposes, and under certain aspects, be considered Rules of Faith, none of them is *the* Rule of Faith; and in fact they are Rules in quite a different sense from what Scripture is. And our Church in Art. VIII. is careful to guard against any misunderstanding on this point. The three Creeds, especially the earliest of them, come to us with the greatest claims to our attention, as deliberate professions of the faith of the Church of the early centuries on certain fundamental doctrines; professions put forth after much

[1] Möhler, §§ 39, 40.

controversy, and under circumstances which lend peculiar weight to them. But in their present form they are not of Apostolical origin. Their contents, or the truths expressed in them, we of course believe to be Apostolical, otherwise we should not receive them: but the mode of expression, the *statement* of the truths, was the work of uninspired men. They form, therefore, an Apostolical tradition only in the sense of being human attempts to state, explain, or defend, the great doctrines respecting the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation, which, in an unsystematic form, are expressed or implied in Scripture. The fable which makes the Apostles' Creed the joint production of the Twelve, has been long since exploded: the various forms under which, though in substance the same, it was used in different localities, sufficiently proves that the Apostles left no such summary behind them; or only such bare elements as *e.g.* 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4. This does not in the least derogate from its just authority as the oldest traditionary relic of what the first Christians believed on certain points, or from its value as a basis of Christian instruction, or as a baptismal profession of faith. But it does invalidate its claim to supersede, or to be co-ordinate with, Scripture, as the Rule of Faith; for like all other alleged traditionary relics we cannot, in its present form, trace it directly to the Apostles. How much more does this apply to the two subsequent Creeds; one of which is the production of a Council which "may err, even in things pertaining to God" (Art. XXI.), and the other is probably a work of the fifth century. But, besides this, a moment's inspection of the Creeds proves that they are insufficient to be the Rule of Faith. The Apostles' Creed, though the Trinitarian hypothesis lies at the base of it, is so meagre in its statements on that subject, that Socinians have always professed themselves willing to subscribe to it. It omits, too, all mention of the sacraments and their nature, and all allusion to the doctrine of justification by faith; points important enough to have caused a separation, apparently permanent, between large sections of the Western Church. The later Creeds, though explicit against Arianism and Sabellianism, do not fully supply these defects. On the whole, these venerable formularies cannot be considered as a complete Rule of Faith; and we may add, they were never intended to be so, they were not drawn up for that purpose. They were special protests against special heresies. They expressed, not what the Church *was* to believe, but what she *did* believe on the doctrines assailed; they are not *norma credendi*, but *norma crediti*. And as such, they can only make good their claims by proving their correspondence with Holy Scripture (Art. VIII.). Nor is there anything essentially permanent in the *form* in which they enunciate these doctrines; the permanency belongs to the doctrines themselves. That is to say, though we may admire the

precision of language which the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds exhibit, and think that it could hardly be improved upon, yet the Church is not tied to these or any other uninspired formulary; and even if the Creeds had perished, though the loss would have been great, the Church, taught from above and possessing the written Word, would be able, should the necessity again arise, to frame new formularies, suitable to express her faith and to expel error.

Yet the Creeds and other symbols of particular Churches, are in a certain sense *a* Rule of Faith; they are so to the members of the Christian Society which has adopted these symbols, and made them tests of admission: the proper light to regard them in is, as terms of communion. That is to say, they lay down the condition on which an applicant is to be admitted as a member of the Society. In framing such conditions, the Society does not arrogate to itself infallibility, it merely states what it does believe as such a Society, and reminds the applicant that if he becomes a member thereof he must be supposed to share its convictions. If he does not share them, he is under no compulsion to join the Society; and if he ceases to share them, he is under no compulsion to continue a member. Our Church proposes the Apostles' Creed to candidates for baptism as sufficient to stamp a distinctive character on their profession of faith; if the candidate agrees with this, *her* interpretation of Scripture, and declares his assent, he is admitted, otherwise not. Such terms of communion are obviously quite a different thing from the Rule of Faith. And what the Apostles', or the two other Creeds, are to the Church at large, each Church's particular symbol is to itself; with this difference, that such symbol affects rather the teachers than the mere members of the Society in question. Our Thirty-nine Articles are terms of communion for the ministry of our Church; we do not propose them to candidates for baptism. Such subscription is intended, and is necessary, to provide some guarantee that our public teachers accept the peculiar ecclesiastical position which we occupy in reference to other Churches. For this position is one of opposition, not merely to the ancient heresies of the early centuries, but to various errors (as we believe them to be) of the Church of Rome; and to leave it open to public teachers to teach as they please on other points, provided they adhere to the doctrine of the three Creeds, would be to ignore an essential feature of our particular Church, and to reduce it, so far, to a nebulous haze without outline or form. The points of difference between us and Rome constitute the really essential portions of our dogmatical formulary; essential, that is, not to our claim to be a Christian Church, but to the justifying of our position as regards the Romish communion of which we once formed a part.

Hence the attempts that have been made from time to time, in some reformed Churches, to substitute, *e.g.*, the Apostles' Creed as the *norma docendi* for their distinctive confession, cannot be commended; if successful, they would be tantamount to ecclesiastical suicide: nor for the reasons before given, can this Creed be made the Rule of Faith instead of Scripture.[1] On the other hand, teachers who have subscribed our symbol, cannot claim a right to fall back on Scripture alone on the ground that we make Scripture the sole Rule of Faith; for the statements of the symbol are, in fact, our Church's interpretation of Scripture: in her view these statements *are* Scripture or Scriptural; she claims to have examined Scripture and to have settled the question what it teaches; and she justly may call upon her ministers either to adopt her interpretations, or to retire from their office.

The *nature* of the sufficiency of Scripture may be described in few words. It contains no catechism, no articulated formulary of doctrine, standing out in relief; but the essential doctrines are so interwoven in its texture, that they can no more be separated from it than the miraculous element can from the Gospels. It is the Holy Spirit addressing those in whom He dwells as one friend would another, or as a father would his children come to years of discretion; not as a schoolmaster or lawgiver (Gal. iv. 1, 7). "The servant knoweth not what his lord doeth, but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you." And as regards matters of polity and ritual, precedents are given, principles are stated, but no positive prescriptions or minute details—a ceremonial law forms no part of Apostolic Christianity. But whether as regards doctrine or discipline, the Church has ever found in the Sacred Volume all that she needs to fulfil her mission in the world, and to conduct herself to eternal glory; all that she needs to refute heresy, or to separate from herself those accretions of error which from time to time may be expected to gather round her system in this imperfect state.

E. A. Litton.

---

[1] The well-known theory of Grundtvig, in Denmark. It had been previously defended in a work by Professor Delbrück, of Bonn, and drew forth three valuable letters in reply by Sack, Nitzsch, and Lücke. Bonn, 1827.

Reviews.

Our Holiday in the East. By Mrs. George Sumner. Edited by the Rev. George Henry Sumner, Hon. Canon of Winchester, and Rector of Old Alresford. London: Hurst and Blackett. Pp. 342.

THE Lands of the Bible, and especially that country once rich in corn and wine and oil, whose terraced hill-sides were as fruitful gardens, and whose fertile plains (not then so devoid of stately trees as now) drank in the rain of heaven in abundance,

> "Over whose acres walked those blessed feet,
> Which eighteen hundred years ago were nailed
> For our advantage to the bitter cross,"

have an intense fascination for the Christian traveller. And it seems inappropriate, almost offensively so, when those whose hearts are not in hallowed, humble, thankful sympathy (so to speak), with the mighty acts of the Lord accomplished there, whether in the olden times of patriarch and prophet, or in the days of His incarnation, visit the Holy Land and then publish their inadequate impressions.

Such were none of the party whose three months' sojourn in the East is graphically depicted in Mrs. Sumner's thoughtfully and devoutly written diary—a record, however, by no means lacking in liveliness or sense of humour. Her graceful narrative will afford much useful information to the untravelled; and to others bring back the remembrance of their own "holidays in the East," enjoyed as keenly as were hers, and which have left behind them sunny memories, all the brighter for the intervening shadows which have since then crossed the pathway of life.

On February 23, 1880, Mrs. Sumner and her husband, accompanied by five relatives and friends, left London for a tour "full of deep and absorbing interest," and one "crowned with continual mercies," as she thankfully observes at the close of her volume; and so pleasantly does she describe their calm and prosperous voyage from Brindisi to Alexandria, that we seem to share in the sensations of rest, refreshment, and interest experienced by the travellers in their brief life at sea, with its glimpses of famous sites and scenes on the Italian and Greek coasts. Alexandria is depicted as standing out sharp and clear against the sky-line, like one of Goodall's pictures; and here the party were joined by their admirable dragoman, Michel-el-Hani (who had formerly attended Mr. MacGregor when canoeing on the Jordan), under whose escort they proceeded to Cairo.

Our travellers' stay in Egypt was necessarily short; but they saw much in the land of the Pharaohs to interest them profoundly. First experiences of Eastern life are always impressive; and the brilliant sunshine, the clear pure atmosphere, the golden sands of the desert, the majestic pyramids, the mingling of past and present, of Oriental dress and customs with European civilization and comfort, all combined to make their sojourn in Egypt delightful. Miss Mary Whately's Mission Schools in Cairo were visited, and "God's blessing on her brave indomitable energy, and the motive power of love in her heart," thankfully recognized. Mr. and Mrs. Sumner felt that she was "doing a noble work," and left her school with an earnest prayer that such "unselfish labours" might be abundantly prospered.

On landing at Jaffa Canon Sumner and his party commenced in real earnest their greatly enjoyed tent life. With their trusty dragoman and faithful attendants; well mounted, and amply provided with all the

necessaries and luxuries of Eastern travel, but quite unarmed (which Hani judged to be the wisest course), they wended their way to Jerusalem, the Dead Sea, and Jericho, Bethlehem, Nablous, Samaria, Nazareth, the Sea of Galilee, and so on to Damascus, Baalbek, and Beyrout. When they parted from their dragoman he told them that he had never made so good a journey, and he attributed their safety and prosperity to the Bible which Mr. Sumner carried in his pocket, and to the prayers which evening after evening were solemnly offered up in his encampment. Well would it be if all English travellers thus exemplified the Divine Word, "Ye are My witnesses."

Space forbids us to do more than notice a few points of special interest in Mrs. Sumner's journal, which will abundantly repay a careful perusal. It will be observed by her readers that the Holy Scripture was the constant companion and guide-book of herself and her party. Again and again did they gather round Mr. Sumner while he read from the Old or New Testament, passages concerning the localities at which they halted or through which they had passed, and with a doubly hallowed interest when relating to those spots specially consecrated by their connection with our Blessed Lord in the days of His flesh.

Thus Jaffa was pre-eminently associated with the heavenly vision granted to St. Peter, and at Lod, or Lydda, they remembered his cure of the palsied Æneas, only regretting the difficulty often felt of "realizing the exquisite Scripture stories in modern degraded Palestine," "trodden down" as it now is in its length and breadth by "the Gentiles." As they looked upon the valley of Ajalon, they tried to picture to themselves "Joshua pursuing the Amorites" along the way that goeth up to Bethoron, and recalled in imagination the wondrous miracle there wrought.

At Jerusalem their tents were pitched near the Damascus gate; close to "a green grass rounded knoll," still called "Bethhac-Sekilah," the place of stoning, from its having witnessed according to tradition the martyrdom of St. Stephen; and which Captain Conder, of the Palestine Exploration Society, believes to have been the spot to which our blessed Lord was led out for crucifixion. "As we gazed at it evening after evening," says Mrs. Sumner, "from the doors of our tents, we could more clearly realize the greatest event that ever took place in this sin-stricken world, the mysterious and awful darkness, the insulting crowd, the broken-hearted mother, the sorrowing disciples, and that one godlike patient sufferer, hanging in all the majesty of grief, and uniting heaven and earth by His bitter cross and passion."

Of course the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and the traditional sites within and without its ancient walls, were visited with profound interest; and on Palm Sunday our travellers were pained to see "the Turkish soldiers drawn up in line to keep order," we may add, to keep the peace among the Christian worshippers. They obtained permission, accorded to no local Christian, to go within the sacred precincts of the Temple area, and the great Mosque of Omar, and thus they stood before the site at least of that "Golden Gate" through which our Divine Saviour passed into the courts of His Father's house on the day of His triumphal entry. On Palm Sunday the Sumner party, after attending service in the well-filled English church, walked out as far as Bethany, and returned to Jerusalem along the very same road which our Lord had trodden on the first Palm Sunday. "The road which wound along the mountain side was wild and rocky, the blue iris and bright crimson anemones" abounded, and they "occasionally passed fig-trees," bearing, as is usual at that season, "small early figs." The interest of this memorable walk "culminated" as on their homeward way they "rounded one of the shoulders of Mount Olivet," and "Jerusalem suddenly burst upon them, and they

felt they must be standing at the very point where our Lord halted as He rode from Bethany." Need we add that they paused here to read all the details of His triumphal entry which the Four Evangelists have been moved to record. On Good Friday, after listening to an earnest sermon on the great subject of the crucifixion from the Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem, Mr. and Mrs. Sumner and their companions visited the traditional "upper chamber," where the Lord Jesus gathered his disciples "around Him for the Last Supper," and where also the disciples waited "for the Pentecostal blessing." The site, if not the building, may be the same.

On their journey northward they halted at Jacob's Well, the identity of which is undisputed; and after passing through Samaria, with occasional pauses at localities famous in sacred story, they found themselves at Nazareth, "the centre of Christian love and veneration." Brief mention is made of the modern features of this "secluded village." The Protestant Church and Orphanage (the latter belonging to the Society for Promoting Female Education in the East, and admirably managed by Miss Dickson) receive a passing notice, and then Mrs. Sumner speaks of the interest with which they visited the well, to which day by day "the mother of Jesus" would "draw near to fill her water jar, accompanied doubtless by the Holy Child." A carpenter's shop, too, in which "a young Nazarene was busily employed in his trade, dressed in a long striped cotton gaberdine reaching down to the ankles, with a girdle round the waist, and tight sleeves," could not but recall the words, "Is not this the carpenter?"

Mrs. Sumner truly remarks that it is "hardly possible to imagine any part of Palestine in which our Saviour's presence is more vividly realized than by the Sea of Galilee. The scenery, too, is exquisite." "The beautiful hillsides" were carpeted with brilliant flowers in lavish profusion. Pomegranates, fig-trees, and oleanders "grew down to the water's edge. But where were the busy, populous towns, with all their stir of commercial activity—Capernaum, Bethsaida, Magdala?" Dwindled down to wretched mud villages or ruinous heaps, in "fulfilment of the woes which our Lord denounced against them." Safed, the "city set on a hill," Kadish, Naphtali, Lake Merom, Banias, were visited, and there our travellers passed beyond the limit of the Holy Land, but not beyond scenes hallowed by their association with Holy Writ. In Damascus "the street which is called straight" is still to be identified. Abana is as beautiful and as fertilizing as in the days of Naaman; and Abraham's faithful steward is not to be forgotten in the ancient city with which his name is united. The palaces, the bazaars of Damascus, Abd-el-Kader, Baalbeck, Lebanon and Hermon; Mission and school work in Syria and Palestine; various encounters with the natives, friendly and formidable; adventures and small accidents by flood, and sundry entertaining incidents of travel, form prominent features in this interesting volume, though we have had to pass them over without notice. A similar course has been necessary with regard to Mrs. Sumner's interesting account of the Maronites and the Druses, the massacres of 1860, and her many references to Jewish and Mohammedan manners and customs.

The homeward progress of the party, by way of Cyprus, Athens, and Constantinople, though all are at this time places specially noteworthy, we cannot follow, but must hasten to take leave of Mr. and Mrs. Sumner and their "delightful companions," commending this modern pilgrim's tale to the attention of all who "pray for the peace of Jerusalem," whom "it pitieth to see her in the dust," and who look for the day "when Israel shall return unto the Lord."

A Popular Commentary on the New Testament. Volume II. The Gospel of St. John and the Acts of the Apostles. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1880.

THE second volume of this attractive Commentary contains St. John's Gospel, by Professor Milligan, of the University of Aberdeen, and Dr. Moulton, the eminent Wesleyan, and the Acts of the Apostles by Dean Howson and Canon Spence. As a whole, the second volume is not inferior to the first, issued about a year ago, and warmly recommended in these columns. With the portion of the volume which deals with the Acts of the Apostles we are particularly pleased. While thoroughly scholarly, showing everywhere results of research, this work well maintains its claims as a "*Popular* Commentary." The notes, free from technicalities, are not too long, and the exposition is, for the most part, plain and positive. The doctrine is evangelical. A spirit of reverence pervades the whole. To intelligent students of Holy Scripture who have little leisure for learned annotations, such a work will be welcome. The printing is exceedingly good; there are many illustrations, and five maps.

In the Introduction to the Commentary on the Gospel, Professors Milligan and Moulton remark on the absence of references. "Innumerable references," they write, "might have been made to the extensive literature connected with this Gospel, and to the opinions of those who have commented upon it before us. We have thought it best, except in one or two instances, to refrain from giving them." That they have so refrained, many of their readers will be thankful. Nothing is more wearisome to the "general reader" class among students of Scripture, than a running commentary on sceptical objections, with references to books which in a few years will be forgotten. Professors Milligan and Moulton, further, express their regret that "the noble Commentary of Dr. Westcott did not appear until almost the last" pages of their own work had been printed off. They add, that to the personal communications of Dr. Westcott, and to "the discussions which have taken place in the New Testament Revision Company," they probably owe more than they are themselves aware of. At the same time they remark, and so far as our examination goes, remark with justice, that they have submitted every question to independent investigation; they have given the results at which they, after due deliberation, have arrived. On Chapter iii. verse 5, stating first the view that the birth "of water and spirit," can only refer to Christian baptism, and secondly, that Christian baptism is not alluded to here at all, the learned commentators conclude their argument by remarking that in both these "extremes" there is error. "There is no *direct* reference here to Christian baptism; but the reference to the truths which that baptism expresses is distinct and clear."

Each of the Authors of the Commentary on the Acts, we read, has revised the work of the other. "The Dean of Chester is directly responsible for the notes on Chapters x., xi., xxvii., and xxviii. to v. 17, with the excursus on the two accounts of the Conversion of Cornelius; the three accounts of the Conversion of St. Paul; the Ships and Navigation of the Ancients, and the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles. The rest of the work has been executed by Canon Spence." The Dean's excursus on the Conversion of Cornelius (the same remark will apply to that on St. Paul's conversion) is a gem; exceedingly interesting, and of no small value. The Dean well remarks, that "the method of the *Horæ Paulinæ* is applicable, not only to the comparison of one class of documents with another, with the view of proving the honesty of both by exhibiting minute consistency without contrivance, but likewise to the comparative criticism of different parts of the same document, by showing that

undesigned coincidences link them together, and thus give to them the coherence of truth. Paley himself applies this mode of reasoning to the Epistle to the Philippians, in the matter of Epaphroditus, without any comparison with the Acts of the Apostles. The parts of this book of the Acts which lend themselves with the greatest felicity to this method of treatment, and do, in fact, most obviously invite it, as they most richly reward it, are the three accounts of St. Paul's conversion."

The conclusion of the argument, in the Introduction, on "the purpose with which the Book was written" (see CHURCHMAN, page 313), is that the view which regards the Acts as the sequel to the Gospels—*i.e.*, as the account of what Jesus *continues* to do and teach from His glory throne in heaven, must be accepted as a devout and true conception of the spirit of St. Luke's second treatise. The view, also, which represents it as the story of the solemn progress of the faith from Jerusalem to Rome, Dr. Howson and Canon Spence accept as "partly true." But they go further. They look upon the first twelve chapters as Paul's justification of his life and teaching, and the second part as the story of his work and his success: "between the twelve first called apostles and the seven deacons, between the church of Jerusalem and the missionary churches of St. Paul, no difference of opinion existed."

The work of Canon Spence exhibits skill and judgment; his notes are fresh, suggestive, and pleasing.

The Englishman's Brief on behalf of his National Church. New, revised, and enlarged edition, pp. 210. S. P. C. K. 1880.

WE are glad to see a second, cheaper, issue of this book, and the committee of the venerable Church Society have done well to take it in hand. It will have, no doubt, a very large circulation. The aim of the author, we read, was to provide a brief manual for Englishmen, setting forth and plainly dealing with the various questions involved in, and arising out of, the consideration of the Church of England in her threefold aspect as a *National, Established,* and *Endowed Church.* In the face of much prevalent misunderstanding, as well as wide-spread misrepresentation, a plain outlined statement will probably prove useful to many—whether friends or opponents of the Church—in removing wrong impressions, and imparting correct ideas on the subject. "It will, moreover," writes the author in his Preface, "furnish with material for Church Defence those who may be disposed, whether in conversation, through the press, or on the platform, to advocate the cause of the Church, a needful thing in these times, when the attacks made upon her are so numerous and persistent, and in which Disestablishment and Disendowment are becoming such prominent if not 'practical' political questions."

Amongst the points to which the author, says the Preface, has endeavoured to give prominence are:—

(*a*) That it does not appear from the Old or New Testament record that the union between Church and State is contrary to the teaching of Holy Scripture or of Christ or his Apostles.

(*b*) That the union between Church and State is not the result of a deliberately formulated theory, but is the outcome of their gradual mutual growth, and inter-dependence during the long course of centuries.

(*c*) That in this way the Church, in the early period of Christian history in this country, became established, and therefore was never established by Act of Parliament.

(*d*) That her Endowments were never in whole or in part derived from the State, but were of private origin—the free gifts of individual members.

(*e*) That as such they are *not national,* but Corporate property, vested in thousands of separate Corporations, for the spiritual benefit of the popu-

lations of dioceses and parishes, and as such cannot in justice be dealt with by the State otherwise than it deals with the property of other Corporations in the country.

In preparing this "Brief," we read, "it has been very far from the author's intention to write in a controversial spirit, or to make an attack on any religious body outside the Church of England, or to say a single discourteous word of, or impute other than religious motives to, those who may, from their ecclesiastical standpoint, regard it their conscientious duty to attack the Church." With the tone and temper of the book, indeed, it is not likely that any fault will be found. The statements are well-weighed; references are given to the quotations, many of which are valuable; and, so far as our examination has extended, every statistical sentence is accurate.

On page 77 we observe this question:—*Whence does the Liberation Society derive its present large income of over £16,000 per annum?* The answer runs as follows:—

> The writer of an article in the *Quarterly Review* for January, 1879, on "Aggressive Nonconformity" (page 52), explains all this. He says, "The Liberationist party had no sooner experienced their crushing electoral defeat in 1874, than they held counsel how they might best retrieve their lost position. It was determined to raise a special fund of £100,000, to be expended during the next five years in the furtherance of their object, and more than £53,000 were forthwith promised. So large an amount would at first sight indicate a widespread and earnest determination on the part of aggressive Nonconformists to dislodge the Church from her position without further delay. We do not for one moment question the large numbers or the energy of our opponents. We do not underestimate the mischief which an annual distribution of two millions-and-a-half of Liberationist publications may occasion. But a close scrutiny of the subscription lists and balance-sheets of the Liberation Society reveals some facts of no little significance. Of the special fund, which is being rapidly spent, and which forms two-thirds of the Society's annual income, about £20,000, or nearly one-half, was raised in the town of Bradford and its immediate neighbourhood, three firms alone contributing to it £15,000; Manchester sent £6,200; London sent £6,400; Birmingham, £545; Leeds, £240. From this it is evident that the mainspring of the whole movement arose from a handful of Bradford manufacturers and wool-combers. Nor is there wanting an equally significant indication that the agitation thus elaborately organized has little spontaneous life. There has been a genuine sale of the Liberation Society's publications for the four years ending May, 1878, to the amount of £284 14*s.* 1*d.*, and this magnificent result has been attained by the expenditure of more than £60,000!"

On page 83 we observe a quotation from a Paper by that eminent Nonconformist, the Rev. J. Baldwin Brown, published in "The Congregational Year-Book" for the year 1872.

Referring to the great extent to which Trust Deeds are openly violated, if not utterly ignored, by ministers of religious bodies outside the Church of England, while they continue, be it remembered, to enjoy the property and privileges which are secured to them only on their contract loyally to observe the conditions and provisions of the trusts, this plain-spoken minister boldly declares—"At this moment many of the most eminent of our ministers are preaching under trust deeds containing statements of doctrine which nothing could induce them to utter from their pulpits." Further he says, "Were the original donors to rise from their graves, they would—unless indeed they have learned a larger theology, as we may be sure they have—be simply horrified to hear the doctrine which is systematically taught from their pulpits; pulpits which they thought they have secured for the preaching of the narrower Gospel which satisfied their hearts. As a matter of fact," he says, "trust deeds are constantly ignored, and by our very ablest and most

successful men, chairmen of the Congregational Union." "If it be asked," says our author, "How can such a state of things be permitted to exist? the answer is—the law does not set itself in motion, as against alleged infringements and violations of its provisions, whether in the concerns of the Church or in matters of religious bodies outside her communion." And Nonconformists do not care to set the law in motion.[1] In many Nonconformist congregations, of course, the people agree with the minister in rejecting doctrines.

On page 71 appears this question. *But whatever efforts the Church may be putting forth in making provision for the evangelization of the masses of increasing populations, is she not equalled, if not greatly surpassed, in this matter by the efforts made by Nonconformist bodies, as appears to be the case by their possessing* 18,723 *Chapels*[2] *in England and Wales?* Our author replies as follows:—

The statement that Nonconformists possess 18,723 *chapels* in England and Wales is, to those who do not know the actual facts of the case, entirely misleading.

In the ordinary sense in which we understand a "Chapel," we associate with it and comprehend in its meaning a building which is the property, on trust, of a religious body, exclusively dedicated to religious purposes, and having a stated congregation of regular worshippers, with a resident minister attached to it to conduct its services and carry out other customary ministrations.

Now, we have good reason to believe that of the alleged 18,723 chapels possessed by all forms of Nonconformity in England, not more than one-half come up to this standard or fulfil these ideas and requirements of a chapel, but on the contrary, that more than one-half of them are a mere medley of preaching stations or places in which regular or occasional services or prayer meetings are held by local preachers and other well-disposed and religious-minded people, who, according to their ideas and in their ways, are anxious to do good in trying to evangelize the people.

If it be asked—"How can this be proved?" our author replies that matter of proof is simple and easy enough. "We can prove it by studying the detailed statistics of the more important and prominent Nonconformist bodies, in which we find the exact number of their regular and recognized ministers and the precise number of their regular chapels with ministers attached, as distinguished from their mere temporary places of worship and preaching-stations, the latter of which are generally enumerated in full in the Annual Report of each religious body."[3] Again:—

We get at the real facts of the case in another way. We know that, as a rule, with very few exceptions, Nonconformists are keenly alive to the importance of availing themselves of every privilege which the law of the land affords them in their rivalry of the Church, and therefore they rarely fail to have every regular chapel not only certified for public worship, but also registered for marriages. Now out of the alleged 18,723 *chapels* of all denominations which the "Congregational Year Book for 1880," page 434, tells us are *certified* for religious worship to the Registrar-General, only 8,425—the same authority tells us—are registered for marriages. But suppose we add to this number some 2,000 more for assumed cases of regular chapels, with reference to which there has been an

---

[1] If a member of any religious body, differing from the preaching and teaching of his minister, demanded, as he has a right to do, to inspect the Trust Deed of his Chapel, and found cause, and was inclined, to take proceedings against him, it would soon be seen how far such minister was free from State control.

[2] See "Baptist Handbook," 1878, page 436, and also "Congregational Year-Book," 1880, p. 434.

[3] See "Baptist Handbook," "Congregational Year-Book," and "Minutes of Wesleyan Conference."

omission to register them for marriages—which we think is a most liberal allowance—then with the utmost stretch of facts there cannot be more than about 10,500 Nonconformist places of worship in England and Wales, fulfilling the conditions in the ordinary sense of the word associated with a Nonconformist "chapel"—that is, a chapel being the trust property of the religious body after which it takes its name, set apart for religious purposes, with a regular congregation attending it, and with a resident minister attached to it to conduct the religious ministrations within its walls, all the rest being a medley of places of worship, with little if any pretence to the designation "chapel" in the commonly-understood sense of the word.

On reference to the appendix to this volume, some idea will be formed of the nature of some of the buildings comprehended in the sum total of the 18,723 "chapels" to which Nonconformists lay claim; and we need only remark, says the author, "that if the Church of England followed the example of the Nonconformists by designating as 'churches' all buildings and schoolrooms in which her clergy or lay missionaries held religious services, she could easily on paper make the number of her churches double or treble what it now is. But would this be accurate? Would it be right? Would it not greatly mislead the public as to the extent of her church building and as to the permanent provision she had made for the evangelization of the masses and for the conduct of public worship?"

We give a portion of the appendix to which the author refers:—

II. TABLE SHOWING THE NUMBER OF BUILDINGS REGISTERED FOR THE SOLEMNIZATION OF MARRIAGES, AND ON THE REGISTER ON 31ST DEC., 1879.

Presbyterians:	
Church of Scotland	17
United Presbyterians, including Relief and Secession Churches	26
Presbyterian Church in England	100
Presbyterian Church of England	180
Independents	2,101
Baptists	1,601
United Brethren or Moravians	24
Roman Catholics	819
Unitarians	127
Wesleyan Methodists:	
Original Connexion	1,478
New Connexion	132
Primitive Methodists	557
Bible Christians	76
Wesleyan Methodist Association and Wesleyan Reformers, generally forming the United Methodist Free Church	343
Other Wesleyan Methodists	27
Calvinistic Methodists	452
Countess of Huntingdon's Connexion	34
New Jerusalem Church	39
Catholic and Apostolic Church	28
All others	264
Total	8,425

Short Notices.

The True Mission of the Laity in the Church of England: How can we lead all Classes and Ages to fulfil it? A Paper read before the Devon and Cornwall Clerical and Lay Society, at their annual meeting in the Bath Saloon, Torquay, May 26, 1880. By C. PAGET-BLAKE, M.D. R.N., F.R.C.P. Lond., Lay-Assistant, Diocese of Exeter. Plymouth: Latimer and Son.

This pamphlet of fifteen pages is well worth reading. The subject is of the highest importance, and Dr. Paget-Blake is practical. As lay-deacon, lay-assistant, lay-reader, different names in different dioceses —what an enormous amount of supplemental work can be done by earnest laymen in the cottage gathering of the village, the fitted-up barn of the isolated hamlet, the school-room of the crowded city, the mission church in neglected alleys and slums of sea-ports and other swarming towns!

Everlasting Punishment. Lectures delivered at St. James's Church, Piccadilly. With Three Dissertations. By EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBOURN, D.C.L., D.D., Dean of Norwich. Pp. 275. Second Edition, Revised and enlarged. Rivingtons. 1881.

We are not surprised to observe that a second edition of Dean Goulbourn's work has been required within the space of a few months. On so solemn a subject the pious and learned Dean is peculiarly qualified to write; he touches the various points involved with a tender hand, and at the same time in a true spirit of Christian humility, with profound reverence for the Word of God. In his remarks on "the fewness of the saved," we are reminded, here and there, of Archer Butler. The present edition of the work is dedicated to Dean Burgon, "to whose friendly and judicious criticisms some corrections and improvements of these Lectures as first published are due." We learn, from a prefatory note, that the "Fifth Lecture—'Lessons of the Story of the Crucified Malefactors,' in which some assumptions were made which did not seem to be fully borne out by Holy Scripture, has been in part re-written." Further, dissertations on the irretrievable ruin of the fallen angels, the (comparative) fewness of the saved, and the limits of understanding in apprehending the character and ways of God, have been appended. From the third Dissertation we make a brief extract:—

St. Peter, supplementing what his "beloved brother Paul" has written, compares the "sure word of prophecy" (observe it is a "*sure* word," an every way reliable one though it has its obscurities) to "a light that shineth in a dark place." Yes, a light which serves sufficiently as a lantern to our feet for practical guidance, and for the cheering of our faith and hope, but at the same time "a light that shineth in a dark place." The ray of a single taper in a vast cathedral at midnight might be sufficient to guide our steps in walking through the building, and as we moved cautiously along would reveal to us pier after pier springing up like tall trees into the surrounding darkness, but it would not do much more than this. The meeting of the lines of those piers in the gigantic arches overhead would be altogether hidden from us, and had we never been in such a building by day we should probably imagine that the lines had no such meeting-point above. Our taper has not more than sufficient power to show us a single part at a time, its light cannot possibly disclose the relation of the parts to one another or give that unity of effect to the interior which it has when seen under the full flood of daylight. The application of the image is easy and instructive. God's whole plan of administration over His rational creatures is nowhere revealed to us in Holy Scripture; nor have we at present the capacity to under-

stand it if it were. But such of His ways and dealings as it is necessary for us to know in order to our practical guidance, it has pleased Him to disclose to us. He has also revealed Himself to us, both in the Scriptures and in the moral sense, as a Judge who cannot fail to do right, and in Christ, as a most wise and loving Father, who gave up the Son of His love to a death of ignominy and cruel pain, in order to secure our salvation. How His revealed character, or how the attributes of the character are to be harmonized with one another in each of His dealings, can never, it may be, fully and perfectly understood by us in our present state, so long as we know but in part and see only through a glass darkly. And if, perversely insisting upon measuring all things by our own limited capacity and knowledge, we maintain that God will deal with man continuing impenitently in sin after the remedy for it has been made known to him, otherwise than as He has explicitly said, and that He will be too merciful to banish any from His presence everlastingly, it is well for us to remember that our sin has the brand of idolatry upon it; that we are framing a god to ourselves with our minds if not with our hands; framing him as idolators do—in our own image and likeness, and incurring the divine censure launched against those that excuse themselves in evil from the thought of the impunity which attends it.—"These things hast thou done, and I kept silence; thou thoughtest that I was altogether such an one as thyself."

Critical Handbook. A Guide to the Study of the Authenticity, Canon, and Text of the Greek New Testament. By E. C. MITCHELL, D.D. Illustrated by tables and facsimiles; with a map. Pp. 150. Religious Tract Society.

Dr. Mitchell has done his work with skill and judgment. His "Handbook" shows research, and, as a whole, really *multum in parvo*, is the best treatise of the kind, so far as we know. In a second edition he will be able to insert in the note on p. 64 a reference to Professor Charteris's recently published work, "Canonicity," which will supersede Kirchhofer's *Quellensammlung*.

Break of Day in the Eighteenth Century. A History and a Specimen of its First Book of English Sacred Song. Three hundred hymns of Dr. Watts, carefully selected and arranged, with a sketch of their history. By CYPRIAN T. RUST, Rector of Westerfield. Pp. 270. W. Hunt & Co. 1880.

In its own way a book of interest and value.

Jesus Christ; His Life and His Work. By the Rev. F. A. MALLESON, M.A., Vicar of Broughton-in-Furness. Illustrated. Pp. 370. Ward, Lock & Co.

The author of this able and interesting work gives in his preface a declaration of the spirit and faith in which he has written. He holds "the full and plenary inspiration of the Holy Scriptures;" he receives "every miracle in all its details and accessories;" he protests against a Rationalistic verifying faculty; he will make no concessions to that which is presumptuously styled the "advanced thought" of the times. Further, so far as we have examined Mr. Malleson's work, its doctrine is Evangelical; there is a simplicity and spirituality in tone and style. Sufficiently critical for thoughtful and intelligent Biblical students, it is likely to be a favourite with many who have no leisure for study. The book will prove, indeed, we think, really popular. With many Sunday-school teachers it can hardly fail to do good service. For parish libraries, and as a prize or reward book for elder pupils, it is very suitable. We are sorry that an earlier notice has not appeared in these columns.

The Pillar and Ground of the Truth: 1 Tim. iii. 15. *Is it the Church or Timothy?* By the Rev. W. GUISE TUCKER, M.A. Pp. 38. Seeley. 1880.

An interesting publication.

From the admirable sermon on Acts xvii. 16, "The City; or, The Sight which stirred St. Paul," recently preached before the University of Oxford by Bishop RYLE (W. Hunt & Co.), we extract two or three sentences:—

Need we stand still and be ashamed of the weapons of our warfare? Is the Gospel, the old Evangelical creed, unequal to the wants of our day? I assert boldly that we have no cause to be ashamed of the Gospel at all. It is not worn out. It is not effete. It is not behind the times. We want nothing new, nothing added to the Gospel, nothing taken away. We want nothing but "the old paths"—the old truths fully, boldly, affectionately proclaimed. Preach the Gospel fully, the same Gospel which St. Paul preached, and it is still "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth," and nothing else called religion has any real power at all.

A Pathway of Song. By T. SMITH. Pp. 44. Elliot Stock.

Pleasing verses; impressions of travel on the continent. A tasteful little book.

The Saviour Prophet; or, Incidents in the Life of Elisha. By Rev. FREDERICK WHITFIELD, M.A., Author of "Voices from the Valley," &c. Pp. 290. Nisbet & Co. 1881.

Mr. Whitfield's style is so well known that we need not notice at any length the interesting book before us, addresses delivered in St. Mary's, Hastings. "The Divine Call," "The Last Walk," "The Shunammite," are the titles of some of the chapters, of which there are twenty. The book is well printed and got up.

Life and Letters of Horace Bushnell. Pp. 580. London: R. D. Dickinson. 1880.

After reading several pages of this book, here and there, we have been constrained to put it aside. For many readers in the United States, probably, it will have a certain interest.

Tender Grass for the Lambs. Sermons to the Young. By the Rev. CLAUDE BOSANQUET, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Folkestone. Pp. 160. Sampson Low, Marston, Searle, & Rivington. 1881.

In this volume appear twelve sermons: "A Caution for the Holidays," "The Quarrel stayed," "Three Stations on the Down Line," "A Diamond Necklace," &c. In tone earnest and affectionate, in style simple but suggestive. This is Mr. Bosanquet's second volume of children's sermons.

We gladly recommend a sermon, "Life through Christ and for Christ," by the Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., Fellow of Balliol, preached in St. Aldate's Church, Oxford (16 pp.), published by Messrs. Hatchards.

Cuthberht of Lindisfarne: His Life and Times. By ALFRED C. FRYER, F.R. Hist. Soc. Pp. 212. S. W. Partridge & Co. 1880.

We are much pleased with this book. It gives a good deal of information, and in a quiet pleasing way word-paints the scenery of Cuthberht and Bæda's Christian living. That the sacramental teaching of these Fathers of the Anglic Church differed widely from that of Rome, Mr. Fryer points out, and proves.

The Prayer Meeting and its Improvement. By the Rev. L. O. THOMPSON. From the 4th American edition. Pp. 220. London: Hamilton, Adams & Co. 1881.

"The prayer meeting is the people's meeting, and they support its exercises." So writes Mr. Thompson. And, again, he says, "The weekly prayer meeting is the pulse of the Church." This book is well worth reading.

The District Visitor's Companion. A Handbook of Instruction, Help, and Encouragement for those engaged in District Visiting. By Rev. W. Boyd Carpenter, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Paddington. Pp. 75. Elliot Stock.

The subject of district visiting is undoubtedly of great consequence; it is much more important than even earnest church-folk, as a rule, seem to suppose. Rating very highly, as we do, the labour of a sensible and spiritually-minded district visitor, we were prepared to give a cordial welcome to Mr. Boyd Carpenter's "Handbook," now before us. We have not been disappointed. "The District Visitor's Companion," regarded from every point of view, merits praise. It is eminently practical, and in tone all that we could desire. The "Handbook," unique, so far as we know, supplies a want, and it can hardly fail to do great good service. Its author evidently has many of the qualifications desirable in such an undertaking. First of all he is outspoken. He speaks, for example, of the good, kind visitor, who lacks fibre—she is flabby; of the mechanical distributor of tracts; of the garrulous visitor; of the lady whose "heart is swallowed up and drowned in the great deep of her strong good sense;" and of the theological phrase-talker, more apt to perplex than to please. But although here and elsewhere Mr. Carpenter by no means minces, he is not likely to cause offence; his words are wise. A bold rider, he has a very light hand, and he knows the country. To drop metaphor, he shows, as an experienced Christian worker, the double meaning of that Christian term, *παράκλησις*, exhortation and consolation. And hence his words, with devout Christians, will prove welcome, and also weighty. We are particularly pleased with the chapter "How to do our Work," divided into four sections, viz., the work in relation, first, to ourselves, second, to those we visit, third, to the Christian Church, and fourth,[1] the work in relation to our Master. The chapter on "Visiting the Sick" is also exceedingly good. We venture to suggest, however, that in a second edition it might be well to insert a word or two as to the expediency of reading hymns, and, in the case of the poorer classes, who have little learning, of making the prayers very simple. The present writer has found, both among the peasantry and the labouring classes of town parishes, that, in order to be understood, it is necessary to use in the sick-room short sentences and homely language; the simpler the better. He has found also that to read a hymn and to pray is sometimes better than to speak. In heartily recommending the little volume before us, we have only to add that it is well printed, and has a very pretty cover.

The Cross: Heathen and Christian. A Fragmentary Notice of its Early Pagan Existence, and subsequent Christian Adoption. With many illustrations. By Mourant Brock, M.A. Second edition, enlarged. Pp. 115. Seeleys. 1880.

To those who have not read the learned works on the cross in relation to the heathen world, many of the facts in the book before us will come as a great surprise. Zoeckler's work has been translated, but few English readers, probably, have made acquaintance with it. Mr. Brock has evidently given a good deal of time to this subject; and his book contains many facts not to be met with elsewhere. He has taken his own line. Quotations are copious; they are interesting and judicious. On page 36 we observe he quotes Dean Burgon's "Letters from Rome," to the effect that crosses do not exist on Christian monuments of the first four centuries; and he adds that the learned antiquary, Mr. Parker, thinks the Dean's opinion perfectly correct, while Lichtenberger (Paris: Sandoz,

[1] A typographical error in the "Handbook," iii. instead of iv., page 38.

1878) fixes the date at the beginning of the fifth century. As to the crucifix, its probable date is the eighth century.

On the Relations between Church and State. An Article reprinted from the *Christian Remembrancer*, April, 1850. By R. W. CHURCH, M.A., Fellow of Oriel. London: Walter Smith, 6, Paternoster Row. 1881.

Placing this essay, thirty years old, by the side of the Memorial in favour of Ritualism promoted by the eminent author a few weeks ago, we have read the essay with much interest; and we are inclined to think that the arguments of the Fellow of Oriel form, in a certain way, a warning against the Memorial of the Dean of St. Paul's.

Far Off. Part II. By the Author of "The Peep of Day." London: Hatchards.

Few of the works of the late lamented Mrs. Mortimer will be found more useful to parents and teachers than this. "Far Off" describes Oceania, Africa, and America in a way that is at once interesting and intelligible to young minds. The illustrations are copious and very good, and the book abounds in anecdotes.

The Exiles of Salzburg, and other Stories. Translated from the German of GUSTAV MERITZ by Mrs. KERR. Pp. 250. Religious Tract Society.

"The Exiles of Salzburg" (A.D. 1732), "The King of Prussia's Tall Soldier" (A.D. 1737), and "The Belfry of Dresden," an episode of the Seven Years' War, are the three stories in this attractive and very readable volume. The first relates to the expulsion of Protestants by the Archbishop of Salzburg. When their descendants, we read, were celebrating their great jubilee of 1832, in remembrance of their reception in Prussia, thousands flocked around a venerable old man who, more than a century old, stood as the monument of a past generation. This is an interesting volume. It is got up with taste as a gift-book.

Duty. With Illustrations of Courage, Patience, and Endurance. By SAMUEL SMILES, LL.D. Pp. 430. John Murray. 1880.

In an interesting preface to this volume it is stated that "Self-Help," one of the greatest literary successes of our days, was published in 1859. It was offered in vain to a London publisher, and it was not till after the "Life of George Stephenson" had been published that "Self-Help" was issued "through the kindness of Mr. Murray." Thirteen years later appeared "Character." Five years ago was published "Thrift," and now comes "Duty," the last book, we are told, of the series. In many respects the fourth book is, in our judgment, equal to the first, and in one respect superior to it, which is saying a great deal. A wonderful series, and welcome, has this been; widely read all over Europe, and throughout the United States. One of the most interesting chapters in "Duty" is "Heroism in Missions." Open the book, however, where we may, some striking anecdote or apt quotation meets the eye. For the England of to-day lessons on duty have an especial value. Can it be, we read, on p. 43, that the ever-extending tide of democracy is bearing down the best fruits of domestic discipline and moral character? Has England been steadily declining in the qualities which make up the strength of national character? Serious questions. Erasmus once said that he would not be unfaithful to the cause of Christ, "at least, *so far as the age will permit me.*" In politics, in religion, in social and domestic matters, there is a sad lack of fibre. People will not stick to principles, and the restraints of discipline are disliked. Ambition, like lazy self-indulgence, avoids the question, What is *right?* Cecil's remark, "Duties are ours: events are God's," is not popular with the time-serving. The recollection of this saying of Cecil leads us to observe that, on p. 33, the sentence on the state of the world calling man to do something, is, if we remember right,

Cecil's; and the sentence about a poor country parson battling against evil in his parish should be marked as a quotation from Adams. In heartily recommending the able work before us, which will prove, we hope, exceedingly useful, we will only add that Dr. Smiles's observations on "culture," including a reference to Goethe, the inventor of *geist*, or culture, are as telling as they are timely. Many now-a-days worship "culture;" it is their only religion; intellectual cynicism and scepticism and a varnish of refinement. In speaking of life's duties, we remember hearing that genial, true-hearted Christian worker, Dr. Guthrie, use some stirring words, and we may quote them (not, perhaps, quite correctly) as follows:—

I live for those who love me,
For those who know me true,
For the Heaven that smiles above me,
For the good that I should do.
For the cause that needs assistance,
For the wrongs that need resistance,
For the future in the distance,
For the crown I have in view.

A Charge delivered at his Second Triennial Visitation to the Clergy of the Diocese of St. David's. Published at their request. By WILLIAM BASIL JONES, D.D., Lord Bishop of St. David's. Rivingtons. 1880.

There are several points in this Charge on which, had we space, we should gladly touch. But we will simply quote from the passage in which the Bishop refers to the reform or reconstruction of Convocation:—

We hear on all hands among Churchmen a demand for the reform of Convocation. Will you permit me to express my own deliberate conviction—one at which I have arrived after much thought, and in the face of a feeling originally adverse to it—that no reform of Convocation will make it more influential than it is, or will enable its resolutions to carry greater weight with Parliament or with the country, which has not the effect of converting it from what it is according to its present constitution, viz., a Convocation of the Clergy, into a mixed assembly of Clergy and Laity. For my own part, I am inclined to believe that those very reforms which at present find most favour with the Clergy at large, and which look in the direction of increasing the representation of the parochial Clergy in proportion to the official element in the Lower House, if not of excluding the latter altogether, would tend to diminish rather than to increase the influence of the body, by breaking down the bridge which still spans *the rapidly widening chasm dividing the opinions and feelings of the Lower House from that of the great mass of the educated Laity.* [The italics are ours.] If such a change in the constitution of Convocation as I here plead for could possibly be effected (a change which I fully acknowledge would amount to an entire reconstruction), I believe that the Convocation would be armed with such influence that its decisions upon the purely internal matters of the Church would generally be accepted by Parliament without question, the more so that Parliament would be only too glad to relieve itself of the burden of such matters, and to leave them virtually in its hands.

A new periodical has been published—*Light and Truth*—"A Record of Church Reformation Work in Spain, Portugal, Mexico, and other parts of Christendom." (Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co., Grafton Street.) With the first number, January, 1881, we are much pleased. The name chosen for this little magazine has its own history. In Madrid, under the editorship of Signor Cabrera, there has been published now for many years a fortnightly paper named *The Light*, which has done much to dispel the surrounding darkness. In the City of Mexico a similar publication has for some time combated error under the title of *The Truth*. In the Irish periodical it has been thought well to combine both these kindred elements of reformation work. Lord Plunket contributes a brief preface. The Most Rev. Prelate writes:—

This Paper is intended to meet a need not elsewhere supplied. A wanton multiplication of periodicals is a feature of the present day, and cannot be well defended; but the ground which this Paper seeks to occupy is not, so far as I can learn, already covered. We have publications that record Church-work (including Church Reformation work) at home. We have others that tell of Church Missionary work throughout Heathendom; but there is no Paper, so far as I am aware, which undertakes, as its exclusive aim, to present the public, at reasonable intervals, in a cheap and accessible form, a survey of Reformation work in Christendom, conceived in a tolerant and comprehensive spirit, but taken, at the same time, from a distinctly Church standpoint.

The first volume of *The Churches of Yorkshire*, by W. H. HATTON, Esq., is announced for immediate publication by Mr. Elliot Stock.

A new edition of *The English in Ireland*, by Mr. FROUDE, recently published by Messrs. Longman & Co., contains some very interesting additional matter. The first edition of the work appeared in the year 1872. Mr. Froude's present words have no small significance. On the Church of Ireland he writes :—

After all was said, for its worst failings England had been herself to blame; if the Irish clergy had been a legion of angels the distribution of Church patronage would have brought them down to the level of erring mortals. At the time when they were put to the bar for judgment, they had extricated themselves from their shame. For the last fifty years there had been no body of men in the whole Empire who had been doing their duty more loyally and admirably. The peasantry, even the Catholic peasantry, loved and trusted them. They had ceased to be a grievance. There was no cry for their disestablishment. No one had asked for it, no one had wished for it, except, perhaps, the Catholic hierarchy; and the authorities at the Castle can say how far the Catholic hierarchy has shown itself effectively grateful. If Mr. Gladstone had spared his taunts and had left the Church alone, English influence might, perhaps, not have sunk to its present level. Unhappily, other motives were working in the Cabinet. Falsedice had more than once been used in playing with the fortunes of Ireland. The Liberal party needed to be reorganized, and disestablishment was a convenient subject to bring the sections of it into harmony.

In the January and February numbers of *Good Words* (Isbister & Co.) appear some deeply interesting "Reminiscences of the High Church Revival," by Mr. FROUDE. Of Keble, we read:—"The inability to appreciate the form of arguments which he did not like saved him from Rome, but did not save him from Roman doctrine. It would, perhaps, have been better if he had left the Church of England, instead of remaining there to shelter behind his high authority a revolution in its teaching. The Mass has crept back among us, with which we thought we had done for ever, and the honourable name of Protestant, once our proudest distinction, has been made over to the Church of Scotland and the Dissenters." A series of these Papers will appear in *Good Words*.

In the *Antiquary* (Stock) appears "A Walk round Old St. Paul's in 1510" by Dr. W. S. SIMPSON, F.S.A.

The *British Quarterly Review* (Hodder & Stoughton) contains an article on "Congregationalism," by Mr. DALE, and one on the "Lord's Supper" historically considered, by Mr. CAVE—several points in which, had we space, we should be glad to notice. "Some National Aspects of Established Churches," an article with the initials "H. A." appended, has not, to say the least, the characteristics of sweetness and light strongly marked. Why should our Congregationalist brethren be so angry with us because we are not Radicals, and will not forsake the principle of a National Church, advocated by the Puritans and by their leading successors down to recent times?

The Religious Tract Society has published a new edition of *Pilgrim's Progress*, cheap, well printed, tastefully got up. The original side-notes are preserved. There are several illustrations.

THE MONTH.

CONVOCATION of Canterbury opened on the 7th. In discussing a Report on the relations of Church and State which came up from the Lower House in 1879, the Bishop of Peterborough moved a resolution, carried unanimously, requesting his Grace the Primate to move for a Royal Commission to inquire into the laws ecclesiastical and the constitution of the Ecclesiastical Courts. The Bishop of Bath and Wells remarked that although their Lordships asked for an inquiry respecting the Ecclesiastical Courts, they did not, it should be understood, express any dissatisfaction with the decisions of these Courts. The Archbishop expressed himself as exceedingly pleased that the Bishop of Bath and Wells had brought out the fact, which might have been overlooked, that their Lordships had no dissatisfaction with the Court of Appeal:—

It should be borne in mind, moreover, that formerly the Court approved itself even to the very persons who now found fault with it. He was glad that it had been distinctly laid down that their Lordships did not in any way join in the senseless clamour which had been raised against the Court of Appeal. . . . . It would be distinctly laid down by those who moved for the Royal Commission that their Lordships were firmly and devotedly attached to the great principles of the Reformation as embodied in the statutes relating to the supremacy of the Crown and the good government of the National Church. In this age of great anxieties, when some people were wildly calling for changes, it would do an infinity of mischief if it were supposed that the fathers of the Church were swerving from the great constitutional principles upon which the Church rested. In a conference with the Bishops of the Northern Province on the previous day upon this point (twenty-six bishops being here present),[1] agreement had been given to the course which it was now proposed to adopt. The information which the Royal Commission could give would enable them to build up the peace and usefulness of the Church so as to hand it down unimpaired to future generations.[2]

[1] The Bishop of Carlisle, in a Pastoral Letter, says:—"If any measure can be devised and introduced into Parliament by means of which future scandals can be prevented, and discipline enforced without violence to person or liberty, it shall have such support as I can give it. At the same time, I cannot conceal from myself that there must be some method of enforcing discipline, whatever it may be. I confess that I should have thought the old-fashioned method of enforcing discipline, of which we have the scheme in the Ordination Service—obedience to the Ordinary, following with a glad mind and will his godly admonitions, and submitting to his godly judgment—was by far the best method, and the only one likely to bring back permanent peace to the Church."

[2] The Bishop of Lincoln's resolution, amended, finally adopted by their Lordships, runs thus:—

"That this House, having taken into consideration the petitions and

In the Lower House, a Motion, "an expression of conciliation," was brought forward by Canon Gregory. The Dean of Llandaff (Dr. Vaughan) held that the Motion asked that a dispensing power should be given to the bishops, and that that for the time being should be the law of the Church :—

This he considered a most mistaken direction. His own humble opinion of the best remedy was to be found in the following amendment, which he begged to move :—"That this House, by recognizing to the full the right of every clergyman to promote by all constitutional means the adoption of any changes in the law of the Church which he may think expedient, yet desires to record its opinion that it is a primary duty that the ministers of the Church, pending the introduction of such changes, should set an example of ready obedience to the admonitions of their ecclesiastical superiors and the decisions of the existing tribunals."

The Dean of Salisbury seconded the Amendment. The Motion asked bishops to do what lay in their power already, for it had been decided that there was a vast discretion resident in the bishops. Canon Bernard said that the practical effect of any action the House might take on the Motion would be very serious. The effect on the public mind would be an impression that the House had practically adopted the innovations which had been creeping in the Church, and that thereby a fresh step had been taken in the direction of the Roman communion, and a considerable step in the direction of alienation from the surrounding mass of nonconforming Christians. The Dean of Peterborough heartily supported the Amendment. His opinion was that the *gravamen* meant that a clergyman was to decide for himself what law he was to obey. As to the Ritualists and their appeals to conscience he must observe that there was such a thing as a wrongly-trained and perverted conscience. As to the charge of Romanizing there were grounds for it. Archdeacon Kaye supported the Amendment. Ultimately, the *gravamen*[1] of

memorials brought before it by his Grace the President, and also the *articulus cleri* presented to it by the Lower House, is of opinion that litigation in matters of ritual is to be deprecated and deplored, and if possible to be avoided. It also declares that authority to settle differences in such matters is adherent in the Episcopal office, as witnessed by ancient practice, and as referred to in the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer; and while this House entertains the hope that the clergy, as in duty bound, will, in conjunction with the laity, support the legitimate exercise of this authority, it also expresses its confidence that this authority will be exercised by the Bishops of this Province, in their respective dioceses, with an earnest endeavour to compose such differences without litigation, and at the same time to maintain order, decency, purity of doctrine, and edification in divine worship."

[1] "*Reformandum*—The House therefore prays that your Lordships, having regard to the uncertainties which have been widely thought to surround some recent interpretations of ecclesiastical law, as well as the

Canon Gregory which began with the statement that "during the last half-century there has been a great outburst of life in the Church of England," and which seemed, as Sir James Philipps, and several speakers, pointed out, to assert that the zeal was all on the side of the Ritualists, was carried. Dean Vaughan's Amendment was rejected by 65 to 20 votes.[1]

Several letters have been published in *The Times* concerning "Doctrine and Ritual." The Dean of Chester wrote:—"The contention that the expression of doctrine by change of ritual is as allowable in a regularly constituted Church as its expression in the pulpit is so astounding, and it is so obvious that by the method of persevering and progressive changes of ritual a doctrinal revolution in the Church of England might be silently affected, that public attention ought to be directed as carefully as possible to this precise point of the question" recently raised. Dr. Howson quoted two authorities, one on the ecclesiastical, and

---

peculiar character of parishes and congregations placed in the most dissimilar religious circumstances, would discountenance, as far as possible, legal proceedings in these matters. In making this request the House feels that this forbearance must be conditioned by limitations. It prefers, however, to remit the consideration of those limitations to your Lordships assembled in this solemn synod under the guidance of the Holy Spirit."

[1] Archdeacon Allen had moved "the previous question," as he thought it undesirable to adopt any strong expression of opinion in favour of connivance with breaches of the law, or to make a show of dictating to the bishops. Dean Stanley, in seconding the previous question, objected to the assumption that all the energy in the Church was on one side. He always had combated that notion, and always would do so. Long before the appearance of the "Tracts for the Times" the activity, energy, and devotion of members of the Church of England was fully known to all the world, and the assumption was all the more ungenerous as their Evangelical brethren were very little represented in that House. (Hear, hear.) He had said before, and he must now repeat it, that this was merely a question of clergymen's clothes. (Oh, oh.) One of the vestments so clung to as representing doctrine was the chasuble, and, as everybody knew, it was unknown to the Church until the 9th century, and it was first worn as an outdoor garment of the clergy, and of the peasantry, on rainy days. ("Oh, oh," and laughter.) The Dean of Llandaff (Dr. Vaughan) said:—Ample justice has been done to the persons whom, I suppose, it is not disrespectful to call Ritualists. If the term were disrespectful I would not use it; for I know and respect many members of that body. But I wish equal justice had also been done to the minor nonconformities (if such there have been) of a body which is in a great minority in this House—which, in fact, so far as their representation in this place is concerned, I might almost call the extinct Evangelical party. (Cheers and a laugh.) I wish that equal justice had always been done to the greater nonconformities which are avowedly without the pale of the Church of England. That we live in an important crisis I do not dispute. A great wave of lawlessness has been sweeping over Europe. (Cheers.) We have seen it in France. We have seen it in Russia. We have seen it in Ireland. "Etiam in senatum venit; etiam in ecclesiam!"

the other on the legal side of the subject, which taken together leave very little more to be said regarding it. Bishop Wilberforce speaking in Convocation in the year 1868, used the following words:—

I do not hold that the liberty of introducing unusual Rites into the Church stands in the least on the same footing as the liberty of preaching Doctrine. Now, that is an important distinction, and one which the persons concerned seem to me to forget. When a Ritual long established and standing on the *mos pro lege* principle, is altered in a Church, it is not only that the man who does it advances his views as a teacher of the Church, but, taking advantage of his position to make actual manual alterations in the Services, he makes all the congregation of the Church who acquiesce in those alterations parties with him in his particular view. And there must be a distinction between the larger licence given in Preaching and the smaller licence given in any alterations of an existing Ritual.

The other quotation given by the Dean is from the Bennett judgment:—

If the minister be allowed to introduce at his own will variations in the Rites and Ceremonies that seem to him to interpret the doctrine of the Service in a particular direction, the service ceases to be what it was meant to be—common ground upon which all Church-people may meet, though they differ about some doctrines. But the Church of England has wisely left a certain latitude of opinion in matters of belief, and has not insisted on a uniformity of thought, which might reduce her communion to a narrow compass.

Remarks on the memorial for "Toleration" have been published by the Dean of Chichester, in the form of a Letter[1] to the

[1] We quote a few paragraphs from this very valuable letter. The Dean says:—6. "It would have greatly simplified the issue which has been thus raised, if the framers of the present Memorial had been so obliging as to state which precisely are the concessions they expect to obtain at the hands of the Bishops. For they cannot seriously suppose that indiscriminate license is henceforth to become the law of the Church; or that, simply in order to facilitate 'Ritualistic' irregularities, the Sectarian principle of mere Congregationalism is going to be recognized to the prejudice of our ancient Parochial system. It is also to be hoped that the originators of the document under consideration will in due time have the manliness to come forward openly, and explain *why* they are so strenuously bent on obtaining these concessions. There should be throughout this matter the utmost openness and candour on both sides. 7. I will set the Memorialists an example of candour by plainly avowing that the reason why I regard the demands of the (so called) 'Ritualists' with utter disfavour, is because I find it impossible to divest myself of the conviction that what the leaders of the party in reality aim at is the introduction into our Reformed Church of England of something undistinguishable from the Romish MASS. 8. That the plain letter of our Articles and Formularies is irreconcilable with such an attempt, we are well aware. And so are they. But then they also know (and so do we) that a ceremonial closely assimilated to that of Rome; that vestments and

Primate. At the outset the Dean points out that the Memorial is ambiguous:

It asks for a "policy of toleration and forbearance" on the part of our ecclesiastical superiors in dealing with questions of Ritual. But surely such a policy has prevailed for a long time past,—is prevailing to an extraordinary extent *now*. We could all indicate Churches (not a few) in which our reformed Ritual is scarcely any longer recognizable; but where the incumbent pursues his self-willed course undisturbed. In fact the amount of indulgence at this time accorded to those of the clergy who (in the words of the late Bishop Wilberforce) exhibit "a fidgetty anxiety to make everything in their Churches assimilate to foreign usage," provokes general astonishment. It cannot therefore be a large measure of charitable forbearance, or even of indulgent allowance, which is pleaded for by your Memorialists, for that is enjoyed already.[1]

The Counter Memorial forwarded by Bishop Perry to his Grace the Primate, on the 1st, was signed by nine Deans, and by a large number of representative dignitaries, including Professors Swainson and Lumby, Dr. Corrie, and Professor Pritchard.[2]

The *National Church*, an ably edited and interesting periodical, has some sensible observations on the present position of the Tithe Question, a question which in one way or other is surely

---

other 'ornaments;' that postures, gestures, phraseology, music, hymns and accessories of whatever kind, freely adopted from the practice of the same corrupt Communion;—that these will go a long way towards overcoming any obstacles presented by our Book of Common Prayer. Inconvenient expressions in the Communion Office can always be (as they actually are) omitted, or else rendered unintelligible by the celebrant. With the aid of a highly ornate ceremonial, it would in fact be quite easy to evacuate the Reformed Rite of its doctrinal significance; and to make it undistinguishable from the Mass."

[1] No particulars were mentioned, we may remark, in the plea for toleration. The *Guardian*, in a hesitating way, had suggested that the cope might be permitted; but as Dr. Blakeney has pointed out in his valuable work on the Prayer Book, the cope is not a sacerdotal garment.

[2] Referring to the Memorial drawn up by Dean Church, the Memorialists say:—

"We have no desire to narrow the comprehensiveness of the National Church, or to abridge that reasonable liberty which has always been conceded to Churchmen in matters non-essential. We are, however, firmly convinced that neither in Public Prayer, nor in administration of the Sacraments, ought there to be granted any toleration of the use of vestments and symbols avowedly reintroduced as exponents of doctrines which we believe to be unscriptural, and which have been declared to be not in accordance with the plain intention of the Articles and Formularies of the Church of England.

"We therefore respectfully but firmly entreat your Grace to give no countenance to any attempt to procure toleration for ritual practices, which for more than 300 years, and until a very recent date, were almost unknown in the Church of England, and which, when submitted to the highest Courts, have been declared to be contrary to the laws of the Church and realm."

coming to the front. The article in the *National Church* thus concludes:—

The remedy for a state of things which is vexatious to the farmer and not advantageous to the owner of the rent-charge, is a short and simple one, capable of being passed through Parliament even in so busy a session as the present. Let the owners of the tithe rent-charge join hands with the tenant-farmers. Let the irritating and costly system of collecting the rent-charge from the tenants be abolished, as it has been in Ireland (2 & 3 Wm. IV., c. 119, and 3 & 4 Wm. IV., c. 100), as it has been in Scotland (Stats. 1663, c. 17; 1690, c. 23), as it is on many estates in England. Let the rent-charge be demandable from the landowner, or, if in any case it be paid by the tenant, let him be empowered to deduct it in full from his rent. Secondly, let a further sacrifice be conceded by the owners of the rent-charge for the sake of peace and simplicity. Let the system of the septennial averages be abolished, and let the average value in money of the rent-charge since the year 1836 be made a fixed and permanent charge on the land.

The publication of the secret correspondence between the Russian authorities and Shere Ali, found in Cabul, will serve, to some extent, as a vindication of Lord Lytton's invasion of Afghanistan.[1]

The case of Jones *v.* Stannard, argued at considerable length before Vice-Chancellor Hall, shows how a Congregationalist may appeal to Trust Deeds, against Minister and Trustees, with success. The discussion of spiritual matters in secular courts is sometimes unavoidable; and the ultra-Churchmen who are clamouring for disestablishment under the delusion, that, as "Free Churchmen," they must be free from State Control, will read, we hope, the report of the Huddersfield Chapel case. It may here be remarked that at the opening of Convocation the Archbishop referred to the clerical cry for freedom from civil control:—

He could not help calling to mind that at a Church Congress one of their brethren, an African Bishop, at Croydon, rose and thanked God

[1] One passage in a letter from General Stolitieff runs thus: "Now, my kind friend, I inform you that the enemy of your famous religion wants to make peace with you through the Kaisar (Sultan) of Turkey. *Therefore you should look to your brothers who live on the other side of the river.* If God stirs them up, and gives the sword of fight into their hands, then go on in the name of God (Bismilla); otherwise you should be as a serpent; *make peace openly and in secret prepare for war;* and when God reveals his order to you, declare yourself. It will be well when the envoy of your enemy wants to enter the country if you *send an able emissary, possessing the tongue of a serpent and full of deceit,* to the enemy's country, so that he may, with sweet words, perplex the enemy's mind, and induce him to give up the intention of fighting with you. My kind friend, I entrust you to the protection of God. May God be the protector of the Ameer's kingdom, and may trembling fall upon the limbs of your enemies. Amen.'

that he was entirely free from any jurisdiction of the civil power. Now, his Grace's table was laden with papers with reference to this very Bishop. He was denied entrance to his own cathedral; his power of suspending any one from office had been denied; and it appeared that the only remedy that Bishop had was by appeal to the civil power.

Thomas Carlyle has passed away in his 86th year.

A deplorable war has broken out in the Transvaal; and the rebellious Boers at the outset gained considerable advantages.

The proceedings at the opening of Ridley Hall, Cambridge, were most auspicious. The Vice-Chancellor (Dr. Perowne, Master of Corpus) presided, and three of the four Divinity Professors were present.[1] The sermon was preached by the Rev. Sir Emilius Bayley.

Several letters have appeared in the leading journal concerning the "minor nonconformities" of the Evangelical section of the clergy; to an admirable letter from the veteran Dr. Close we hope hereafter to call attention.

On the 2nd, the Speaker, from the very necessity of the case, making a precedent for the House of Commons, closed a sitting which had been vexatiously prolonged for more than forty-one hours. The Home Rulers, growing wild in lawlessness from impunity, had become more and more offensive in their obstruction as well as defiant in their language. Acting, as he afterwards stated, upon his own responsibility and from a sense of duty to the House, the Speaker summarily closed, at nine o'clock on Wednesday morning, a debate which had commenced on Monday afternoon at four. On the following day, at an evening sitting, 36 Home Rulers were suspended.

The Coercion Bill has not yet (19th) passed through Committee. The Obstructionist Irish Members gave indications that they were beginning to recover from the effect of the Speaker's *coup d'état*, and the Government have accordingly suggested regulations still more stringent.

---

[1] The fourth Divinity Professor, Dr. Lumby, was detained, according to a correspondent of the *Record*, but he is known to be friendly to the Hall. The correspondent mentions an interesting fact in regard to religious life in Cambridge. A special service was held in Trinity, for servants. "There was a congregation of at least 400 persons, of whom fully 300 were in the employ of the college in its many departments of work. The Precentor read the service, the Deans the lessons, the Regius Professor of Divinity was present, and the sermon was preached by one of the Fellows. A noble and *profitable* anthem (Wesley's "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord") was beautifully sung by the choir, who gladly volunteered help."

INDEX TO VOL. III.