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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

JUNE, 1881.

ART. I.—THE TRUE CHARACTER OF THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

WE are familiar with two theories of the Christian Ministry. They may be termed the Evangelistic and the Sacerdotal. There are those amongst us who, in spite of misrepresentation and hard names, as if they were not true Churchmen, venture to maintain that the Sacerdotal theory is not that which is held by the Reformed Church of England, who think that she ought not to hold it, and who, believing that she does not, earnestly hope that the determination of her Ministers and members may become stronger and stronger, that, so far as teaching and influence have any power, she shall not.

For the proof of the assertion that the Reformed Church of England ought not to hold the Sacerdotal or Sacrificial theory of the Christian Ministry, we must refer to Holy Scripture. It is the more necessary in this case, because the Reformed Church professes, as in her twentieth Article, that the Christian Church is a witness and keeper of Holy Writ, and ought not to decree anything against the same, or that is contrary to God's Word written; and asserts, in her sixth Article, that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man to be believed as an article of the faith. As to the testimony of Holy Scripture on this point, it may be enough to refer to the authoritative statement of S. Paul concerning the true character of the Christian Ministry. He says to the Corinthians (1 Ep. ix. 13, 14):—

> Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? And they which wait at the altar are partakers of the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel.

Passing by instructive references to other matters not relating to our present subject, such as the authority of the Old Testament Scriptures, which the Apostle endorses, the statement that the ministers about holy things were supported without the necessity of a secular employment, and the Lord's purpose, that the preachers of the Gospel should be similarly supported, it is important to mark the telling significance of the contrast presented in the quoted passage between the Old Testament and New Testament Ministry. During the Old Testament dispensation there was an altar. This was the chief and distinguishing characteristic of the worship there enjoined. Everything else either led to it, or derived its significance from it. But an altar implies sacrifice, the taking away of life, the shedding of the blood which is the life. And sacrifice, again, involves the necessity of a priesthood, who might come between God and the sinner, by whom the essential sacrifice might be offered, and through whom alone the offerer might be accepted. All these, again, the Priest, the Sacrifice, the Altar, in order to be complete, required a corresponding ritual, so contrived that every act, and every dress, and every arrangement might be symbolical and typical.

In pointof fact, this was the case. Very minute particulars concerning everything connected with the Old Testament worship were ordained, and enjoined by God Himself. The holy anointing oil, the incense, the priestly garments, the special vestments of the high priest, the curtains of the sanctuary, the candlesticks, and the many regulations connected with all these, are so described, that no deviation in their composition, or pattern, and no variety in their use, could be allowed. They were shadows of things to come—holy things, because God had appointed them to be used in His worship. They were connected with God's altar; and those who ministered about these holy things might fitly be described, therefore, as priests who waited at the altar. But the time appointed for their use came to an end. The Apostles and Prophets show that they were intended to point to the great High Priest, Christ Jesus; and when He came and finished His work, then these, having all testified of Him, and therefore served their purpose, were put aside. The priesthood being changed, there was, of necessity, a change in the ritual connected with it. As a significant indication of this, at His death the veil was rent in sunder from the top to the bottom. The way to the immediate presence of God in the holiest was now seen to be through the atoning work, and the continued intercession of the one great High Priest. His High Priesthood is unchangeable, intransmissible; it passes not from one to another. No one but Himself can exercise it. There can be no atoning sacrifice for sin but that which He offered

once. "We are sanctified," says the Apostle, "through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once." To attempt the reconstruction now of that which testified of Him, and then required an altar, and a continually recurring sacrifice, would be to build again that which God has taught us He has pulled down, as being no longer necessary;—it would be to attempt to mend the torn veil; and if the attempt could succeed, it would intimate that the way to the Holiest is not yet made manifest;—it would be to interpose between the sinner and God that which God Himself has removed: it would be to keep at a distance those to whom He has given liberty to enter even into the Holiest by the blood of Jesus; it would be to give up that liberty with which Christ has made us free, and suffer ourselves to be entangled again with the yoke of bondage.

Another part of the contrast is seen in the characteristic feature of the New Testament dispensation. They who once ministered in holy things had to do with the *altar;* they who now minister in holy things have to do with the *Gospel.* Once the descriptive term for God's ministers was "*They wait at the altar;*" now the descriptive term for God's ministers is "*They preach the Gospel.*" This is a contrast in which there is untold significance. Then, the Lord's priests sacrificed for His people: now, His people are themselves a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ; and His ministers are helpers of their faith, exhorting and testifying of Christ, and of the true grace of God wherein we stand. Then, the words Priest, Altar, Sacrifice, had a primary and real significance: now, when used, they can only have a secondary meaning, sufficient indeed, to show the reality of the blessings which they indicate, but in no way either interfering with or supplementing the office and work of Him who is our one true Priest, Altar, and Sacrifice. Then, they who ministered in holy things had to show the necessity of a work to be done; the work of reconciliation was committed to God's priests, that they might set it forth by types and symbols: but now, they who minister in holy things have to testify to the work of Christ already done; and consequently the Apostle tells us, that to Christ's ambassadors is committed the *Word* of reconciliation. The *work* is in Christ's hands alone. It could be trusted in no other hands but His. It is honour enough for His ministers to be trusted with "the Word," the testimony concerning their Master and His finished work. They need not seek that priesthood also which, jealous for His honour and dignity, they should attribute exclusively to Him. One might appeal for the proof of the significance of the contrast, and its importance, to the whole of the New Testament Scriptures. If under this dispensation it had been intended that there should be an elaborate ritual corresponding to that

under the Old Testament dispensation, might we not reasonably expect that minute details, and careful directions would have been as characteristic of the one as of the other? But what is it that we find? Very much about Christian doctrine and practice; very little about the ceremonial of Christian worship. Many details about the office and character of bishops, very much about the sanctity that should characterize presbyters, and the piety and purity of deacons, but not a word, simply nothing, about their ministerial vestments. About gown, or surplice, simply nothing. Even the Book of Revelation is no exception. It is a book of symbols, but yet of symbols which it is impossible to copy; a book full of meaning, but prescribing no ritual which we can imitate. Are not these things significant? Do they not show that weightier matters should occupy the thoughts of those whom the Father seeks to worship Him in spirit and in truth? Do they not show that a manly Christianity, while seeking that everything shall be done decently and in order, and to edification, will connect itself with that reasonable service which makes the distinction which God Himself has drawn, between the worship whose chief characteristic was that its ministers *wait at the altar*, and the worship the grand description of which is that its ministers *preach the Gospel?*

We now arrive at an important conclusion. The true position of the ministers of Christ is different to that occupied by the servants of the Lord under the Old Testament dispensation. The Old Testament servants of the Lord who had to do with the daily service of the Sanctuary, were called priests. But S. Paul and Apollos and Cephas were *not* called priests. For "who is Paul, and who Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed?" "Let a man so account of us," not as the priests of God, but "as the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God." Old Testament priests were typical representatives of Christ, the one great Apostle and High Priest of our profession. New Testament ministers are special messengers to the Churches, to bear Christ's testimony. Old Testament priests presented sacrifices without which there could be no remission of sins, and no acceptance. But New Testament servants and stewards present not Christ to God, but Christ to their fellow-sinners. Hence, as has often been noticed, in the New Testament the word for sacrificing priests is never applied to Christian ministers and stewards; there is but one passage into which the Greek term for sacrificing priests enters; that word refers to the spiritual offering of the Gentiles as a living sacrifice. The reason is plain, the necessity of sacrificing priests has ceased, because Christ; by one offering, has perfected for ever. But the necessity for testifying servants and faithful stewards continues. In proportion as they realize the Scriptural description of their office, they will stand

aside out of the sinner's way and point him to the Lamb of God; careful not to allow even their own shadow to fall on the path on which the sinner flies to Him. What then? Are not those right who say that the Reformed Church of England, professing as she does to be guided by Holy Scripture, OUGHT NOT to allow any priestly interposition between the soul and the Lord Jesus Christ?

We may safely and thankfully aver that SHE DOES NOT! Three illustrative particulars may be selected to show this. The clergyman's commission, his actual ministration, and the special Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper.

It may be well to recall the terms of the commission given to her ministers. In the charge of the Bishop to those ordained, the office to which they are called is described. It is spoken of as one of Dignity, Importance, and Weight; but it is explained that it consists in the being messengers, watchmen, and stewards of the Lord; not a word is said of the duties or office of a sacrificing priesthood, but they are to teach and premonish, to feed and provide for the Lord's family; to seek for Christ's sheep that are dispersed abroad, and for His children who are in the midst of this naughty world, that they may be saved through Christ for ever. In all this there is no interposition between the soul and the Saviour.

The office of messenger, and watchman, and steward, is afterwards spoken of as the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God. But the word is used in the sense in which the corresponding term "Presbyter" is employed in the New Testament, and never in any connection which admits of the meaning of a sacrificing priest, but simply of one who has a certain office committed to him in the Church of God.

The words of our Lord, which, in later times, have been repeated, when the office and work of a priest in the Church of God is committed to the ordained, convey no more authority now than they conveyed to the Apostles when first spoken. We have no Scriptural instance of the Apostles receiving confessions and ministering absolution in the sense asserted by some modern teachers, against whose teaching we are bound to protest, and to protest all the more strongly because it may be boldly affirmed that no such opinions were held by the Apostles as are now put forth touching the necessity for Sacramental Confession and Priestly Absolution.

The testimony of Bishop Harold Browne, in a recent Charge, will not here be out of place:—

> If Sacramental Confession [he says] be an ordinance of the Gospel, and necessary for the Christian, as is sometimes asserted, it is most unaccountable that the New Testament is profoundly silent concerning it, that there is no injunction with regard to it, no example

given of its practice, and especially that St. Paul, who lays down exact rules concerning so many ordinances of the Church, and the conducting of its services, never once alludes to it. A certain temperate and intelligent review of Scriptural doctrine and practice will keep us from exaggerated opinions on one side or the other. There are those who pine for constant confession of sins to human ears, and cannot believe that sin will be forgiven if confessed to God alone. There are those, on the other hand, who would erase from our Service books all forms of absolution, all invitations to unburden the troubled soul, and especially those words of Christ pronounced by the Bishop over the heads of all that are ordained to the priesthood. I am convinced that neither of these extreme positions will stand the testimony of Scripture or of truth. Those sacred words of our Lord conveyed no miraculous authority to the Apostles, no power of discerning spirits, and so forgiving sins. The authority they did convey was distinctly ministerial, to admit to Church fellowship by baptism, to exclude by excommunication, to restore by absolution. That authority is as much vested in the successors of the Apostles as it was in the Apostles themselves. Without it there could be no Church discipline, there could be no true Church. But it did not, as conveyed to the Apostles then; it does not, as given to the Bishops and Presbyters now, interfere with the personal responsibility, nor with the personal privilege of every Christian soul. For each one there is access through the great High Priest to the throne of grace, where alone "we may obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need."

It must not be forgotten that our Bishops put a Bible into the hand of those whom they ordain, and bid them take authority to preach the Word of God, and to minister the Holy Sacraments in the congregation. That authority is only such, then, as the Word of God allows; authority to bear the keys in God's household, to bring out of His Treasury things at once new and old, and in their office to discharge those great duties to which God has called them as His messengers, watchmen, and stewards.

In consistency with this, it is important to observe the place assigned to the minister or priest, when he enters on his ministrations in the congregation. The terms minister and ministration, by the way, are continually employed in the Articles of Religion, as contrasted with the priests that were said to offer Christ in the sacrifices of masses for the quick and the dead. The position of the minister in his ministrations is that of a worshipper with the people, a leader, indeed, of their devotions, but in such forms of prayers and praise as cannot be intelligently used, except as the people take their part as truly as the minister takes his part. And by these forms minister and people alike are brought into the immediate presence of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Again and again, He is addressed in prayer and praise as immediately present; and every prayer not directly addressed to Him ends with the

recognition of His gracious name, His merits, His might, His love, His honour, His grace. And all this, be it remembered, when no other name but His is pleaded, no Mediator or Advocate recognized but Himself; no intercession desired as meritorious but His alone; no interposition of blessed Virgin or Saint, real or supposed, or even of officiating priests, but brought at once, as Jesus passes by, to cry out, "O Son of David, have mercy; O Christ, hear us; O Lamb of God, that takest away the sin of the world, grant us Thy peace."

The special character of the order of administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion, will repay attention. The importance of an accurate acquaintance with this particular will be seen when it is remembered that the ministers of our Church have solemnly pledged themselves to minister the Doctrines and the Sacraments of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church and nation hath received the same. In view of this, the remark made in the Preface to our Prayer Book is not without signification :—

> If any man who shall desire a more particular account of the several alterations in any part of the Liturgy, shall take the pains to compare the present Book with the former, we doubt not but the reason of the change may easily appear.

Such a comparison will be found to be instructive and profitable. Two quotations express what will be its sure result. The first is from Archdeacon Wilberforce, who seceded to the Church of Rome. In his work on the Eucharist, he says :—

> The service, consequently, was divested of its sacrificial character, and no longer bore witness, as in early times, to the great event which is transacted at the altar. This was done both by mutilating the prayer of oblation which had been retained in the Book of 1548 (that is the first Prayer Book, sometimes referred to the date of 1549) and by placing it after instead of before the Communion (Chap. xiii. p. 379).

The second is from a pamphlet, said to be by a late Lord Chancellor of Ireland, published without his name, but professing to contain a strictly legal view of the matter in question. After stating in the preface that the laity of the Church of England are entitled to be secured against any ministrations of the clergy that are not in accordance with the Articles and Formularies lawfully interpreted, he thus concludes his notice of the alterations to which reference is made :—

> Every word was weeded out of the service which might be supposed to imply that Christ was otherwise present than in the heart and soul of such as rightly and worthily received with faith the Holy Sacrament.

He confirms this conclusion by referring to that remarkable passage of Hooker, in which he says, "The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not, therefore, to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament" (Book v. c. lxvii. 6).

We unhesitatingly affirm that the testimony now quoted tends to show that the Reformed Church of England DOES NOT hold the Sacerdotal theory of the Christian ministry. And if this be so, can any wonder at the solemn determination of some at least amongst us that, God helping us, and so far as we have any power or influence, SHE SHALL NOT. It might be urged that we have no honest standing-ground, as members and ministers of a Church that is at once Catholic and Reformed, except as we hold fast her Scriptural and Evangelical, and therefore Protestant, principles. But there are some practical reasons of no small weight and influence which it may be well to consider.

First, then, the preservation of Christian liberty requires that we should have decided views as to the true character of the Christian ministry. Rights have been dearly purchased; and they are at stake. They cannot be maintained except by earnest and loving contention for the simplicity of the Gospel. We were delivered at the Reformation from an enormous Sacerdotal usurpation. Embrace the Sacerdotal theory, and there is neither reasonable justification for the Reformation, nor any effectual safeguard against the re-imposition of that yoke which our forefathers were not able to bear. To be forewarned should be to be forearmed. Warning upon warning is found in the Sacred Scriptures that perilous times will come, that some will depart from the faith, that even amongst Christian teachers some will arise speaking perverse things. Fact upon fact has been accumulated in our times showing that such warnings are not to be despised. It ought, therefore, to be neither matter for reproach nor surprise that a jealousy should be felt, similar to that which the Apostle expressed when he said, "I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ."

But the security of Christian privilege and the success of Christian effort are involved in this matter. Who can sufficiently estimate the value of that privilege? Assurance of pardoning mercy, adoption into God's family as fellow-citizens of the saints, peace under a continued sense of reconciliation, boldness and access with confidence by the faith of Christ, a sense of our acceptance and of the acceptance of our unworthy attempts to glorify God, the knowledge that all things work together for our good, the confidence that when we are absent from the body we shall be present with the Lord—all these are

involved in that Gospel which is committed to the Christian minister. Well might our Lord teach us that the least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than the greatest of the Jewish prophets, who had not these privileges, and could not enjoy this consolation.

Then as to the success of Christian effort. Effort there must and will be if there be a true appreciation of Evangelical truth. The simplicity of the Gospel cannot be consistently held, except where in practice there is no slothfulness. The garden of the sluggard, whatever his opinions may be, is the garden of a man void of understanding. We have in these days greater opportunities, and more facilities, for Christian work than perhaps have been granted to any generation since the Apostolic age. Christianity may cast God's seed upon all waters, and quickly find the fields everywhere white unto the harvest. But if we look for success, we must put forth effort in God's appointed way, and in the use of His appointed means. The preaching of the Gospel of Christ has been tried. In Apostolic days it proved to be the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believed, Jew and Greek. Why should we doubt that the Gospel of Christ should possess the same power now? The promise of the Spirit has not been taken from us. The presence of the Saviour is continued with us. When the question then again and again returns, "Shall God's ministers go forth as sacrificing priests, or as faithful Presbyters?" let no one think it strange, if we say that the latter expression describes the ministry of the New Testament. Let no one think it strange that though we refuse not the name of priest according to its original derivation from Presbyter, yet we receive it (Hooker, Book v. ch. lxxviii. 2, 3), "as drawing no more the minds of those who hear it, to any cogitation of sacrifice, than the name of a senator, or alderman causeth them to think of old age, or to imagine that everyone so termed must needs be ancient, because years were respected in the first nomination of both." Let no one think it strange that—remembering with Hooker that "the Holy Ghost throughout the body of the New Testament, making so much mention of Christian ministers, doth not anywhere call them priests,"—we determine to embrace and carry out in practice the Evangelistic, rather than the Sacerdotal theory, of the Christian ministry, assured that whatever may be the discouragements of the present hour they who go forth bearing precious seed, will doubtless come again with joy, bringing their sheaves with them.

WILLIAM CADMAN.

ART. II.—ERASTIANISM.

PART II.

FROM what has been said, it may be seen how the term ERASTIAN, historically connected with the German physician of the sixteenth century, has come to be used with a wide application to all who maintain the principle that "the Church" should not, in a Christian country, have any *coercive* power, independent of "the State," and that the civil authority must ultimately regulate all ecclesiastical jurisdiction. But it should not be forgotten that the controversy associated with the name of Erastus was but a local and specific phase of an older and larger controversy; one, which dates back to the fourth century, and necessarily came into existence directly that Christianity was recognized as the "State" religion of the Roman Empire. When this recognition was made, the whole question of the adjustment between "civil" and "ecclesiastical" authorities arose.

It being admitted that there was some sort of jurisdiction already exercised by Church officers, how was this exercise of discipline or direction of life, which was involved in the authority of these "ecclesiastics," to be combined or harmonized with the legal and magisterial functions of the officers of State? Were the jurisdictions to be kept entirely separate or co-ordinated, or was one of them to be subordinated to the other; and if so, which? Where was the *jus circa sacra* to reside, the *jus in sacris* being conceded to the clergy as holding a distinct and inalienable office?

Two tendencies exhibited themselves in the course of historical development; one, known by the name of *Byzantinism*, which predominated in the East, according to which the "Church" authority was distinctly subordinated to "State" rule; the other, that which culminated in *Papalism*, according to which the "Church" claimed to be superior to all secular or "State" authority. Hence arose in the West all those contentions, *inter imperium et sacerdotium*, which form so large a part of the historical process out of which different National Governments were evolved.

In this conflict and collision of claims there was truth on both sides: for "the Church" had its function to leaven "the State," and to sanctify law and government by high ethical and religious principles, whilst, on the other hand, "the State," with a wider sphere than the ecclesiastical organization of discipline and worship, had soon to face the difficult task of controlling clerical domination without repudiating religious sanctions, or refusing due respect to the "spiritual" independence claimed by "the Church." But the real problem all along has been to

perceive clearly wherein the proper independence of "the Church" consists. Various considerations make this problem a complicated one. The necessary admixture between "temporal" and "spiritual" interests in human affairs; the impossibility of keeping political rule separate from questions of ecclesiastical discipline, when that discipline touches the persons and properties of subjects; the difference which exists between the authoritative assertion of Christian doctrine and the authoritative enforcement of it; the twofold aspect of the clergy, as office-bearers in a Church and subjects in a State; the variability of the Christian element in the State, *qua* State—*i.e.*, as represented in its Government,—are all difficult points to deal with, both theoretically and practically. May we not say that the hierarchical view of the Church in the Middle Ages cast a strange and misleading glamour over the term—which means so much, yet is often so sadly misused—"the Catholic Church"? That view was too external and mechanical a one, and the growth of intelligence and of a profounder spiritual appreciation of Christianity gradually corrected it. And most of us can now at once recognize that the claims of *the* Church,—*i.e.*, of the whole body of Christian believers viewed collectively,—differ considerably from the claims of *a particular* Church, whose history has connected it with any particular national development. The former claims are, in a sense, universal, because they are spiritual, and they can only be regulated by Christ Himself, and by the Divine Law, the application of which is in many important respects entrusted to the ministers of the Word, although it is, ultimately, a matter *in foro conscientiæ* for each professed Christian. But the claims of a particular Church as connected with a particular State are necessarily limited in point of all coercive discipline by the historical circumstances of its position; and while it must distinctly refuse to sacrifice its defined doctrinal basis (without which it would not be a Church at all) to the behests of a political ruler or rulers, it cannot, without forfeiting its peculiar connexion with the State, and any attendant power, prestige, or privileges arising from that connexion, refuse to acknowledge the claims of the State, *qua* Christian, to have jurisdiction over its external regimen. In what way that jurisdiction may be best exercised, and how far the ecclesiastical office-bearers may be also officers of the State, or exercise a jurisdiction *circa sacra*, as well as *in sacris*, subject to an appeal to the sovereign authority of the State, is matter for mutual agreement between those who officially represent the Church and those who officially represent the State.

Such State superintendence is regarded by the stricter Presbyterian theorists, and by some High Churchmen, as undue State interference, and as antagonistic to the liberties and independence of the Church. But provided that a doctrinal standard has

been antecedently fixed and agreed upon by representatives of the Civil Government and of the Church body, and provided that the distinctive clerical functions be guarded from intrusion of unauthorized persons, there is no unjust interference with the independent functions of a Church by the fact that a Christian Government exercises a general control over "Church legislation," and claims the right of appeal from "Church judicatories."

Theories of State control (call them Byzantine, or Anglican, or Erastian, which you please) may be pushed to a mischievous extreme, if the difference between the imposition of doctrine and the exercise of regulative restraint be forgotten. This was the case in the policy of Grotius and Barneveld referred to in a recent Article of the *Church Quarterly Review*,[1] as "hasty and ill-judged Erastian proceedings," which ruined them. "The dangerous and fatal error of attempting to solve religious controversies by lay interference" was committed. "The great error which they made, the grievous mistake of their political career, was the thinking it justifiable to set out a legal creed on [certain] topics, and to enforce it by civil power: for the State to intervene in religious questions *not merely as the ultimate court of appeal, but as the active director* of what was to be taught and believed." The attempt to enforce doctrine by Governmental edicts is, certainly, vain and wrong. *Non est religio cogere religionem:* and the Reviewer rightly reminds us that "so long as man's religious faith is his dearest and most sacred possession, so long will it be dangerous to attempt to constrain, direct, or regulate it by the lay authority, whether that authority be Republic, King, or Parliament." We must not, however, on this account run into the opposite error of supposing that our "religious faith" is best secured by blind submission to *clerical* authority; or in fear of being called Erastians, be led to conclude that by preferring an "Ecclesiastical" to a "Civil" tribunal, we are necessarily securing either Christian truth or Christian liberty.

Grotius, in his treatise *de Imperio Summarum Potestatum circa sacra*, of which Hallam speaks as "written upon the Anglican principles of regal supremacy,"[2] may be said to have formulized the Erastian theory of State control in Ecclesiastical matters, and he advocates a stringent view of the authority of the civil ruler in regulating the affairs of the Church. Erastus had pleaded earnestly for the liberty of the laity from clerical domination, in special view of the practice of excommunication. Grotius insisted strongly upon the supremacy of civil law over all clerical proceedings. The aim of the one was to remove the

[1] *Church Quarterly Review* for January, 1881. Art. IV.
[2] Hallam, "Lit. of Europe," Part III. c. ii.

ecclesiastical yoke from the shoulders of the laity; the aim of the other was to press the political yoke upon the shoulders of the clergy. Both, it must be recollected, assumed that the government was essentially *bonâ fide*, and professedly Christian, and that "the magistrate could alter nothing which is definitely laid down by the Word of God."

Before turning our attention directly to the bearing of the Erastian controversy upon the present condition of affairs in the Church of England, it will be well to state summarily what may be regarded as the main principles upon which Erastians insist. They are these: that there should be a large liberty in the permitted use of the external means of grace; that there should be a control over clerical causes and persons by the supreme civil magistrate; and that the clerical function should be regarded as spiritual and suasive rather than legal and coactive. As a protest against clerical arbitrariness and the abuse of the "power of the Keys" (whether the hierarchical claim be "sacerdotal" or "presbyteral"), these principles are good and wholesome. But they do not traverse the whole field which has to be measured in estimating the due relations between "Church" and "State." They are *critical* principles, not *constitutive* principles; and, although the existence of the Church and the Rule of Scripture are taken for granted in all the arguments of Erastus and Grotius, more modern Erastians have, in accordance with later and laxer views of what a Church is, and of what Scripture requires, put too much out of sight the dogmatic basis on which ministerial authority and the constitution of the Christian Church ultimately rest. Such Erastians in their extreme anti-clericalism err in two respects. They do not sufficiently recognize the value of the counterpoise which is constituted by the existence of the clergy, as an independent "spiritual" order, to the secular tendencies of worldly politics; nor do they estimate at its true worth the stability which is given to religion by the agreement of the clergy to maintain a definite Confession of Faith, such as may keep the fundamental lines of their public teaching in the continuity of traditional Christianity, and form a central standing-ground amid the fluctuations of temporary theological opinions and controversies. Clericalism may lead to a narrowness of view, and an arbitrary exclusiveness which will make the Church too small for the nation. Anticlericalism, unchecked, may lead to an utter vagueness of doctrine, and an indiscriminating inclusiveness which will call the nation a Church, when it has become only a congeries of persons holding every variety of religious sentiment. But if this were to be the case, it would be time for the "State-Church" to cease. Religious men, with deep convictions concerning the fundamental truths of Christianity, cannot be content with an utterly colourless State-creed.

It is, however, to historical facts and not to mere abstract theoretical considerations that we must look if we would duly realize what our present ecclesiastical difficulties mean, and what our duty is as citizens of a country that still makes a public profession of Christianity, and still possesses a National Church.

The problem which a National Church must be always working out is to harmonize Christian law with Christian liberty. And this is a problem, not a theorem. It is a historical development, not a logical process. The introduction into the world of the Christian religion by Jesus Christ produced "the Church"—*i.e.*, a body of believers in Christ whose commission was to be witnesses unto HIM, "both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth,"[1] and to make disciples of "all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost."[2] This "Catholic Church" is—to use the epithets employed by a speaker at the Plymouth Church Congress, in 1876—*supernatural* and *supernational*, if we regard it in its ideal aspect. In this sense, the Church is an *ab extra* organization, independent of the State. On the other hand, when a particular nation, acting by its representatives, the civil ruler or rulers, accepted Christianity as the religion which was to be recognized throughout the region subject to the sway of such ruler or rulers, and when it placed the official teachers of Christianity in a position of authority, a relation was formed in which the right of sovereignty necessarily rested with the national ruler; and *the particular Church*, thus formed, maintaining its independent spiritual basis and spiritual functions, took its place as an integral ingredient of a *Christian* State, and, in proportion as it did its work properly, leavened with good influences, and exalted by high ideals, both the Law and the Life of the nation. But such a particular local Church was not infallible, and could not claim to be "supernatural" or "supernational" with any more justice than the haughty Church-State of Rome could arrogate to itself the Vicarship of Christ. Such a Church has, indeed, a supernatural deposit of truth to guard, and a connexion which, if it be faithful to the truth, is kept up with the "Catholic Church," which is independent of all State organizations whatsoever. Yet, as a particular Church in historical and temporal relations with a particular State, it is human, liable to error, and corruption, and variation, and needing occasional readjustments and reforms, like the State itself.

A rapid retrospect of the principal stages in the development of the Church in England will serve to remind us that the

[1] Acts i. 8. [2] Matt. xxviii. 19.

relations between Church and State have varied with the progress of the national history; that however deplorable incidental mistakes may be which have arisen either from ecclesiastical or civil policy, the essential fact of the connexion between Church and State has been beneficial to the nation at large; and that the *mutual interdependence* of ecclesiastical and civil authorities in a friendly and reasonable adjustment of rights and duties is the object to be aimed at by all patriotic Churchmen who desire to steer between the Scylla of ecclesiastical domination on the one hand, and the Charybdis of an extreme "Erastianism" on the other. If this interdependence cannot be maintained, and this adjustment became impossible, then Disestablishment must come, and its occurrence will be one additional illustration of the adage that a house divided against itself cannot stand.

It can hardly be necessary to state that the union between Church and State in England never resulted from any deliberate and formal compact between civil and ecclesiastical rulers. There is no definite date, or act, whereto we can assign the formulating of a contract or treaty between the Church, as a body of Christians, and the State, as a body of citizens—the former being the advocates of the Christian religion, the latter the promoters of National Government. We see a relation between the moral and religious obligations involved in the idea of the Church, and the legal and social obligations which are involved in the idea of the State, at once and readily acknowledged, as soon as Christianity comes into connexion with those in civil authority. Augustine, when he lands on the shores of Kent, pays due respect to the authority of King Ethelbert. Ethelbert, after his conversion, recognizes the spiritual functions and positions of Augustine. Oswald of Northumberland makes it his "first princely care to provide pastors to instruct his people in Christianity;" and the good Bishop Aidan, whom he fetches from Iona, finds in King Oswald a royal interpreter of his sermons, while as yet he was not perfect in the Northumbrian language. We find throughout the history of the gradual formation of the realm of England in the Anglo-Saxon period the civil and ecclesiastical administration blended in a simple, inartificial manner. The "incorporation" of Church and State is seen to be a natural growth. The moral element of government and of society is specially evoked and guided by ecclesiastical regulations to which civil rulers give the force of law.

At the Norman Conquest an important change took place. The separation between ecclesiastical and civil jurisdictions instituted by William the Conqueror led to momentous results in the national development. For a contrast and a conflict arose between the legal element and the sacerdotal; and this

latter being mainly upheld by Papal power and interference (an interference in some instances wisely and humanely exercised, but more often unwisely obtruded, and for selfish and ambitious purposes), a national spirit of independence was nurtured into strength, and the distinction between National and Papal interests in ecclesiastical matters came more and more clearly to light. During the period between the Conquest and the Reformation the relations between Church and State were rather those of "alliance" than "incorporation." The hierarchy formed a separate caste and order in the land, and their power and their possessions were such as to show the great need of State control, and of confining the ecclesiastical authority within the limits of national rule.

In Henry VIII.'s time the revolt against the authority of the Pope culminated in the emphatic assertion of Royal *versus* Papal supremacy. With emancipation from Papal discipline came an emancipation from mediæval errors and superstition, and, in God's good Providence, a combination of religious, literary, and political influences "re-formed" the National Church, and in the great disruption of external Christendom which took place in the sixteenth century England became a Protestant nation, and her Church a Protestant Church. As in other Protestant States, the Civil Power became stronger, and more defined, and the *Lay* element of national life and progress was brought into prominence.

In the Elizabethan and Stuart period the relations of Church and State were thoroughly tested. The endeavour to enforce uniformity, first on the Episcopalian, and then on the Presbyterian, platform, brought out the fact that free inquiry and diversity of individual conviction in religious subjects were henceforward to be important factors of the nation's social development, and therefore important matters for consideration by rulers in Church and State. The rise and spread of Congregational principles and the multiplication of Separatists manifested the growing power of Individualism. And although, at the Restoration of the Monarchy, the reaction against military rule and dissatisfaction with the vagaries of religious fanaticism produced for a short period a state of things in which penal enactments against Dissenters characterized the national policy, the idea of Toleration had taken root, and could not be suppressed.

By the Act of Toleration in 1689 a new state of things was inaugurated. The modern period of the relations between Church and State began, in which Dissidents from the National Church obtained a legal status; and although the Civil Power still recognized in the Church the authorized national organ of religious teaching and worship, it gave up the idea of demanding

uniformity of religious worship and discipline. It was therefore no longer possible for the Church of England to be regarded as conterminous with the State of England; and yet the Church remained part of the legal constitution of the realm, and was not severed either from the privileges or the obligations of its constitutional connection with Crown and Parliament.

We must not pursue our historical survey into further details. The brief retrospect I have attempted will suffice to impress upon our minds the desirability of maintaining the union between Church and State by a due reverence for fixed religious principles combined with a wise adaptation of external machinery to the exigencies of the age. In the early period of our national progress we see the union of religion and rule effected by a simple blending of ecclesiastical and civil authority. In the pre-Reformation period we see the Ecclesiastical Power predominant, modified by Regal and Legal action. In the post-Reformation period, up to the latter part of the seventeenth century, we see the Civil Power predominant, but modified by the progress and effects of the Puritan movement. In the modern period since the Revolution settlement, we see a gradual working out of the idea of Toleration. Through all the periods, the Church's connexion with the State has been maintained; and the intermingling of the clerical view of social problems with the political view, and the constant correction of each by the other, has resulted in a larger and more comprehensive national policy than could have been possible if that close connexion and interdependence had not existed.

Assuming the fact that the bulk of the nation do not wish for the Disestablishment of the Church of England, or the cessation of its organized work, and the substitution for it of the varied and sporadic operations of different denominational sections of Christians, let us ask wherein lies the stress of what has been termed the present Church crisis?

The difficulty of our present position arises partly from the preponderance of the lay and secular influences in a heterogeneous Parliament, and partly from the clerical extremism of a certain section of Churchmen who exaggerate the difference between the ecclesiastical and political aspects of Law as applied to Church matters. It has been well said that in the mutual dependence of the rulers of the Church and of the State there are two main sources of danger:—

> There is a constant tendency in pastors and theologians to confound their own traditions with the essentials of Christianity. They are thus in danger of hazarding the peace of society, the union of the Church, and the influence of religion, from zeal for points of doubtful expediency, in which no law of Christian duty is really involved. Mere statesmen, on the other hand, are too apt to think that nothing is firm

or stable in Divine truth, that religious creeds have weight and value merely from the number of those who hold them; and that whether doctrines are true or false, and practices right or wrong, the favour publicly shown to them should be determined by statistics and motives of expediency alone.[1]

The same able and earnest writer says in another place:—

A National Church Establishment, in its healthy condition, requires the harmonious union of three separate elements. The rights of conscience, the authority of Church rulers, and the claims of the Kingly office or Civil power have all to be reconciled. The first alone, when the claims of authority are cast aside, can lead only to anarchy and vice, as in the days of Gibeah. The dominion of the State when the Church becomes a mere tool of the Civil Power, and liberty is stifled, answers only to the bondage of Egypt and Babylon. Church authority in its turn, when unrestrained by Royal authority and the rights of conscience, tends to Antichristian tyranny and idolatrous corruptions of the faith. The balance of these three powers, in our imperfect world, is the best security against the abuses to which they are separately exposed.[2]

Of these three powers, the harmonious operation of which is essential to the well-being of a National Church, ecclesiastical authority was emphasized in Mediæval times, State authority was emphasized at the Reformation period, and the claims of Individual liberty are emphasized in the modern period of our national development. Our Church must take account of all three, if it would live and be healthy. And what is it which may form the centripetal force to bind together, in a comprehensive orbit of duty and of continued usefulness, Individual liberty, rightful Church authority, and righteous State law? Generally speaking, we might answer, a sincere attachment to the Holy Scriptures as a revelation of Divine Truth, and a rule of faith and practice. But speaking more particularly, with reference to "the Protestant Reformed religion established by law" in our country, which the Sovereign, at coronation, solemnly swears to maintain—*i.e.*, our National Church—we say that such a restraining and combining force is to be found in loyal adherence to the doctrinal position of our Church as defined in the Articles of Religion, honestly and reasonably interpreted, and finding concurrent expression in the Liturgy.

These lay down a position which is both Catholic and Protestant in their dogmatic utterances, and are at once definite, comprehensive, and practical in the range of their regulative statements. The substantial adhesion to a standard of Christian doctrine and duty which, while it does not profess to be a com-

[1] Birks' "Church and State," pp. 368, 369. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 386.

plete creed, but the confession of faith of a particular Church, rests upon Scripture and the Catholic Faith, and repudiates mediæval errors, will save us from the danger of utter vagueness which I have spoken of above as characterizing modern Erastians, and which is a feature of our anti-dogmatic age.[1]

Such loyal adhesion would also save us from those tendencies to desert and even to revile Reformation principles which have unhappily prevailed in a certain section of the Church. One great *raison d'être* of the National Church in England would be taken away were it to cease to protest against the errors condemned in the Thirty-nine Articles, as superstitious accretions which overlaid and corrupted the simplicity of the primitive Christian faith.

The questions which are now considerably agitating the Church (though we may rejoice that much practical work is being done by clergy of all parties, independently of the "vexed questions" of which we speak) are indirectly connected with doctrine, but directly with Church discipline, and ritual, and procedure. The principal ones may be briefly noted as (1) *the liberties of the clergy*, sometimes termed "the liberties of the Church;" (2) ecclesiastical *jurisdiction;* (3) ecclesiastical *legislation*, or the claims of Convocation, and how far this assembly can be, and should be, reformed or enlarged.

There are some Churchmen who, without being Ritualists, plead for toleration of divergence of ritual in consequence of "the uncertainties which have been widely thought to surround some recent interpretations of ecclesiastical law," and in consideration of "the peculiar character of parishes and congregations placed in the most dissimilar religious circumstances;" and practically ask the Bishops to exercise "a dispensing power," instead of administering the law. A demurrer to this plea was made in the Dean of Llandaff's sensible resolution, moved, but unfortunately rejected, in the Lower House of Convocation in the Southern Province. He wished the House, "while recognizing to the full the right to promote by all constitutional means the adoption of any changes in the law of the Church which he may think expedient," "to record its opinion that it is

[1] It will not be sufficient to speak of "a common ground and common purpose which all communions faithfully admit" ("Principles of National Church Reform Union"), and to leave out any definition of "the common ground" on which persons propose to co-operate, and of the Church constitution which they purpose to recognize. Such vagueness finds its source in the desire to conciliate, but unless there be some definite dogmatic basis laid down and recognized as the limitations within which the Church body is to shape its authoritative teaching, the results of a policy of *mere* comprehension might be to attenuate truth rather than strengthen it, and dissipate rather than make a practical concentration of religious forces.

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." Evangelicals who oppose the prayer for such "toleration" do not deny that there may lawfully be considerable divergence of ceremonial and differences in the Church ritual at different localities, but they oppose what is the professed object of certain vestments and symbols which is avowedly "exponent of doctrines not in accord with the plain intention of the Articles and Formularies of the Church of England." This question is one of clerical independence. Is the clergyman to disobey the law laid down, and plead conscience as contravening any admonition or penalty that may be inflicted on him? There surely can be no doubt that the "liberties of the laity" must be supported as against autocratic setting aside of legal decisions by the clergy, and that the law of the Church, which is also the law of this realm, should limit this clerical claim.

But, we are told, the ecclesiastical courts are not ecclesiastical enough, and that somehow there is an encroachment of "the State" upon "the Church" in the appointment of Judges, andmethods of procedure. The Erastian would say, "Have no ecclesiastical courts at all." According to the Anglican system, however, there is a retention of ecclesiastical administration of the law, subject to an appeal to the Sovereign. The Royal Commission on Church Courts will probably help us to see through some of the complications which at present beset the subject of the Church judicature in its technical aspect.

The most important question, and that to which minds of all Churchmen anxious for the interests of the Church of England as an organized Church body have been much directed in recent years, is that of Church Legislation. Convocation is confessedly an inadequate representation of the clergy; and although some good work has been done in it since its "revival," it does not command much influence in its present limited form. Yet it is doubtful whether any reform of the Convocation could be effected (as the Bishop of St. David's says in a Charge, quoted in THE CHURCHMAN of March), which would "make it more influential than it is, or 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." The Bishop believes that if such a reconstruction could be effected, "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."

On such questions as these, and on the whole situation indi-

cated by them, the Erastian controversy, as we have traced it, has a significant bearing. That controversy, as we have seen, was really a controversy between *clerical* claims and *lay* claims in a Christian community. It was itself a phase of the larger controversy which has been working itself out in Church History since the time of Constantine the Great, as to the relations which should exist between ecclesiastical and civil authorities in a Christian State.

In the historical Church of England, what we have termed Erastian principles have their place, as *limiting* principles, connected with, and supplemented by, more positive ideas of the constitutional authority of Church Rulers as distinguished from, though not independent of, the Civil Power. And so we have impressed on our minds the importance of the *mutual interdependence* of clerical and lay power of which we have spoken. A triple lesson may be connected with our thoughts on the whole subject.

A lesson of *moderation.* By this I mean, not that Churchmen, clergy, or laity, should give up their own convictions, but that they should give fair consideration to the opinions and convictions of others. Not that there should be made the attempt to *equalize* all opinions, or stifle free discussion by the futile cry of "No Party!" but that there should be earnest endeavour to avoid bitterness of party spirit, and to take an *equitable* view of controverted points—treating the two Memorials, *e.g.*, in an earnest but self-controlled manner, not as party weapons, but as materials for consideration and judgment, so as to arrive at an honest conclusion.

A lesson of *large-mindedness.* We need to take broad views of what is for the interest of the Church at large, and not to fret ourselves as to petty technicalities and points of procedure and form, if substantial justice and equity can be done to all parties concerned.

A lesson as to the need of being *practical* in Church politics. We should be ready to sacrifice symmetry of theoretical adjustment to what is practically the best adjustment. Not losing sight of any high ideal that may guide or animate us, we should yet always remember that in earthly affairs, whether of Church or of State, friction must be allowed for, and that the clever *doctrinaire* is not necessarily a good statesman.

Let us hope that the Church of England, passing through this "crisis," as she has through many others aforetime, will emerge —not weakened by too much bickering concerning minute points of legal rights and claims—to treat wisely and effectively with that other larger crisis, of which Dr. Vaughan spoke, "in which Infidelity is the foe, and Christianity the defendant."

WM. SAUMAREZ SMITH.

ART. III.—THOMAS CARLYLE.

AN Article on "The Reminiscences of Thomas Carlyle," appeared in the April number of THE CHURCHMAN. Many interesting extracts were given from the volumes edited by Mr. Froude, but the paper was not, nor was it intended to be, exhaustive. It was struck off while the iron was hot, and the public mind was occupied with the illustrious deceased. There is room for another Paper on the man and his opinions; a man of original thought, singular genius, of true eloquence, gifted with a poetic imagination, and dowered with great strength of will. He was one who took a large and vigorous grasp of every subject that he touched. "The Reminiscences" are full of pathos—indeed, in some parts, of tragic pathos—and they have the power to touch while they enchain the reader. But they are also, in many of their aspects, very painful, and leave an impression of the author far from pleasant or satisfactory. They have not unnaturally cooled that first ardour of laudatory appreciation which was so general when the tidings that "the sage of Chelsea" was no more, reached the public ear. There was on the news of his death an almost unanimous chorus of praise from the secular press, mingled with lamentations for his loss, and no terms were thought too eulogistic for the homage that was due to the illustrious dead. But now the fervour has abated, and with the strains of eulogy are mingled other and far different notes. It is thought, and said, that "the Reminiscences" have given a death-blow to his heroic reputation. The great image which was supposed to be wholly of iron is found to have been mixed with clay. His weakness is almost as great as his strength. Already more than one indignant protest has appeared from the friends and relatives of those of whom he has written unkindly and ungenerously in this the last work that proceeded from his pen. Many of his remarks on his friends and contemporaries are with truth affirmed to be "often petty," "always painful," in many cases entirely unfounded and mistaken; and Mr. Froude is blamed for giving the book in its present form to the general eye. Carlyle intended these "Reminiscences" for publication, but he left to his executor a discretion in the matter. But whether meant for publicity or not, many of the sketches in the book are very painful, and they reveal what is far from being either heroic or great in the character of one to whom so much homage and reverence has been paid. It is therefore naturally a subject of regret with his numerous admirers, that the Editor should have shown so little delicacy and taste as to print those harsh

judgments of his friend, which are calculated to wound and distress the living. Had he expunged such passages, there is no doubt we should have had a higher opinion of Carlyle; but that would be simply because we should have known less about the man—because we should have been kept in ignorance how far a vanity wounded because he thought himself insufficiently appreciated, could lead him to speak slightingly and contemptuously of those whom he called his friends. We might, it is true, have had a better opinion of Carlyle, but the man himself would have been the same; more highly esteemed simply because less truly known. Here, no doubt, "ignorance" would have been "bliss." But, after all, it is well to know what manner of man this was, of so fine a genius, of such unremitting energy, whose literary skill was so forcible and picturesque, and who waged a life-long battle against shams and hypocrisies of every kind. And it is from his own hand, a hand, like Ishmael's, lifted up against every man, with but few exceptions, that we have a picture of himself. From his "Reminiscences" we learn that he counted himself wiser than the wise, and that from the sublime heights of self-appreciation he looked down with contempt on many whom the world had considered to be his equals, in some instances his superiors. No wonder that the book has aroused some indignant protests against—shall we call them the slanders?—sown broadcast through its pages. The friends of Mrs. Irving and her family, the Martins of Kirkcaldy, have come forward to complain of the misrepresentations regarding the wife of Edward Irving and her nearest relatives. Mrs. Proctor, in a pamphlet printed for private circulation, has spoken out for her own family, and has said in her preface that "he should beware how he strikes with a dead hand." All this comes like a shock to all who regarded Carlyle as a man of great heart and generous mind; and the shock is greater in the case of those who had placed him on a pedestal above his fellows, and regarded him in the light of a prophet and a seer. And the thought cannot but intrude itself that whatever may have been the indiscretion on Mr. Froude's part in giving these "Reminiscences" to the world, the sketches were the deliberate work of Carlyle, a work undertaken, as he says, to relieve an overwhelming sorrow, and which might surely have had a softening effect on his mind, and have removed any inclination to be harsh or ungenerous, as he recalled, in his solitary chamber, the friends and acquaintances of his early days.[1]

[1] Since the above was written, I observe the following remarks in the *Quarterly Review*. "If these things were not intended for publication, why were they deliberately, and even artistically, noted down and dressed up? Why are they so thickly interspersed in pages professedly

Mrs. Oliphant, in her Article on Carlyle in *Macmillan*, puts in, as an apology for the tone of remarks "offensive to so many personally, and painful above measure to all who loved and reverenced Carlyle," the circumstances under which, the Reminiscences, excepting the sketch of his father, were written:—

He had lost the beloved companion whom, as we all do, yet perhaps with more remorse and a little more reason than most, he for the first time fully perceived himself never to have done full justice to. He had been left desolate, with every circumstance of misery added which it is possible to imagine; for she had died while he was absent, while he was in the midst of one of the few triumphs of his life, surrounded by uncongenial noise of applause, which he had schooled himself to take pleasure in, and which he liked, too, though he hated it.

Again, Mrs. Oliphant says of him after his return from Mentone, where his friends had taken him for "a thorough change:"—

At first alone in his desolate house, and then stranded there upon that alien shore where everything was so soft and unlike him in his gaunt and self-devouring misery, he seized upon the familiar pen, the instrument of his power which he had laid aside after the prolonged effort of "Frederick" with more or less idea that it was done with, and rest to be his henceforth, and poured forth his troubled agony of soul, his restless quickened life, the heart which had no longer a natural outlet close at hand.

"Let any one," she continues, "who is offended by these 'Reminiscences' think of this:"—

He never looked at the disturbed and unhappy record of this passion again; "did not know to what I was alluding," when his friend and literary executor spoke to him two years later of the Irving sketch. Miserable in body and mind; his nerves all twisted the wrong way; his heart-rent storm, full of sorrow, irritation, remorseful feeling, and all the impatient longings of grief, no doubt the sharpness of those discordant notes, the strokes dealt blindly all about him, were a kind of bitter relief to the restless misery of his soul.

Let us make every allowance for the sharp words of one thus "wild with grief, distraught, and full of sombre excitement:" let us allow that there is nothing in them of deliberate malice; that all that is unkind in the book "should have been buried with sacred pity, or burned with sacred fire, and the rest read

---

devoted to friendship, filial piety, and conjugal love? They equally indicate the disposition and manner of judging whether they were meant for publication or not, and our knowledge of the real character of the man would be incomplete if they had been suppressed."—*The Quarterly Review*, April, 1881.

with reverence and tears;" yet it is not in these "Reminiscences" alone, that Carlyle has shown the sharpness of an irritable temper or dealt reckless strokes at others, "blindly all about him." Most of his illustrious contemporaries have come under the merciless lash of his sarcastic wit.[1] Long before he was "struck to the heart by the one blow which life had in reserve for him, the only blow which could strike him to the heart," he had shown how a mind with a morbid tendency to irritation could "shoot out its arrows—even bitter words."

In the little book by Mr. Nicoll, which is one of the many biographies called forth by the philosopher's death, the compiler gives the following as a specimen of his conversation :—

> And what men we have to meet the crisis! Sir Walter Scott, a toothless retailer of old wives' fables; Brougham, an eternal grinder of commonplace and pretentious noise, like a man playing on a hurdy-gurdy; Coleridge, talking in a maudlin sleep an infinite deal of nothing; Wordsworth, stooping to extract a spiritual catsup from mushrooms which were little better than toadstools; John Wilson, taken to presiding at Noctes, and painting haggises in flood; the bishops and clergy of all denominations combined to keep men in a state of pupilage, that *they* may be kept in port-wine and roast-beef; politicians full of cant, insincerity and falsehood; Peel, a plausible fox; John Wilson Croker, an unhanged hound; Lord John Russell, a turnspit of good pedigree; Lord Melbourne, a monkey;—"these be thy gods, O Israel!" Others occupied in undertakings as absurd as to seek to suck the moon out of the sky; this windbag yelping for liberty to the negro, and that other for the improvement of prisons; all sham and imposture together, a giant lie, which may soon go down in hell-fire.

Such criticisms may be in part due to the sharpness of his dyspetic constitution and irritable temper, but surely one who comes forth as the great Teacher of his age should set a more dignified example, more humble, more self-controlled; he should let others see that besides being able to "speak with the tongues of men and of angels," and to "understand all mysteries and all knowledge," he has also that "*grace* of charity" which is greater than any *gift*, and which "suffereth long and is kind; which envieth not, vaunteth not itself, and is not puffed up." It is precisely because we see the Teacher so conscious of his own greatness, and so keenly alive to the failings of others, that we cannot but feel he was lacking in that great principle which alone can tone and subdue into harmony all the jarring discords of the natural heart. Sorrow is no excuse for harsh and unkind judgments of

[1] The several sketches in the Book were written at different times—"James Carlyle" was written in 1832; "Edward Irving" in 1866; "Lord Jeffrey" in 1867; "Jane Welsh Carlyle" in 1866.

others. Alas, for the tears, when behind their moisture burn the fires of anger and irritation! Alas, for the tears that do not fall like showers upon the tender grass with refreshing and healing power!

These volumes are full of unjust strictures and unkindly sneers on the greatest of his contemporaries. Thus, "Charles Lamb and his sister are a very sorry pair of phenomena; insuperable proclivity to gin in poor old Lamb." "Shelley to me always was, and is, a kind of ghastly object; colourless, pallid, without health or warmth or vigour; the sound of him shrieking, frosty, as if a ghost were trying to sing to us." "Shelley I likened to one of those huge sandstone-grinding cylinders which I had seen at Manchester, turning with inconceivable velocity (in the condemned room of the iron factory, where the men die of lung disease at forty, but are permitted to smoke in their damp cellar, and think that a rich recompence!)—screaming harshly, and shooting out each of them its sheets of fire (yellow, starlight, &c., according as it is brass or other kind of metal that you grind and polish there)—beautiful sheets of fire, pouring out each as if from the paper cap of its low-stooping-backed grinder, when you look from rear-ward." Much more about Southey of the same import, though he looked upon him, too, with some kindness and pity.

Of Wordsworth he says, amongst other things, "a man recognisably of strong intellectual power, strong character; given to meditation and much contemplation of the meditative world and its noisy nothingness; had a fine limpid style of writing and delineating in his small way; a fine limpid vein of melody, too, in him (as of an honest rustic fiddle, good, and well-handled, but wanting two or more of the strings, and not capable of much!) In fact, a rather dull, hard-tempered, unproductive, and almost wearisome kind of man; nor adorable by any means as a great poetic genius, much less as the Trismegistus of such; whom only a select few could ever read, instead of mis-reading, which was the opinion his worshippers confidently entertained by him!" Even Carlyle's love for Edward Irving does not restrain him from sharp words. "He affected the Miltonic, or old English Puritan style, and strove visibly to imitate it more and more till almost the end of his career, when indeed it had become his own, and was the language he used in utmost heat of business for impressing his meaning. At this time, and for years afterwards, there was something of preconceived intention visible in it; in fact, of real affectation, as there could not well help being." Carlyle's coarse allusions to Mrs. Irving and her family have been referred to already. He has kindly words for some of his friends; but they are few—Mrs. Basil Montague, and Charles Buller, and Irving; and he gives us portraits of his father and

mother, painted with a reverent and affectionate appreciation of their mental and moral qualities, while the sketch of his wife is full of a profound and touching pathos which reaches the well-spring of tears.

The "Reminiscences" are distinguished by the same graphic force which gives such charm to his other works, and the style is as vivid and picturesque. It is this power of word-painting, of placing the very scene which he is describing and the actors before us, with the broad contrasts of light and shade, that renders his style so attractive. This is the secret of his charm. He struck out a new style for himself, forcible, vivid; but by no means faultless, and full of affectations. May we not best attempt to describe it by a passage taken from his own "Miscellanies," and intended for a description of Mirabeau? "He had the indisputablest ideas: but then his style! In very truth, it is the strangest of styles, though one of the richest; a style full of originality, picturesqueness, sunny vigour, but all cased and slated over, three-fold, in metaphor and trope: distracted with tortuosities, dislocations, starting out into crotchets, cramp-turns, quaintnesses, and hidden satire which the French head had no ear for—strong meat, too tough for babes!"[1]

But with all his blemishes, his ruggedness, his frequent obscurity, and his inveterate mannerisms, there is not to be found in our literature such word-power, such vivid pictures of men and things, such scenes of passion and of pathos, of bloodshed and tears, as are painted in what many think his masterpiece, "The History of the French Revolution." And though the History cannot, in any real sense of that word, be called a history, yet, it contains a series of scenes and pictures and sketches which are unique in their effect, their interest, and their power. With a touch like that of a magician's wand, he calls from the dead the various personages of that terrible era, and they live before our eyes. Marat appears at his bidding, and we see the "squalidest bleared mortal, redolent of soot and horse-drugs," his evil soul looking through his "bleared, dull, acrid, woe-stricken face." Danton rises from the dead, "through whose black brows and rude flattened face there looks a waste energy as of Hercules not yet furibund." There comes next upon the scene Robespierre, "anxious, slight, ineffectual-looking, under thirty, in spectacles, his eyes (were the glasses off) troubled, careful, with upturned face, snuffing dimly the uncertain future time, complexion of a multiplex atrabiliar colour, the final shade of which may be the pale sea-green." We have the whole scene before us as this man proclaims to his "Jacobin House of Lords" his woes, his

[1] "Critical and Miscellaneous Essays." By Thomas Carlyle. In Five Volumes. Second Edition. London: Chapman and Hall. 1842.

uncommon virtues, his incorruptibilities, and his readiness to die at a moment's warning; and as on this, David, the painter, cries, "Robespierre, I will drink the hemlock with thee!" and we have then the supreme moment when Robespierre appeals to the "President of Assassins" in vain, when "his frothing lips are grown blue, his tongue dry, cleaving to the roof of his mouth," and the mutineers cry, "The blood of Danton chokes him?"

Let us take but one other picture from this gallery of portraits. This shall be Mirabeau. Mirabeau, with thick, black hair, "through whose shaggy beetle-brows, and rough-hewn, seamed, carbuncled face, there look natural ugliness, small-pox, incontinence, bankruptcy, and burning fire of genius, like comet-fire glaring fuliginous through murkiest confusions, is the type Frenchman of this epoch."

It would be easy to give numberless instances of the same graphic force in hitting off the characteristics of the people whom he knew, as when he describes John Stuart Mill's conversation as "rather wintry and saw-dustish, but always well-informed and sincere." De Quincey is

> A pretty little creature, full of wire-drawn ingenuities, beautiful enthusiasms, bankrupt pride, with the finest silver low-toned low voice and most elaborate gently-winding courtesies and ingenuities in conversation. "What wouldn't one give to have him in a box, and take him out to talk!" This was her criticism of him, and it was right good—a bright, ready, and melodious talker, but in the end inconclusive and long-winded.—One of the smallest man-figures I ever saw; shaped like a pair of tongs, and hardly above five feet in all. When he sate, you would have taken him by candle-light for the beautifullest little child—blue-eyed, sparkling face. Had there not been a something, too, which said "*Eccovi*," this child has been in hell. After leaving Edinburgh I never saw him, hardly ever heard of him. His fate, owing to opium, &c., was hard, evil, and sore: poor, fine-strung, weak creature, launched so into the literary career of ambition, and mother of dead dogs.

Lady Holland he represents as "a kind of hungry ornamented witch, looking at me with merely carnivorous views;" views, no doubt, as to what she was to make of her "Lion" now she had caught him in her social toils. In a few bold and characteristic words he describes a speech of the Duke of Wellington as "a speech of the most haggly, hawky, pinched, and meagre kind, so far as utterance and eloquence went, but potent for conviction beyond any other."

It is not, however, the vividness and picturesqueness of his style alone that have made his writings so attractive to many, and have placed him amongst the most popular authors of the day. Style alone, were it even more pure and polished than his, and free from the faults of extravagance and exaggeration, would

not have given him the acceptance he has enjoyed, or drawn to him the homage of the most thoughtful and active intellects of the lower and middle classes. Many have allowed him to shape their views of life and society because he has waged war to the death against all shams and hypocrisies, and has proclaimed with unceasing energy the absolute necessity of truth, sincerity, and earnestness to every kind of greatness; and has shown a ready sympathy with the true and the right. He craves for energy and intenseness. He lays his axe at the root of all mere formulas and forms. In this he has done good service in an age of shams and seemings, when the deceptions and artificialities which enter into every department of life pass also into our religion, and sap the very foundation of all that is good. In his persistent proclamation of the beauty and glory of earnestness and truth, Carlyle has spoken both justly and profoundly; but, as it has been well said by Archdeacon Hare, in a note to his "Mission of the Comforter," "When it is asserted that these qualities are all in all—that truth, subjective truth, truth of character, sincerity, earnestness—are not merely essential elements in that which is good and great, but do of themselves and by themselves constitute goodness and greatness, it is plain that the power of evil in man and in the world, the lawless tendencies of the will, and the necessity of law to organize the tumultuous stirrings and heavings in man's breast in a consistent orderly whole, must be left out of view; and then an admirer of mere energy will readily fall into that abysmal error, that Might is Right."

To quote another passage from the remarks of the same writer on Carlyle's "Lectures on Heroes." "Though in these Lectures," says Archdeacon Hare, "the truth often wrestles with its opposite, it is not brought out with distinctness how the informing idea alone can render the fermenting energies in man truly heroic, and how the latter are without form and void until that idea vivifies and hallows them; in a word, how the truly heroic idea is that of Duty, animated by Love, and kindling into self-sacrifice; and how Law is the clearest, and for man, in almost all cases, the safest exponent and form of Duty; so that the true hero should realize Milton's grand description of a king: 'disciplined in the precepts and the practice of temperance and sobriety, without the strong drink of injurious and excessive desires, he should grow up to a noble strength and perfection, with those his illustrious and sunny locks, the laws, waving and curling about his godlike shoulders.'"

Carlyle's ideas of heroes and hero-worship are the offspring of that pantheistic spirit which has so pervaded our literature, and which makes power and intellect a sort of inspiration, even though divorced from purity, sobriety, and religion. His

heroes are men of genius, of strength of will, and energy of mind. In such qualities as these he sees the "godlike," the "divine." Moral character is left out of sight, and so he chooses for worship such men amongst others as Mahomet, Richter, Goethe, Burns! "These be thy gods, O Israel!" He has also an immoderate admiration of Mirabeau and others whose principles and lives Christianity condemns, and who are utterly wanting in the graces which are emphatically commended by Christ. The men whom he calls upon us to admire are distinguished by qualities which have no place amongst the beatitudes, and are altogether outside of that kingdom of heaven whose citizens are the pure in heart, the poor in spirit, the merciful, and the meek, the mourners, and those who hunger and thirst after righteousness. He idolizes strength, courage, power, all of which are pagan virtues, and passes over with contempt those passive and more gentle graces which are exalted in the pages of the New Testament. And in spite of much that is wise, and noble, and true in his writings, much to fire the imagination, reach the conscience, and touch the heart—it is sentiments like these which create a doubt whether he is to be regarded as a believer in Christianity at all. If his creed, so far as it may be gathered from his several writings, be not pantheistic, it has certainly a close analogy to that system. And so far as it is so, his works, however fascinating and powerful they may be, however high-toned in sentiment, generous in their advocacy of the oppressed, and bold in their assertion of many neglected truths, are calculated to inflict a grave injury on religion, and to be hurtful to the young, indeed to all who are unable to disengage what is sound and valuable from the errors and exaggerations which are so abundant.[1]

Even his own friends say, "What his beliefs were, no one can definitely pronounce; they were more perhaps than he thought." It is to be hoped so—one of the most painful things in the "Reminiscences" is that, although the greater part of

[1] Since the above was in type the Writer has seen the following remarks conceived in the same spirit, in the April number of the *Quarterly Review*:—"That his admirers should still think it right to raise busts or statues in his honour is their affair; but they are assuming a grave responsibility. They are canonizing genius simply because it is genius, without regard to its application or direction, careless of its good or evil effects upon mankind. They are sanctioning a false philosophy. They are setting up a false standard of excellence. They are winging and pointing anew arrows aimed at the reputation of their most distinguished contemporaries. They are doing their best to diffuse and perpetuate a baneful influence; to give increased authority and circulation to works composed for the most part in open defiance of good sense, good feeling, or good taste; works whose all pervading tone, spirit, and tendency are radically wrong."

them was written in his latter days, there is nothing in them of a true Christian hope. The chapter about his wife, a most remarkable woman according to the testimony of all who knew her, is, as has been said already, full of a pathos that lies very near to tears. His allusions to her are most touching, and are fraught with feelings near akin to remorse that he had never discovered her true worth till she was no more. Passages like the following occur again and again. "Oh, what of pain, pain, my poor Jeannie had to bear in this thorny pilgrimage of life! the unwitnessed heroine, or witnessed only by me, who never till now see it wholly." Speaking of his lectures in Willis's Rooms, after saying, "Detestable mixture of prophecy and play—actorism, as I sorrowfully defined it—nothing could well be hatefuller to me," he adds:—

But I was obliged; and she, oh, she was my angel, and unwearied helper and comforter in all that; how we drove together, we poor two, to our place of execution; she with a little drop of brandy to give me at the very last, and shone round me like a bright aureola, when all else was black and chaos! God reward thee, dear one! now when I cannot even own my debt. Oh, why do we delay so much till death render it impossible? And don't I continue it still with others? Fools, fools! We forget that it has to end; so this has ended, and it is such an astonishment to me, so sternly undeniable, yet, as it were, incredible.

Again he sorrowfully says:—

Oh, my dear one, sad is my soul for the loss of thee, and will to the end be, as I compute. Lonelier existence there is not henceforth in this world—neither person, work, or thing going on in it that is of any value in comparison, or even at all. Death I feel almost daily in express fact, death is the one haven; and have occasionally a kind of kingship, sorrowful but sublime, almost godlike, in the feeling that it is nigh. Sometimes the image of her, gone in her car of victory (in that beautiful death), and as if nodding to me with a smile—"I am gone, loved one! Work a little longer, if thou still carest; if not, follow. There is no baseness, and no misery here. Courage! courage! to the last. That, sometimes, as in this moment, is inexpressibly beautiful to me, and comes nearer to bringing tears than it once did.

Once more:—

As to talent epistolary, and other, these letters, I perceive, equal, and surpass whatever of best I know to exist in that kind; for talent, genius, or whatever we may call it. What an evidence, if my little woman needed that, to me! Not all the Sands and Eliots, and babbling *cohue* of celebrated scribbling women that have strutted over the world in any time, could, it seems to me, if all boiled down and distilled to essence, make one such woman.

Then there are cries, wrung from the very depths of his wounded spirit, which are profoundly affecting. "Oh, my dearest, my dearest, that cannot now know how dear." "Ah me! ah me!" "Ay de mi!" "Blind and deaf that we are! oh, think if thou yet love anybody living, wait not till death sweep down the paltry little dust-clouds and idle dissonances of the moment, and all be at last so mournfully clear and beautiful, when it is too late."

But one more sob of this sorrowful, regretful heart, which will find an echo in many another sorrowful and regretful heart, that only realizes all that it has lost when the dear one has passed away beyond recall, and can never more be told of our infinite love; when remorse is idle, and tears are vain. "Ah me, she never knew fully, nor could I show her in my heavy-laden miserable life how much I had at all times regarded, loved and admired her. No telling of her now. Five minutes more of your dear company in this world. Oh, that I had you yet for but five minutes to tell you all!"

These cries must go to every heart. But what is painful in the book is the absence of any expression of that faith which would be like a healing branch in these waters of bitterness turning their saltness into sweetest streams. Though it would appear that he never quite shook off the early training of his pious father and mother, yet is there too much reason to fear that he cast aside his belief in dogmatic Christianity. For our own part we would gladly exchange all his vague phrases about the "Eternities," and the "Silences," and "The Immensities," "The Everlasting Yea," and "The Everlasting Nay," "Nature and Eternal Fact," for one clear statement of that Christian hope which lightens the gloom of sorrow, and irradiates the darkness of the grave.

CHARLES D. BELL.

ART. IV.—"HOW I CROSSED AFRICA."

How I Crossed Africa: from the Atlantic to the Indian Ocean through Unknown Countries. Discovery of the great Zambesi Affluents, &c. By Major SERPA PINTO. Translated from the Author's Manuscript, by Alfred Elwes. Two vols. Maps and Illustrations. Sampson Low & Co. 1881.

A WELL-WRITTEN book of African travels is always welcome. There is a sort of fascination about the interior of Africa; and a careful description of a journey through regions of which but little is known, and about which there is really some-

thing to say, is sure to command readers. The work of Major Serpa Pinto, as an explorer and as a describer, merits hearty praise. His progress, it is true, was not marked by discoveries of great importance. Geographically, his enterprise does not rank with Speke's, or Stanley's, or Cameron's; the general features of our map of Africa are left unchanged. Nevertheless, Major Pinto's description of certain countries is trustworthy, and his narrative is full of interest; his astronomical observations are valuable; he has laid down rivers, and marked out boundaries. Inferior to Livingstone's works, this Portuguese narrative, "How I Crossed Africa," from West to East, has its own attractions. In his preface, Major Pinto refers to the aid and advice he obtained from Henry Moreland Stanley. He met Mr. Stanley, that "great explorer, the intrepid traveller who had just terminated the most stupendous journey of modern times," in the year 1877, on the Western Coast. The Major also refers to another "eminent explorer," his friend Captain Cameron. Grateful acknowledgment is made of kindness from French, Belgian, and English, Geographical and Scientific Societies. Thanks to Foreign Sovereigns are tendered, especially to "the illustrious and learned" King Leopold, while the work is dedicated to the author's own Sovereign, the King of Portugal. "Your Majesty," he writes, "gave me the opportunity of connecting the obscure name of a Portuguese soldier with one of the happiest and most auspicious attempts essayed in modern times by Portugal."

Major Serpa Pinto had some experience of Africa twelve years ago. In 1869, he served with a column which came into conflict with the natives in regions of the Lower Zambesi; and he made a hasty journey through the Portuguese possessions of Eastern Africa. On his return to Portugal the study of African questions became, he says, his exclusive pastime; and his desire to be sent out to explore the interior of Africa grew upon him. In 1875 he drew up a plan for the survey of the Portuguese colonies, and submitted it to the Government, but for the time in vain. In May, 1877, while military commandant in the Algarve, a telegram summoned him to Lisbon; and after conference with the Ministers, he undertook to start for Africa on the 5th of July. He had to fit out the expedition in Paris and London, and he had only a month to do it in. To make the necessary purchases, about £1760 was placed to his credit by the Portuguese Ministry.[1] He returned to Lisbon in good

[1] Thirty contos of reis (£6600) had been voted by Parliament for surveying the hydrographic relations between the Congo and Zambesi basins, and the countries comprised between the Portuguese colonies, on

time, and on the 6th of August he arrived at Loanda, the place where he met Mr. Stanley. After a little delay he left Loanda for Benguella.

Benguella, a picturesque town, has a doubtful reputation, as regards salubrity and morality, among the Portuguese possessions of Africa. The greatest of the criminals of the mother country are sent to Benguella; and the "white" portion of the colonial forces are convicts. "One robbery in Benguella," says our author, "was planned by a sergeant and carried out by soldiers." The blacks of which the colonial army is composed, he says, are bad soldiers; but the whites are worse than the negroes.

At Benguella, Major Pinto determined to proceed directly to the Bihé; and on the 12th of November he began his journey. Before leaving he went down to the beach, and feasted his eyes on the expanse of the Atlantic. Two years elapsed before he saw the Western waters again. In the month of March, having first proceeded in a S.E. direction, and then N.E., he arrived at Bihé. This country, small in extent, but for Africa thickly peopled, is a great emporium of the slave trade. The relations between the Bihenos and the Portuguese are friendly; over the tribes between Benguella and Bihé the King of Portugal has a sort of sovereignty, or suzerainty; and in the centre of the country Portuguese traders have a recognized position. The traffic in slaves Major Pinto denounces as "infamous," and insists that the Portuguese Government is not responsible for the conduct of escaped convicts, and runaway black or white rascals. It may be hoped that his statements and suggestions will have weight in the Ministerial circles of Lisbon.

Among the Bihenos the women alone cultivate the soil, which is rich and productive. The men roam about; they journey into the interior after wax, ivory, and slaves; they are capital carriers, but a race "more persistently cruel, more profoundly vicious, and more openly depraved," Major Pinto does not know. Considering the class of Portuguese with whom these natives have had to do, it is not surprising that "contact with the whites has produced no change for the better among them. They have no idea of any religious faith, they adore neither sun nor moon, they set up no idols; but live on, quite satisfied with their sorceries and divinations." A sort of notion as to the immortality of the soul, or at all events, an existence of the soul after death for a season, seems to prevail among them. They are much given to drunkenness; the aguardente has found s way thither, and where that fails they manufacture a sort of

---

both coasts of South Africa. Subsequent instructions laid stress on a survey of the river Congo, &c. The Major was at liberty to spend three years on his expedition.

beer from Indian corn. No salt is to be found. There are two rainy periods. The climate is such, our author believes, that Europeans could reside there with the utmost comfort. Throughout the territory between the Bihé and Benguella, the tsee-tsee fly—that scourge of so many parts of South Africa, which, by destroying the horse and ox, deprives man of two of his best auxiliaries for practical life—is entirely unknown. The Transvaal has great mineral wealth, which is wanting in the Bihé country, but the Transvaal is no more fertile than the Bihé, and it is isolated from the rest of Africa by arid deserts and the tsee-tsee.

At the beginning of June Major Pinto again set his face eastward. He had waited for the goods which were left behind in November; and when at length his powder came from Benguella, the supply of carriers failed. Sixty-one of their loads had to be destroyed, and the greatest difficulties of the traveller were now to be encountered. He was resolved to make direct for the Upper Zambesi. The passage of his caravan over the River Cuanza, took a couple of hours; his mackintosh boat, bought in London, did him here and elsewhere, the greatest service; canoes were lent by a neighbouring chief.

In the course of this journey he passed through the territories of the Quimbandes, the Luchazes, and the Ambuellas: these three races speak the same language, the Ganguella. He thinks that of all the South African races, the Ambuellas are the most likely to be influenced for good by European traders, and by Missionaries. Of the women of the Quimbandes, he remarks that their headdresses were the most extraordinary he ever beheld:—

> Some arrange the hair in such a way that, after it is embellished with cowries, it looks for all the world like a European woman's bonnet. Others friz it out, and twist and turn it, till it wears the aspect of a Roman helmet. Cowries seem to be profusely lavished in the adornment of the female head, and white or red coral is also visible, but not to the extent observable among the people to the west of the Cuanza. The hair on their stupendous headdresses is fixed with a most nauseous red cosmetic, formed of a resinous substance reduced to powder, and castor oil.

The temperature, now and then, in these elevated regions varies greatly. On one occasion, says the traveller, the thermometer registered at 3.30 A.M. 0° F., and at six o'clock in the morning was only two degrees above zero. Sometimes his carriers could get no rest except in the neighbourhood of their fires.[1]

[1] It was the habit of our traveller, we read, to wake at three o'clock; he rose and replenished the fire, and examined the thermometer. From three till five he smoked. At five he removed his clothes (as he always slept dressed and armed) and took a bath (mackintosh india rubber).

The inequality between the maximum and minimum for European constitutions is most trying; the thermometer sometimes rises from freezing-point in the night to 80° F. in the day. On the great central plateau the cold in the winter seems to be somewhat bitter.

Some curious particulars are given concerning ants. The forest ants use in the construction of their dwellings whatever materials come first to hand; and, notwithstanding the cement employed in the fabric, the mounds have not such tenacity and durability as those raised by the ants in open ground. The latter employ the stiffened clay, and their habitations are nearly as hard as stone. On one occasion, when cutting down the wood for an encampment, the Major's blacks took flight in every direction. Millions of that terrible ant the *quissonde* were issuing from the earth; and the only safety was to be found in flight. The natives told him that this dreadful insect will even attack and kill an elephant by swarming into his trunk and ears. The length of the quissonde is about the eighth of an inch; its mandibles are very strong, and in proportion, of great size. It is the only ant which will attack man. A smaller insect, the black ant, is the fierce enemy of the termites. In some dwellings of the termites, curiously enough, Pinto found *giant* ants, and these were five eighths of an inch long.[1]

On June 30th, Major Pinto arrived at a rivulet whose waters ran towards the River Cuito; until then he had met only with streams which ran towards the Atlantic.

In the country of the Luchazes, iron is found and worked. The natives cultivate canary-seed (*massango*), beans, castor, and cotton. They collect wax about the forest, which they barter for dried fish from the Cuanza. They hunt antelopes for the sake of their skins. They import flints and manufacture steel. Almost all the Luchaze men are furnished with a beard beneath the chin, and a small moustache: both men and women have their four front incisors fashioned like a triangle, so that, the teeth being closed, there appears a lozenge-shaped aperture in the middle. They drink a fermented liquor composed of water, honey, and powdered hops

On July 10th, our traveller arrived at the sheet of water, rather a marsh than a lake, in which the Cuando, the largest affluent of the Zambesi, takes its rise. He terms the Cuando a "magni-

[1] One curious creature was discovered by the Major, a species of antelope, termed by the natives the "Quichobo," which lives chiefly in the water. Owing to the formation of its feet, the Quichobo cannot move quickly on land; it comes out to graze at night-time. It appears to be the superior of the hippopotamus in diving powers; even when it is asleep, it only approaches the surface sufficiently to show the upper portion of its spiral horns above water, the head and body remaining below.

ficent stream."[1] On the 24th of August, he arrived at Lialui, on the Upper Zambesi, close to the 15th parallel South. The city of Lialui is the new capital,[2] founded by Lobossi, of the great kingdom of South tropical Africa, known by the three names—Barôze, Lui, and Ungenge. Of the traveller's public interview with this King, we have the following description:—

I was advised at daybreak that King Lobossi was prepared to receive me. I at once undid my traps, and put on the only complete suit of clothes I possessed; repairing subsequently to the great Square, in which the audience was to be held. I found the King seated in a high-backed chair, in the middle of the open place, and behind him stood a negro, shading him with a parasol. He was a young man about twenty, of lofty stature, and proportionately stout. He wore a cashmere mantle over a coloured shirt, and in lieu of a cravat had a numerous collection of amulets hanging on his chest. His drawers were of coloured cashmere, displaying Scotch thread stockings, perfectly white, and he had on a pair of low well-polished shoes. A large counterpane of several colours, in lieu of capote, and a soft grey hat, adorned with two large and beautiful ostrich-feathers, completed the costume of this great potentate. On his right, on a lower chair, was seated Gambella (Prime Minister), and the three Councillors were on the opposite side. About a thousand persons were squatted on the ground in a semi-circle, displaying their hierarchy by the distance at which they were placed from the Sovereign.

After compliments, Pinto explained to the King that he was not a trader, but an ambassador from the King of Portugal (in South African, the *Mueneputo*[3]). Lobossi replied in friendly terms, and a private audience was promised. The King and courtiers drank copious draughts of *quimbombo*, but none was offered to the guest, it having been signified that he drank only water. Afterwards, thirty oxen were sent as a present, and the King's favourite slave hinted that the animals should all at once be slaughtered. Accordingly, some of the best pieces of beef were sent to the Royal kitchen, others to the Prime Minister and

[1] On his journey he came in contact with the Mucassequeres, "the true savages of South tropical Africa." These strange aborigines never cultivate the soil; they live on roots, honey, and animals caught in the chase. The arrow is their only weapon; their only shelter is a forest tree. A type of the Hottentot race, of a dirty yellow complexion, with flat nose, hair crisp and tufted.

[2] The people of the Lui are greatly degraded by intoxication and immorality; they smoke *bangue* to a most injurious extent. In few countries of Africa is polygamy more profligate: the Prime Minister of Lobossi had seventy wives. The Luinas are great rearers of cattle; they work in iron, and all their arms and tools are produced at home. They possess many slaves. This country was seen by Livingstone, twenty years before, under the empire of the Macololos.

[3] *Muene*, King, and *Puto*, the name given to Portugal.

the chief people of the Court. The hides were sent to the Councillors. Major Pinto's carriers had a good time of it that evening. One of the grandees, "a hale old man, whose sympathetic and expressive face greatly interested" the traveller, was Machauana, the former companion of Livingstone, in his journey from the Zambesi to Loanda, and of whom he wrote in high terms of praise. Machauana afterwards called upon Pinto, and they had a long talk together concerning Livingstone. Illness followed; severe fever being accompanied by depression of spirits. An attack of home-sickness crushed the traveller; the King was greedy, and his messengers impertinent; the people were agitated by rumours of war. Seeing that things were taking an ugly turn, the Biheno carriers declared they would go no further; they returned home in a body. It was proposed by the Prime Minister, Gambella, that the white man should be assassinated; but Machauana in the Council stoutly resisted this proposal, and with success. An attempt was made, however, that night, at the instigation of Gambella; and an assegai grazed the Major's arm. He shot at, and wounded the negro who had been sent to kill him, and hurried to the King's house, where he received promises of protection. The next night, however, the little encampment was attacked; the huts were burnt; and, although breech-loaders kept off the screaming savages for a time, but for a panic produced amongst the negroes at close quarters by nitroglycerine, Pinto and his followers would have been killed to a man. As it was, several were wounded. When the fighting had ceased, Machauana appeared with a large force; and it seems probable the King had prevented this friend of the white man from starting earlier. Fearing further treachery,[1] and also failing to get any food, Pinto made a journey of fifteen miles, and encamped at the base of the mountains. Here they got some fish, which they boiled and ate without salt. But treachery was still at work; one night, having gone to sleep early that he might be called to

[1] Major Pinto had on one occasion liberated a gang of slaves. He seems, in fact, to have defied the slave traders; he terms them "expatriated wretches" whose conduct brings dishonour on the Portuguese name. These men, in revenge, dogged his steps and prejudiced the negroes against him. Many of his misfortunes are traceable to the spiteful slanders and insinuations of the slave traders or their agents. The "Portuguese" slave traders, whether white or coloured, are bitterly opposed to any attempts to set up a legitimate trade. Major Pinto's idea of founding a "colony" in the Bihé valley under the control of the Portuguese Government, seems hardly practicable at present; the difficulties, at all events, would be great. It is much to the credit of the gallant traveller that in regard to the slave trade he speaks out so boldly. Cameron's statements are by him strongly supported; and it may be hoped that the authorities in Lisbon will, in African territories under their control, cease to pursue a policy of masterly inactivity concerning an infamous traffic.

observe a reappearance of the first satellite of Jupiter, the sentry fell asleep. Pinto was woke up with a cry, "Sir, we are betrayed; all our people have fled, and have stolen everything!" The rogues had carried off his goods, and above all his powder and cartridges. His own arms, with his papers, instruments, &c. had been in his own hut; these he had; but one of the stolen loads contained his cartridges. This was, indeed, a heavy blow; no wonder he felt as though he were "lost," left as he was in the centre of Africa, without resources, having at the most only thirty bullets.

It is well told how he suffered. He was brooding, he writes, "with heart and brain alike torn by bitter feelings," when, looking at his rifle, an idea occurred to him. He opened the box containing a sextant, he noticed the leaden weights of his fishing net, and with his rifle, "the King's rifle," in his hand, he felt no longer *lost*:—

> The arm which I now fondled so tenderly as one would fondle a beloved child, the arm which was to work out my destiny, and with it the expedition across the broad continent of Africa, was the KING'S RIFLE. Within its case were stored the implements for casting bullets, and all things needful to charge the cartridges, when once the metal envelopes were obtained, each of which, by its system of construction, would serve again and again. A small box, also within the precious case when the King presented to me his valuable gift, contained 500 percussion caps. The thoughts which had trooped so tumultuously through my mind brought to my recollection two tin boxes of powder, which I had used since leaving Benguella, in default of something better, to jam tightly into its place in the trunk the box containing Casella's sextant. Lead only was wanting, and that was now supplied me by my net. I had, therefore, the means within my power to dispose of some hundreds of shots, and with such a supply I could support life in a country where game was to be found.

On the 23rd September, with spirits and strength revived, he set out. Lobossi let him have three canoes and a guide; and his voyage, on the whole, was prosperous. He had heard of a white man, a Missionary; and on the 19th of October, crossing the broad Cuando, the sources of which he had discovered and determined months before, he met with two white men, Dr. Bradshaw, a zoological explorer, and his companion, Walsh. Here he had a breakfast, composed mainly of partridges, and—greatest of luxuries—some bread! The next day he met with the Missionary, François Coillard, and from this time his most pressing difficulties were of a less dangerous type.

After a month's rest, he set out for the cataracts, a trip which he enjoyed greatly. At Daca, he joined the Coillard family, and on December 1 they set out for a long journey southward,

across an unknown desert. After thirty days they arrived at Shoshong, the great capital of the Manguato.

Concerning Missionaries, he writes with candour. As a "good Catholic" he has his own views of Missions, and he expresses them here and there without reserve. Mr. Stanley has argued that the Missionaries should attack Africa through its great potentates; but Major Pinto advocates the establishment of Mission settlements among the smaller and least warlike tribes. A powerful chief, he says, may become a Christian, and his people "follow suit," so far, at least, as to "outwardly observe the law of Christ;" the civilization which their Christianity represents, however, is of the earth earthy; and when the Sovereign dies, the subjects all relapse. But this is not always the case. In certain tribes Christianity has obtained so firm a hold that the commands of a pagan chief are resisted.

Of the Coillard family Major Pinto writes in the warmest terms, and to the good work done by French Protestant Missionaries he bears ungrudging testimony. François Coillard, he writes, "is the best and kindest man I ever came across: to a superior intelligence he unites an indomitable will." The only fault, in fact, of M. Coillard is this: he is slow to see the bad qualities of the natives.

Of the work done among the subjects of King Khama our traveller writes warmly, but he fears the civilization of the Manguato is superficial, and may not be lasting. Three English Missionaries he mentions as deserving especial honour—the Rev. Mr. Price, the Rev. Mr. Mackenzie, and the Rev. Mr. Eburn; they are "noble examples" for all Christian workers in the Dark Continent.

On the 12th of February, 1879, he entered Pretoria, the Capital of the Transvaal. An independent account of the Boers is just now full of interest. Defending the Boers, Pinto says:—

> The impression abroad concerning them was that they were white savages, possessing all the evil instincts of the savage, with the cunning supplied by semi-civilization, eager for rapine, burning and devastating the villages of the natives (poor martyrs of their brutality and rapacity), and who, strong against the weak, are sneaking curs in the presence of the strong.

As an unprejudiced observer, who had received many favours from Englishmen, our author gives his own view of the Annexation of the Transvaal, and of the moral character of the descendants of the Dutch settlers. He says that the sin of discrediting Boers lies upon Missionaries.[1] He gives no particulars in sup-

[1] On "*bad* Missionaries." Major Pinto writes:—These missionaries, with little knowledge and narrow intellect, commence by instilling into the natives, hour by hour, from the sacred pulpit, whence should only be

port of this charge, and so far as we can see, the charge is based upon the statement that the Boers had "succeeded *in pacificating by force* [! !], the warlike tribes which disputed their possession of the country." Certain Missionaries, he says, came in and preached rebellion. "It is easy to preach revolt;" and thus—in spite of themselves, as it were—the just, and honest, and moral Boers were led to ill-treat the aborigines!

Oddly enough, in another portion of the work, we read a very different estimate of the Boers. Major Pinto says:—

> European by origin, they have in less than a century of time lost all the civilization they brought with them from Europe, have become conquered by the savage element amid which they have been living, and now, though Europeans in colour and professing the faith of Christ, are the veriest barbarians in customs and behaviour.

On March 19, after a journey of twenty-three miles in a dog-cart, he once more saw a railway train and heard a whistle. After a few hours he reached Durban, but he was too late, for that very day the packet had left for Europe! On April, 9, another vessel left Durban, and on June 9, he found himself once more on Portuguese soil. It was November 12, 1877, that he left Benguella; his journey across Africa, therefore, had been accomplished within seventeen months.

Art. V.—THE CHURCH OF IRELAND: SYNOD 1881.

ON Tuesday the 3rd of May, the General Synod concluded its shortest and most harmonious Session. A languid and formal proposal for additional revision was made by a few laymen, rather as a declaration of their views than with any hope of success.

---

heard the accents of truth, that they are the equals of the white man, that they are on a level with the civilized, when they ought rather to say to them, in the tones of persuasion and authority, "Between you and the European there is a wide gulf which I have come to teach you to bridge over. Regenerate yourselves; quit your habits of brutish sloth; labour and pray; abandon crime and practise the virtue which I will show you; cast off your ignorance and learn; and then but not till then, can you stand on the same level as the white; then and then only will you be his equal." This is the language used by the good Missionaries; this is the truth which the bad ones never dream of inculcating. To tell the ignorant savage that he is the equal of the civilized man is a falsehood; it is a crime. It is to be wanting in all those duties which were imposed upon the teacher when he set out for Africa. It is to be a traitor to his sacred mission.

Some interesting Committees were appointed: one to report next year what version or versions of Scripture may lawfully be read in Churches; one to review and supplement existing legislation; and a very strong one to report upon the work done by the Church, through various societies, for foreign Missions.

A statute was passed, providing that, at the next avoidance, the See of Armagh should be divided from that of Clogher. When it is understood that their areas include watering-places on the eastern and on the western coast, Drogheda, within twenty-five miles of Dublin, and Bundoran within forty-five miles of Derry, and towns with a Church population half as large as that of the Diocese of Meath, the reason for this change will be understood. It is a good sign of Church spirit, that, besides some thousands of pounds which are promised, more than twenty thousand pounds are actually in hand for the endowment of the new See. For the twelve sees already in existence, there is already secured, and steadily accumulating, a sum of £397,438.

The report of the Representative Body showed the amount of capital[1] in its possession on the first of January, as follows:—

1. Balance of Commutation, with which to defray life-annuities of £191,010 per annum . . .	£2,655,625
2. Paid by the State as compensation for the seizure of private endowments	500,000
3. Composition money, being that part of capitalized annuity which is relinquished by clergymen who seek release from service.	1,482,782
4. Voluntary contributions by friends of the Church .	2,295,622
5. Interest on items 2, 3, 4	98,498
	£7,032,527

The first of these figures would gradually disappear if the average present age of the annuitants were forty-five years. As they are much older, the success of the great financial operation of commutation is assured; and not one penny has been lost by bad investments. The second sum is chiefly absorbed by the fortunate districts which could establish claims; and the remaining items represent the hoard of the Church for payment of its future clergy, widows and orphans, pensions in old age, &c. The nucleus of special funds for such purposes has been set apart; and a report, to be presented next year, will be the beginning of a systematic distribution of our unallocated capital, which is not large.

In spite of the impoverishment of landlords, and the mis-

[1] This total sum has again, within the last month, been described as a gift from the State to the Church of Ireland!

fortunes and convulsions of the island, it was found that none of the distressed dioceses have yet been forced to cut down any stipends. But this was largely due to the liberal and unsolicited help of the diocese of Down and Connor, and to some extent of Dublin also; and it is painfully evident that a much greater effort will soon be called for.

It must be repeated that the disturbing and incalculable element in Irish Ecclesiastical arrangements is that progressive social change, threatening the impoverishment or expatriation of many of the best and most loyal Irishmen, which English politicians have decreed for us.

G. A. CHADWICK.

ART. VI.—COMPREHENSION.

SECOND NOTICE.

I REJOICE to find that the views which I ventured to express in a former notice[1] on the principles of "Comprehension" —that is to say, the corporate reunion of Orthodox Nonconforming communities with the National Church—have elicited some interest in this delicate and far-reaching subject.

I thought it advisable, while freely expressing my own views, to call the reader's attention, for the purpose of clearing up the *possibilities* of "Comprehension," to the aspect in which it was viewed by the Sovereigns and Parliaments of England in past ages; and also to the aspects in which it is viewed by the three great schools of thought within the Church at the present day.

I am now urged, by not unfriendly critics, to apply my mind to the consideration of the *difficulties* of the subject; while, on the other hand, I am counselled by friendly advisers to insist emphatically upon the *duty* of reunion.

I shall endeavour, very briefly and very imperfectly, but with a due regard, I trust, to the claims of truth, to deal with the first of these two questions. I may, if an opportunity offers, deal at a future time with the question of the *duty* of reunion.

The difficulties, it is important to note, are not of Churchmen's raising. They are raised by Nonconformists. Churchmen stand with open arms, so to speak, ready to welcome back the Orthodox Dissenters to the ancient fold from which they, or their ancestors, have wandered; and to treat them, on a footing of

[1] In THE CHURCHMAN of February last.

perfect equality, as dear brethren in Christ; but the Orthodox Dissenters recoil in alarm, afraid that the reunion will involve them in a loss of principle.

Some Conferences which were held under the auspices of the Home Reunion Society, at Salisbury, in January and February, 1878, were chiefly valuable as eliciting from a local Congregational Minister, the Rev. W. Clarkson (B.A. London), a very clear and temperate statement of those points of difference between Churchmen and Orthodox Nonconformists, which must, in the view of a highly intelligent Nonconformist minister, until satisfactorily arranged, be regarded as forming an insuperable barrier in the way of Corporate Reunion.

Three of the five points of difference mentioned by Mr. Clarkson relate to passages in the Prayer Book. The other two relate to Ritualism and the Union of Church and State.

I. Mr. Clarkson says:—

> With the views we hold of the way of salvation in Jesus Christ we could not possibly be members of a Church which teaches every child, as the first thing it learns, that in baptism it was "made a member of Christ, a[1] child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven."

Mr. Clarkson's objection is not a new one. It was one of the "exceptions" against the Book of Common Prayer, submitted by the Nonconformist Divines to the Savoy Conference:—

> We conceive, they said, it might be more safely expressed thus:—"Wherein I was visibly admitted into the number of the members of Christ, the children of God, and the heirs (rather than inheritors) of the Kingdom of Heaven."

The answer of the Bishops to this "exception" was as follows:—

> We conceive this expression as safe as that which they desire, and more fully expressing the efficacy of the Sacrament, according to St. Paul, the 26 & 27 Gal. iii., where St. Paul proves them all to be children of God, because they were baptized, and in their baptism had put on Christ; "if children, then heirs," or, which is all one, inheritors. (Rom. viii. 17.)

It would be useless to strike out the words, "a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven," in the Catechism, unless the whole Baptismal Service were remodelled. There is no doubt that tender consciences would be reassured by a remodelling of the Baptismal Service; but it is important to consider carefully the recent action of a sister Church—an intensely Protestant Church.

---

[1] An error for "the."

The Church of Ireland has, after full discussion, declined to remodel the Baptismal Service. In the new Preface prefixed to the Irish Revised Prayer Book, are these words:—

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

The Church of Ireland thus makes the Articles of Religion the standard by which the language of the Baptismal Service and of the Catechism is to be judged.

Let us see what answer to Mr. Clarkson's objection may be drawn from the Articles of Religion.

Much turns on the meaning of the word "regeneration" (or "new birth unto righteousness," as it is termed in the Catechism). Regeneration is constantly used by the fathers of the Primitive Church, and by the English Reformers, as a synonym for baptism. But the very Article of the Church of England which uses them synonymously,[1] namely, the IXth. declares that "Original Sin,"—that "infection of our nature" which "deserveth God's wrath and damnation,"—"doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated, whereby the lust of the flesh is not subject to the law of God."

The words of the Baptismal Service, "Seeing, now dearly beloved brethren, that this child is regenerate," must be read in connection with, *e.g.*, Article XXV., "In such only as *worthily* receive the Sacraments they have a wholesome effect and operation:" Article XXVII., "They that receive baptism *rightly*, are grafted into the Church," &c. Repentance and Faith are, in short, essential to a worthy reception of the Sacraments. And this is the express declaration of the Catechism itself. As for Holy Scripture, St. John the Baptist[2] calls baptism "the baptism of *repentance* for (literally, towards) the remission of sins"; and when the Ethiopian eunuch[3] exclaimed, "See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?" Philip said, "If thou *believest* with all thy heart, thou mayest." Let us turn to the language of the highest Appellate Tribunal of the Church.

---

[1] "Renati" is the Latin version of both "regenerate" and "baptized" in this Article.

[2] St. Luke iii. 3. [3] Acts viii. 36, 37.

Sir Herbert Jenner Fust, in deciding against Mr. Gorham, said:—"In the case of infants there is no *obex* in the way." The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in their judgment on appeal from the Arches Court,[1] said:—

> Although the respondent is made to state that in his baptism he "was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven," it is still declared that "repentance and faith" are required of persons to be baptized; and when the question is asked, "Why, then, are infants baptised, when, by reason of their tender age, they cannot perform them?" the answer is not that infants are baptized, because, by their innocence, they cannot be unworthy recipients, or cannot present any hindrance to the grace of regeneration, and are, therefore, fit subjects for Divine grace, but "because they promise them both by their sureties; which promise, when they come to age, themselves are bound to perform." The answer has direct reference to *the condition* on which the benefit is to depend. And the whole Catechism requires a charitable construction, such as must be given to the expression, "God, the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me and all *the elect* people of God."

Such great divines as Archbishop Usher, Archbishop Whitgift, Bishop Pearson, and Bishop Jeremy Taylor, held (as shown by the Judicial Committee in their judgment) that "the inward and spiritual grace" did not necessarily accompany the outward visible sign. Bishop Prideaux says:—"Baptism only pledges an external sacramental regeneration, while the Church *in charity* pronounces that the Holy Spirit renders an inward regeneration." Even the judicious Hooker, a decided High Churchman, says:—"The Church speaks of infants, as *the rule of charity* alloweth both to speak and to think." Bishop Pearson says, "When the means are used, without something appearing to the contrary, we ought to *presume* of the good effect." This is the key to the Baptismal Service and the Catechism. They presume the good effect. The Baptismal Service *assumes* that God has heard the prayers of his faithful people, for the spiritual regeneration of the child, in conformity with the Divine promise:—"Ask, and ye shall have; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you." It encourages the congregation to take the spiritual change in the child for granted. "Doubt ye not, therefore, but earnestly believe."—"We being thus persuaded, and nothing doubting." And the child is encouraged in the Catechism to regard his baptism as his starting-point on the heavenward journey. Baptismal Regeneration, whatever it is, must not be confounded with "conversion," or with "renewal," neither of which applies to infants.

[1] Published at length in 1850 under the title, "Gorham *v.* The Bishop of Exeter." Painter, 342, Strand, London.

The Jews were called "the children of God;"[1] being, as Archbishop Secker points out, "the children of his covenant."[2] The "sign and seal" of the new covenant of grace is baptism. As Article XVII. expresses it: "The promises of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed." The language of the Article, it will be seen, approaches very closely to that of the Nonconformist divines at the Savoy Conference.

Let us compare with it the language of the Westminster Confession of Faith[3]—the Standard of the Church of Scotland, and of Presbyterians generally.

Baptism is ordained, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible Church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace,[4] and his ingrafting into Christ,[5] of regeneration,[6] of remission of sins.[7]

By the *right* use of this ordinance[8] the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and *conferred* by the Holy Ghost to such as that grace belongeth to.[9]

The Confession, however, like the learned prelates, cited by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the Gorham case, declares that "the efficacy of baptism is not tied to the moment of time wherein it is administered."[10] The Confession points to the story of Simon Magus, as showing that the grace of regeneration is "not inseparably annexed" to the ordinance itself. In the thirteenth verse of the eighth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles it is stated that "Simon Magus believed and was baptized;" yet he was told, almost immediately afterwards, by St. Peter, that he was "in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity!"

The Wesleyan Methodist Conference has set forth, by its authority, a Catechism which deals with the subject:—

Q. "What is the inward and spiritual grace signified by baptism?"

A. "The inward and spiritual grace signified by baptism is our being cleansed from sin, and becoming *new creatures in Christ Jesus*." Acts xxii. 6: "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."

But Mr. Clarkson is a Congregational Minister; and it is necessary very briefly to refer to the standards of his denomination.

---

[1] Deut. xiv. 1. [2] Acts iii. 25. [3] Chapter xxviii.
[4] Rom. iv. 11; Col. ii. 11, 12.
[5] Gal. iii. 27 (the passage cited by the Bishops); Rom. vi. 5.
[6] Tit. iii. 5. [7] St. Mark i. 4.
[8] Gal. iii. 27 (the passage cited by the Bishops); Titus iii. 5; Eph. v 25, 26; Acts ii. 38, 41.
[9] St. John iii. 5, 8. [10] Chapter xxviii. 5.

In No. 1 (Second Series) of the "Congregational Union Tracts," intituled, "Christian Baptism," published by authority of the Union,[1] we find the following passages:—

"Baptism has taken the place of circumcision, as a seal or confirmation of the faithfulness of God's Word, being termed by the Apostle Paul, 'The circumcision of Christ'" (Col. ii. 11). "It is the initiatory ordinance of Christianity, *the gateway to the Heavenly Kingdom*, or Gospel dispensation, bringing the subjects of it into direct relation to the Christian economy." "Baptism is a badge of Christian discipleship, and by it we are admitted to the School of Christ." "Children are made disciples by baptism." "Children belong to the Heavenly Kingdom, and we may, therefore, thankfully place on them the seal of that Kingdom."

The Rev. Joseph Foxley, in an "Occasional Paper," published by the Home Reunion Society,[2] cites stanzas from "The New Congregational Hymn Book," which clearly show that Congregationalists distinctly follow the language of the Baptismal Service in asking God that the child may be spiritually regenerated in baptism:—

Baptismal Service. (*Church of England.*)	Hymn Book. (*Congregationalist.*)
Grant that this child may receive the fulness of thy grace.	Let this infant find a place In thy covenant of grace.
Grant to this child that thing which by nature he cannot have; may he receive remission of his sins.	Let thy blood, on Calvary spilt, Cleanse this child from nature's guilt.
Wash him and sanctify him with thy Holy Spirit.	Holy Ghost, to thee we cry, Thou this infant sanctify.

If "baptismal regeneration" is, as is asserted in the Congregational Union Tract, "a doctrine which finds no warrant in the Bible," it is very strange that Congregationalists should so earnestly ask God to confer it upon their children!

It is clear, I think, that Presbyterians, Wesleyans, and Congregationalists, like Churchmen, look upon Baptism, in the language of the XXVIIth Article of Religion, as "a *sign* of regeneration" and "*seal* of the forgiveness of sins and of our adoption to be the sons of God."

Whether the "thing signified" always accompanies the "sign," they leave an open question, and so does the National Church.

---

[1] Jackson, Walford and Hodder, 27, Paternoster Row, London. 1863.
[2] 7, Whitehall, London.

II. The Congregationalist minister says:—

With the views we hold of the Christian ministry we could not possibly become members of a Church which authorizes any living man, in any office whatever, to say, "Receive[1] the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest—whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven."

Learned commentators have explained that the word "receive,' in this passage, is in the optative mood and precatory, and not in the imperative mood, being equivalent to "May ye receive:" just as the words "Be happy" are equivalent to "May you be happy"—"Happy may you be." *Macte virtute esto.*

This view acquires support from the next sentence: "And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of his holy sacraments;" where the words "Be thou" are clearly optative, and not imperative, being equivalent to "Mayest thou be."

"Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven: whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained."

These expressions, which are evidently taken from St. John xx. 23, have been considered as equivalent to those contained in St. Matthew xvi. 19, and xviii. 18, where the expressions "bind" and "loose" are used, instead of "remit," (or "forgive") and "retain;" to "bind," or "retain," meaning "to subject to ecclesiastical censures,"[2] to "excommunicate"—to "remit," "forgive, or "loose," meaning, "to absolve from those censures."[3] This view appears to receive some sanction from the context in St. Matthew xviii. 18, where, immediately *before* using the words "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth," &c., our Saviour declared that if a "brother" who had sinned against a disciple refused to "hear the Church," he was to be regarded "as a heathen man and a publican." The "keys of the kingdom of heaven" mean, in this connection, the power of admitting into and shutting out of Christian fellowship. Selden[4] remarks that the expressions "binding" and "loosing" were used by the Jews in the sense of "excommunicating" and "absolving."

There is no doubt, however, that tender consciences, both in and out of the Church of England, have been wounded by the expressions in the Ordination Service singled out by Mr. Clarkson. In a Parliamentary Return, issued in 1854, will be found the alterations in "the form and manner of Ordering of Priests," proposed by the Royal Commission of 1689:—

The words pronounced by the Bishops at the imposition of hands, "Receive the Holy Ghost," &c., "Whose sins thou dost forgive," &c.,

[1] The words "Believe in" are evidently a clerical error in the report of the speech of Mr. Clarke for "Receive."

[2] See per Archbishop Secker, cited by Stephens, "Book of Common Prayer," vol. iii., p. 1669.

[3] Wheatley, p. 378.

[4] "De Syned. veter. Ebræor." l. i. c. 7, cited by Wheatley, *ubi supra.*

are struck out, and the following proposal and new form written on the interleaf:—

"Whereas it was the constant practice of the Church to ordain by prayer, which practice continued for many ages, and that the pronouncing these words, 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' in the imperative mood, was brought into the office of Ordination in the darkest times of Popery, it is humbly submitted to the Convocation, whether it be not more suitable unto the general rule the Church of England has gone upon of conforming herself to the Primitive Church to put these words in some such form as this:—

"'*Pour down, O Father of Lights, the Holy Ghost on this Thy servant* for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto him by the imposition of our hands, that whose sins he doth forgive they may be forgiven, and whose sins he doth retain they may be retained, and that he may be a faithful dispenser of God's holy Word and Sacraments, to the edification of His Church, and the glory of His holy Name, to whom, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, be all honour and glory, world without end. Amen.'"

The following note is written in the margin by a different hand, perhaps by Archbishop, then Dean, Tillotson:—

"S. August. l. 15, de 'Trinitate,' cap. 27:—*Quomodo ergo Deus non est qui dat Spiritum Sanctum? imo quantus Deus est qui dat Deum? neque enim aliquis discipulum ejus dedit Spiritum Sanctum. Orabant, quippe, ut veniret in eos quibus manus imponebant, non ipsi enim dabant. Quem morem in suis propositis etiam nunc servat Ecclesia.*"

In the discussions which took place among the members of the Commission, the Bishop of Salisbury (Burnet) pointed out that the use of the phrase, "Receive the Holy Ghost" was "not above 400 years' standing;" the ancient forms were by way of *prayer*, "Exaudi nos," &c. "It was altered in Hildebrand's time, when the design was to exalt the Priesthood."

The recommendations of the Royal Commission were unfortunately rendered abortive by the obstructiveness of the Jacobite Clergy, who at that time swayed the Councils of Convocation.

The Church of Ireland decided not to alter the form of the Consecration of Priests, as it might give rise to some doubts as to the validity of the orders of Irish Clergymen in the eyes of the other Episcopal Communions. In the Preface to the Revised Prayer Book of the Church of Ireland, the following passage, however, occurs:—

No change has been made in the formula of Ordination of Priests, *though desired by some;* for, upon a full review of our Formularies, we deem it plain, and here declare, that, save in the matter of Ecclesiastical censures, no power or authority is by them ascribed to the Church, or to any of its ministers, in respect of forgiveness of sins after Baptism, other than that of declaring and pronouncing, on God's part, remission of sins to all that are truly penitent, to the quieting of their conscience and the removal of all doubt and scruple; nor is it

anywhere in our Formularies taught or implied that confession to and absolution by a priest are any conditions of God's pardon.

Would Mr. Clarkson be content with a specific declaration like this, prefixed to the Prayer Book?

III. Mr. Clarkson says:—

> With the views we hold on this subject, we could not by formal membership sanction such a claim as is contained in the solemn words appointed to be used at the Visitation of the Sick:—"By his authority (our Lord Jesus Christ's) committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins."

Learned commentators[1] point out that where, as in the Daily Morning and Evening Service, the Absolution is declaratory, or, as in the Communion Service, the Absolution is in the optative and precatory, the language used by the Priest is "Almighty God pardoneth"—"Almighty God pardon;" but in the Visitation of the Sick the language is in the indicative and peremptory, because the Priest is not conveying the pardon of God directly to the sinner's conscience, but exercising a *judicial* authority in restoring the sinner to the peace of the Church, which, he appears, by his preceding confession, to have forfeited; though, in the existing laxity of discipline, sentence of Excommunication has never been formally pronounced against him. In proof of this, they point to the language of the prayer which *follows* the Absolution:—"Open thine eye of mercy upon this thy servant who most earnestly desireth pardon and forgiveness," "which," says Wheatley,[2] "surely there would be no occasion for, if he had been actually pardoned and forgiven by God, by virtue of the Absolution pronounced *before*." Then the Priest prays: "Preserve and continue this sick member in the Unity of the Church," "which seems," says Wheatley,[3] "to suppose that the foregoing Absolution had been pronounced in order to restore him to its peace."

There is no doubt, however, that the special Absolution in the office for the Visitation of the Sick has, as stated in the Preface to the Revised Prayer Book of the Church of Ireland, "been the cause of offence to many."

The House of Lords, on the 1st of March, 1641, appointed a Committee, consisting of ten earls, ten bishops, and ten barons, "to take into consideration all innovations in the Church respecting Religion." On the 10th of the same month they were empowered to associate with them as many learned divines as they pleased. The immediate object of appointing this Committee was to inquire into some innovations introduced by

---

[1] See, *e.g.*, Wheatley, pp. 381, 382. [2] P. 377. [3] P. 378.

Archbishop Laud and other Prelates, but there was a general understanding that they were to carry their inquiries into the whole field of doctrine and discipline, and suggest such measures as might tend to allay the then growing feeling of discontent with the Church. Among the bishops were Usher, Archbishop of Armagh, Williams, Bishop of Lincoln (Chairman), Moreton, Bishop of Durham, and Montague, Bishop of Norwich; among the divines, Prideaux (afterwards Bishop of Worcester), Saunderson (afterwards Bishop of Lincoln), Brownrigg (afterwards Bishop of Exeter), Hacket (afterwards Bishop of Lichfield), Warde, Featley, Holdsworth, Twisse, Burgess, White, Marshall, Calamy, and Hill,—"many of them," says Dr. Cardwell, "eminent for their learning and their attachment to the National Church." Among their "Considerations upon the Book of Common Prayer," we find the following:—

> In the Absolution of the Sick, were it not plain to say, "I pronounce thee absolved?" in other words, that the form of absolution for the sick should be made declaratory, instead of being authoritative.[1]

In the first Book of King Edward VI., the rubric preceding the Absolution ran thus:—

> Here shall the sick person make a special confession, if he feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter; after which confession the priest shall absolve him after this form; and the same form of absolution shall be used in all private confessions.

The words "and the same form of absolution shall be used in all private confessions" were omitted in the second Book of King Edward VI. In the Prayer Book of 1662, 14 Car. II., as revised and settled at the Savoy Conference, the words "if he humbly and heartily desire it," were inserted after the words, "the Priest shall absolve him," thus throwing the onus of using this special form of Absolution on the sick person. Without such "humble and hearty desire" on the part of the sick person, no clergyman, I submit, would be justified in using this special form. This alteration in the rubric was made after the attention of the Bishops had been called to the objectionable character of the form of Absolution by the Nonconformist Divines, who suggested that "the form of Absolution be declarative and *conditional*, as, 'I pronounce thee absolved' (instead of 'I absolve thee'), if thou dost truly repent and believe." "The condition," the Bishops said, "needs not to be expressed, being always necessarily understood."

---

[1] Cardwell's "History of the Conferences on the Prayer Book," pp. 239, 240, 241, 276.

In the Parliamentary Return of 1854, will be found the alterations in "the Order for the Visitation of the Sick," proposed by the Royal Commission of 1689:—

The Absolution is struck out and the following form of Absolution substituted:—

"Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent, and believe in him, of His great mercy forgive thee thine offences; and, *upon thy true faith and repentance*, by his authority committed to me, I pronounce thee absolved from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

The very point, therefore, on which the Nonconformist Divines insisted at the Savoy Conference to so little purpose, was conceded by the Royal Commission of 1689. Unfortunately the golden opportunity presented in 1689 was again lost.

The Church of Ireland has solemnly decided that this form of Absolution shall no longer disfigure their Prayer Book. The optative form of Absolution has been inserted instead.

"The Special Absolution" (thus runs the Preface to their Revised Prayer Book) "in the office for the Visitation of the Sick is a form unknown to the Church in ancient times, and as we saw no adequate reason for its retention, and no ground for asserting that its removal would make any change in the doctrine of the Church, we have deemed it fitting that, in the special cases contemplated in this office, Absolution should be pronounced to penitents in the form appointed in the office for the Holy Communion."

If the Church of Ireland has succeeded in getting rid of this obnoxious form, may not the Church of England be equally successful?

IV. "Ritualism."

We have to consider that by a very large and growing number of the Clergy the Formularies of the Church are being strained to their utmost tension to admit Sacramental doctrines and Sacerdotal usages.

Ritualism is a mere excrescence on the fair face of England's Church. It is not of her; and it cannot be denied that the whole current of modern legal decision has been hostile to Ritualistic pretensions.

I shall never forget the great upheaval of Protestant feeling in the House of Commons during the passage through it of the Public Worship Regulation Bill. It ran like an electric shock through the Members, Nonconformists as well as Churchmen. A firm resolve was on all sides expressed, that, so long as the union of Church and State remained, the Church of this Protestant nation should be a Protestant Church. Never did the late Earl of Beaconsfield achieve so great a triumph as when

he announced his intention of supporting Mr. Russell Gurney, and hurled the withering sarcasms of his eloquence at "the mass in masquerade." Even the Roman Catholic members cheered, because he carefully guarded himself by pointing out that what he was denouncing was not the real mass, but the sham one.

If the Church of England were severed from the State, her members would still uphold her Protestant character.

Has Mr. Clarkson considered fully the sin of holding aloof from the Church, and so depriving her of the advantages to be derived from the accession to her ranks of a vast body of "God-fearing men," deeply imbued with sound Protestant principles? I cannot conceive of any means more likely to "stamp out Ritualism" than the reinforcement of the ranks of Evangelical Churchmen by Orthodox Nonconformists.

V. The union of Church and State is Mr. Clarkson's remaining barrier in the way of corporate reunion of Churchmen and Orthodox Nonconformists. The "absence of self-government and discipline" is given as an illustration—"the dependency of the Church on the State." I have shown in my former notice that in the eye of the law of England, the Church and the State are, for many purposes, one, and that the Church is really the State viewed in its religious aspect. The English nation legislates for itself, in Church as well as in State. If "the Prime Minister," as Mr. Clarkson points out, nominates "the chief officer of the Church," he does so as the representative of the national will, not as a private individual. *Vox populi vox Dei.* The Lord Chancellor exercises his patronage in a similar capacity. Is a Prime Minister fallible, and a deacon infallible? Mr. Clarkson is the nominee, I presume, of his deacons and congregation, "the dependent minister of an Independent Congregation." Is the congregation to count for everything, and the national will to count for nothing? A nation surely owes duties to God, as well as the individuals of whom the nation is composed. How can there be a *national* recognition of Almighty God, as King of Kings, except through a National Church? The Christian Church, we are told distinctly in Holy Writ, was grafted upon the Jewish. The union of Church and State flourished under the Jewish theocracy. It is little short of blasphemy, I submit, to affirm that a system of Church government which has been blest and consecrated by God is sinful and wrong.

A word as regards discipline. The Public Worship Regulation Act, so far from emanating from a purely secular source, emanated from the Bench of Bishops, who found it impossible to maintain the discipline of the Church committed to their charge without it. It in an especial manner emanated

from the chief pastors of the Church, the Primates of Canterbury and York, and it was they who nominated Lord Penzance as the new Dean of the Arches.

The constitution of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has been severely criticised. It is a remarkable fact, that when the Church of Ireland had to reconstitute her Supreme Appellate Tribunal, she formed it chiefly of laymen, "each of whom shall be, or shall have been, Judge of any of the Superior Courts of Equity or Common Law in Ireland, or of the Court of Probate, or of the Landed Estates Court, the Court of Bankruptcy and Insolvency, or the Court of Admiralty, or of an Ecclesiastical Court in Ireland, or a Master in Chancery."[1] Who so fit as the Judges of the land to interpret the law of the Church? I sat in the General Convention of the Church of Ireland, and I can bear emphatic testimony to the desire of the clergy not to be placed at the mercy of theologians, but that the best legal skill should fill the Church's judgment seat.

Since Mr. Clarkson's denunciation of the "dependency of the Church on the State," the case of "*Jones* v. *the Rev. John Turner Stannard*" has been decided in the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice.[2] In that case Vice-Chancellor Hall enjoined the Rev. John Turner Stannard not to exercise the office of pastor at the Ramsden Street Congregational Chapel, at Huddersfield, although he had been elected to that office by 184 votes to 69. The Vice-Chancellor actually set aside the decision of that large majority—and why? Because Mr. Stannard did not hold the doctrines of the universal depravity of man, of predestination and eternal punishment, in as full a manner as the persons who in 1849 framed the trust-deed of the chapel! If Mr. Stannard disobeys the injunction he will be sent to prison by the Vice-Chancellor for contempt of court! Is it not evident, on the one hand, that if the Church of England were severed from the State, the Mackonochies, the Greens, and Enraghts would still be amenable to the law of the land, and that the Congregationalists are, albeit Dissenters, liable to have their wishes overruled by the jurisdiction of a secular court?

WILLIAM T. CHARLEY.

---

[1] Statutes of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, 1879, c. 1. 1st Schedule, ch. vii.

[2] See the report of the case in the *Times* of February 2nd.

ART. VII.—THE REVISED NEW TESTAMENT.

The New Testament of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, Translated out of the Greek; being the Version set forth A.D. 1611, compared with the most ancient authorities and revised A.D. 1881. Printed for the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Oxford, 1881.[1]

SOME reasons were assigned in an Article which appeared in the April issue of this Periodical why it was reasonable to anticipate that the Revised New Testament of A.D. 1881 would prove to be a more faithful and accurate representation of the original text than its predecessor of A.D. 1611. We propose, in the present Paper, to inquire how far the anticipation thus expressed has been realized in the long and anxiously-expected volume which is now before us.

It would be an interesting subject of inquiry were we to endeavour to trace out in detail the various circumstances by which the minds of the English-speaking population have been gradually prepared for a further revision of that admirable version of the Greek New Testament, for which they are, and will ever continue to be, deeply indebted to the unwearied labours and the sound learning of the Commissioners who were appointed by King James in the year 1604. Such an inquiry, however, would occupy far too much of the space which is now at our disposal; and we must content ourselves, before we enter upon any critical examination of the volume which now lies before us, with directing the attention of our readers to a short historical account of the origin of that Revision of the Old and New Testaments, of which the first instalment is already in our hands.

The necessity which existed for a thorough and accurate Revision of the Authorized Version of the Old and New Testaments had long forced itself upon the minds of scholars, both in England and in America, and was beginning to be felt[2] and

---

[1] The work is printed at the University Press. The Cambridge copies are precisely the same as the Oxford. Opposite the title-page appears the statement: Published by Henry Frowde, Oxford Warehouse, 7, Paternoster Row; C. J. Clay, M.A., Cambridge Warehouse, 27, Paternoster Row.

[2] In the year 1856 the subject was brought before Convocation by Canon Selwyn, who moved in favour of a petition for the appointment of a Royal Commission. The time, however, was not yet come. In the House of Commons Sir George Grey declined to entertain the proposal. A private undertaking in the year 1857, the preparation of a revised version of St.

acknowledged in the outside world, when, on the 10th February, in the year 1870, the late Bishop Wilberforce brought forward the question in the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury. He moved for the appointment of a Committee of both Houses of that Province, with power to confer with any Committee that might be appointed by the Convocation of the Northern Province, "to report upon the desirableness of a revision of the Authorized Version of the New Testament, whether by marginal notes or otherwise, in all those passages where plain and clear errors, whether in the Greek text orginally adopted by the translators, or in the translation made from the same, shall, on due investigation, be found to exist."[1] This motion, which had reference only to the New Testament, was formally extended, in the course of the discussion which ensued, so as to comprehend the whole of the Inspired Volume, and was agreed to in the Upper House on the same day, and accepted in the Lower House of Convocation on the day following.

A similar motion was proposed on the 23rd day of the same month in the Convocation of York. This motion was opposed by the Bishop of Carlisle and others, on the grounds that the present Authorized Version is accepted, not only by the Established Church of this land, but also by the Dissenters of various denominations, and by the whole of the English-speaking people of the world, as their standard of faith; that the attempts which had been made in the way of Revision of late years were not such as to encourage the Convocations in their expectations of the beneficial results of Revision; that the power of writing that clear and dialectic English which distinguishes the Authorized Version had been lost by scholars of the present generation; and further, that a work such as was contemplated by the Convocation of Canterbury could be effectually carried out only under a Commission from the Crown. The Northern Convocation appears to have been influenced by considerations such as these; and without, as it appears to us, duly weighing both the preponderating arguments which had been adduced in the Southern Convocation on the other side, or the proposals which had been made, or which yet might be made, with a view to overcome the objections and difficulties which stood in the way, the members of that Convocation came to a conclusion adverse to the original motion which had been submitted to them. This conclusion was

---

John's Gospel "by five clergymen," served to keep the question before the public; and in the year 1869 two of these "five clergymen," Bishop Ellicott and Dean Alford, obtained the support of Bishop Wilberforce. It was thought, at first, that an address should be moved for in the House of Lords, but after consultation with those in authority the idea of a Royal Commission was abandoned.

[1] Chronicles of Convocation, vol. ii. p. 74, 1870.

expressed in the following Resolution, which was passed with general approval, the original motion being previously withdrawn :—

That this Convocation desires to express its thankfulness for the possession of an Authorized Version of Holy Scriptures which has been accepted and valued, not only within the English Church, but by English Nonconformists, and by the English-speaking people throughout the world; that, whilst admitting that certain blemishes exist in that version, such as have been pointed out from time to time by means of marginal notes and corrections, this Convocation deprecates any revision which might lead to a complete recasting of the text of the Authorized Version; that this Convocation earnestly desires to co-operate with the sister Convocation of Canterbury, but, in the present state of the question, it does not think it wise to ask his Grace the President to grant a Committee on the subject of a revision of the Authorized Version.[1]

A formal communication to this effect was made to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, and was read to the Upper House of Convocation of the Southern Province on May 3, in the same year.[2]

The Southern Convocation being thus left to carry on the work alone, proceeded to the appointment of a Committee consisting of members of both Houses, who reported that it was desirable that Convocation should nominate a body of its own members who should be at liberty to invite the co-operation of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they might belong. In accordance with this resolution two Companies were appointed, consisting, not only of scholars belonging to both Houses of Convocation, but also, as had been originally proposed by the Bishop of St. David's, of men eminent for Biblical scholarship amongst the different Nonconformist bodies.

The Company appointed for the Revision of the Old Testament was to consist, as originally proposed, of the following members of both Houses of Convocation :—

Bishop of St. David's (Thirlwall).
Bishop of Llandaff (Ollivant).
Bishop of Ely (Harold Browne).
Bishop of Lincoln (Wordsworth).
Bishop of Bath and Wells (Lord A. C. Hervey).
Archdeacon Rose.
Canon Selwyn.
Dr. Jebb.
Dr. Kay.

The following persons were invited to join in the Old Testament Company :—

[1] See the *Guardian* of March 2, 1870.
[2] Chronicles of Convocation, vol. ii. p. 210.

Dr. W. L. Alexander, Pastor of St. Augustine's Church, Edinburgh, Professor in the Theological Hall of the Congregational Churches of Scotland; T. Chenery, Professor of Arabic in the University of Oxford; the Rev. Canon Cook, of Exeter; Dr. Davidson, Professor of Theology in the Free Church Hall, Edinburgh; Dr. B. Davies, Professor in the Baptist College, Regent's Park, London; Dr. Fairbairn, Professor in the United Presbyterian College, Glasgow; the Rev. I. Field, Rector of Higham, Norwich; Dr. Ginsburg; Dr. Gotch, Principal of the Baptist College, Bristol; Archdeacon Harrison, Canon of Canterbury; Professor Leathes, of King's College, London; Professor McGill; Dr. Payne Smith, Canon of Christ Church, Oxford; Professor Perowne, of Cambridge; Canon Plumptre, Professor in King's College, London; Canon Pusey, of Oxford; Dr. Wright, of the British Museum; and W. Aldis Wright, of Trinity College, Cambridge.

The New Testament Company was to consist of the following members of the two Houses of Convocation:—

Bishop of Winchester (Wilberforce).
Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (Ellicott).
Bishop of Salisbury (Moberly).
Dean of Lichfield (Bickersteth).
Dean of Canterbury (Alford).
Dean of Westminster (Stanley).
Canon Blakesley.

The following scholars and divines were invited to join the New Testament Company:—

Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Trench; Dr. Angus, Principal of Baptist College, Regent's Park; Dr. Eadie, Professor in United Presbyterian College, Glasgow; the Rev. F. G. Hort, Vicar of Great Wymondley, Herts; Canon Humphry; Canon Kennedy, Regius Professor of Greek, Cambridge; Archdeacon Lee; Canon Lightfoot, Professor at Cambridge; Dr. Milligan, Professor of Biblical Criticism, Aberdeen; Professor Moulton, Wesleyan College. Richmond; Dr. T. H. Newman, Oscott, Birmingham; Professor Newth, New College, St. John's Wood; Dr. Roberts, Professor, St. Andrew's University; Rev. G. Vance Smith, English Presbyterian College, York; Dr. Scott, Balliol College, Oxford; Rev. F. Scrivener, Rector of Gerrans, Cornwall; Dr. Vaughan, Master of the Temple; and Professor Westcott, Cambridge.

A few of the members of Convocation who were originally nominated refused to serve, or soon retired from the work, and a few of the invited members were unable or unwilling to accept the invitation. Several of those who were original members of one or other of the two Companies have subsequently died, or,

[1] Of the New Testament Company, Dean Alford, Dr. Tregelles, Bishop Wilberforce, and Dr. Eadie. Dr. Tregelles was never able to attend, and Bishop Wilberforce only attended once. The place of Dean Alford was supplied by Dean Merivale, who, after a short time, resigned; he was succeeded by Professor Palmer, now Archdeacon of Oxford. The place of Dr. Eadie was not filled up, as his death took place at a time when much of the work was done. The number of the members of the New Testament Company was thus for the greater portion of the time only 24.

from various causes, have been compelled to resign their posts. At the present time the lists of members of the two Companies are as follows:—

OLD TESTAMENT REVISION COMPANY.

The Right Rev. the Bishop of Winchester (*Chairman*), Farnham Castle, Surrey.
The Right Rev. the Bishop of Bath and Wells, Palace, Wells, Somerset.
The Right Rev. the Bishop of Llandaff, (*Corresponding Member*), Bishop's Court, Llandaff.
The Very Rev. the Dean of Canterbury, Deanery, Canterbury.
The Ven. the Archdeacon of Maidstone, Canterbury.

The Rev. Dr. Alexander, Pinkieburn, Musselburgh, Edinburgh.
R. L. Bensly, Esq., Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.
The Rev. Professor Birrell, St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, N.B.
Frank Chance, Esq., M.D., Burleigh House, Sydenham Hill, London.
T. Chenery, Esq., Reform Club, London, S.W.
The Rev. T. K. Cheyne, Balliol College, Oxford.
The Rev. Professor Davidson, New College, Edinburgh.
The Rev. Principal Douglas, 10, Fitzroy Place, Glasgow.
S. R. Driver, Esq., New College, Oxford.
The Rev. C. J. Elliott, Winkfield Vicarage, Windsor.
The Rev. Dr. Field, 2, Carlton Terrace, Heigham, Norwich.
The Rev. J. D. Geden, Wesleyan College, Didsbury, Manchester.
The Rev. Dr. Ginsburg, Holmlea, Virginia Water.
The Rev. Dr. Gotch, Baptist College, Bristol.
The Rev. Dr. Kay, Great Leghs Rectory, Chelmsford.
The Rev. Professor Leathes, Cliffe Rectory, Rochester.
The Rev. Professor Lumby, St. Catharine's College, Cambridge.
The Very Rev. the Dean of Peterborough, Deanery, Peterborough.
The Rev. A. H. Sayce, Queen's College, Oxford.
The Rev. Professor W. Robertson Smith, 83, Crown Street, Aberdeen.
Professor Wright, St. Andrews, Station Road, Cambridge.
W. Aldis Wright, Esq. (*Secretary*), Trinity College, Cambridge.

NEW TESTAMENT REVISION COMPANY.

The Right Rev. the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (*Chairman*), Palace, Gloucester.
The Right Rev. the Bishop of Salisbury, Palace, Salisbury.
The Very Rev. the Dean of Westminster, Deanery, Westminster, S.W.
The Very Rev. the Dean of Rochester, Deanery, Rochester.
The Very Rev. the Dean of Lincoln, Deanery, Lincoln.
The Very Rev. the Dean of Lichfield, Deanery, Lichfield.

The Most Rev. the Archbishop of Dublin, Palace, Dublin.
The Right Rev. the Bishop of Durham, Auckland Castle, Bishop Auckland.
The Right Rev. the Bishop of St. Andrews, Bishopshall, St. Andrews, N.B.
The Rev. Dr. Angus, Baptist College, Regent's Park, London, N.W.
The Rev. Principal Brown, Free Church College, Aberdeen.
The Rev. Professor Hort, 6, St. Peter's Terrace, Cambridge.
The Rev. W. G. Humphry, Vicarage, St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, London, W.C.
The Rev. Canon Kennedy, The Elms, Cambridge.
The Ven. the Archdeacon of Dublin, 24, Merrion Square, Dublin.
The Rev. Professor Milligan, University, Aberdeen.
The Rev. Dr. Moulton, The Leys, Cambridge.
The Rev. Principal Newth, New College, Hampstead, London, N.W.
The Ven. the Archdeacon of Oxford, Ch. Ch., Oxford.
The Rev. Professor Roberts, St. Andrews, N.B.
The Rev. Prebendary Scrivener, Hendon Vicarage, London, N.W.
The Rev. Dr. G. Vance Smith, 5, Parade, Carmarthen.
The Very Rev. the Master of the Temple, The Temple, London, E.C.
The Rev. Canon Westcott, Trinity College, Cambridge.

The Rev. J. Troutbeck (*Secretary*), 4, Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W.

It will be obvious to every one who considers the ultimate design of the proposed revision that it could not be other than an object of the highest importance to secure at the outset of the undertaking the sympathy and, if practicable, the active co-operation of Biblical scholars in America, where the Authorized Version of the Bible is as generally adopted and as highly esteemed as in the Mother country. It was with this view that Dr. Angus, one of the members of the New Testament Company, was authorized, under a resolution passed by both Houses of Convocation, to open negotiations for the formation of an American Committee of Revision. At his request Dr. Schaff prepared a draft of rules for co-operation with the English Revisers, and also a list of names of Biblical scholars who, it was thought, would fairly represent the different denominations of Christians in the United States. Communications were opened with the Protestant Episcopal Church. An American Committee, consisting, as the English, of two Companies, was accordingly organized in the course of the year 1871, and began the work of Revision in October, 1872.

The general principles of the Revision adopted by the English and American Committees are the same.

The mode of proceeding which has been adopted in regard to the co-operation of the English and American Companies has been as follows. The English Companies have transmitted their work, from time to time, to the American Companies for their consideration and suggestions. The American Companies have transmitted their remarks, and suggested alterations, from time to time, which have been privately communicated to the members of the English Companies, and jointly considered in their subsequent meetings, and many of their suggestions have been adopted in the final Revision. There will be found at the end of the volume a list of those readings and renderings which are preferred by the American Committee, and which are recorded at their desire, but which have not been accepted by the English Committee.

The first meeting of the English New Testament Company were held on the 22nd of June, 1870. The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, who has presided during ten years and a half, and who out of the 407 meetings, was present at 405, has made an admirable Chairman. For such a post, of course, much more than scholarship was needed; and it is admitted that Bishop Ellicott's guidance proved, under God, in many ways for good; but as an accurate, acute, and accomplished scholar, the Bishop was peculiarly well qualified to take the lead in so difficult and delicate a labour.

Having thus briefly related the circumstances which led to the formation of the Revision Committees, it remains only that

we should first place before our readers a copy of the general rules, which were adopted at the outset by both Committees, as embodying the principles upon which the Revision should be conducted, before we proceed to examine some of the changes which have been introduced into the volume before us as the results of textual criticism, of a more accurate acquaintance with the grammatical structure of the original Greek, and of the changes which the meaning of English words and phrases have undergone, during the lapse of the last two hundred and fifty years.

The rules adopted for the guidance of the two Revision Companies are as follows:—

I. To introduce as few alterations as possible into the Text of the Authorized Version consistently with faithfulness.[1]

II. To limit, as far as possible, the expression of such alterations to the language of the Authorized and Earlier English Versions.

III. Each Company to go twice over the portion to be revised, once provisionally, the second time finally, and on principles of voting as hereafter is provided.

IV. That the Text to be adopted be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating; and that when the Text so adopted differs from that from which the Authorized Version was made, the alteration be indicated in the margin.

V. To make or retain no change in the Text, on the second final revision by each Company, except *two-thirds* of those present approve of the same; but on the first revision to decide by simple majorities.

VI. In every case of proposed alteration that may have given rise to discussion, to defer the voting thereupon till the next meeting, whensoever the same shall be required by one-third of those present at the meeting, such intended vote to be announced in the notice for the next meeting.

VII. To revise the headings of chapters, pages, paragraphs, italics, and punctuation.[2]

VIII. To refer, on the part of each Company, when considered desirable, to Divines, Scholars, and Literary Men, whether at home or abroad, for their opinions.

It was further decided:—

---

[1] In the Preface (which is the work of the Right Rev. the President, but has been carefully considered by the whole Company) we read, of our "time-honoured" and greatly beloved Authorised Version:—"We have had to study this great Version carefully and minutely, line by line; and the longer we have been engaged upon it the more we have learned to admire its simplicity, its dignity, its power, its happy turns of expression, its general accuracy, and we must not fail to add, the music of its cadences, and the felicities of its rhythm. To render a work that had reached this high standard of excellence still more excellent, to increase its fidelity without destroying its charm, was the task committed to us."

[2] "The revision of headings of chapters and pages would have involved so much of indirect, and indeed frequently of direct interpretation, that we judged it best to omit them altogether."—*Preface.*

That the work of each Company be communicated to the other as it is completed, in order that there may be as little deviation from uniformity in language as possible.

That the Special or Bye-rules for each Company be as follows:—

(1) To make all corrections in writing previous to the meeting.

(2) To place all the corrections due to textual considerations on the left-hand margin, and all other corrections on the right-hand margin.

(3) To transmit to the Chairman, in case of being unable to attend, the corrections proposed in the portion agreed upon for consideration."

The first Revision occupied about six years; the second, about two years and a half. Suggestions from America on the second Revision had then to be considered, and reserved questions had to be discussed. It may be said that the work has gone through seven revisions.

We now proceed, as it was proposed, to notice, in the first place, some of the alterations dependent upon textual criticism which have been made in the prevent Revision.

We will refer in the first instance to St. John v. 7. The spurious character of the words respecting the three heavenly witnesses which were probably inserted into the text out of a marginal gloss, is a fact which is now commonly accepted by all competent critics. The absence of the words from the three great uncial MSS.—the Sinaitic, the Vatican, and the Alexandrian,—coupled with the facts that the words are nowhere quoted by the great controversial writers of the fourth and fifth centuries, and that the insertion occurs in some manuscripts before and in some after the mention of the three genuine witnesses, may be regarded as conclusive evidence of the spuriousness of these words. When once the fact is admitted that the words are spurious, no doubt can exist in the minds of those who dread alike additions to or detractions from the words of Scripture, respecting the duty which is absolutely incumbent upon the faithful translator or reviser of the New Testament. We observe, therefore, with satisfaction, that instead of inserting the spurious words in italics, after the example of Tyndale's, Coverdale's, and the great Bible, the Revisers of 1881 have omitted them altogether, and have not even deemed it necessary to notice the fact that they are found in some MSS. of a later date and of inferior authority.

Few, we venture to assert, who are either personally acquainted with the members of the New Testament Company, or who know the reputation in which they are held by those who have been associated with them, will entertain the slightest suspicion that in the alterations which have been made, whether it be on textual or on philological grounds, the Revisers have been swayed by

doctrinal prepossessions. Should, however, any lurking suspicion exist in the minds of any in regard to this point, we think that a careful examination of the alterations which have been made in those passages which bear upon the doctrine of the Trinity will supply evidence of the strict impartiality with which the Revisers have acted in this respect. We have already stated the manner in which they have dealt with the most remarkable instance of unauthorized insertion. We will now refer to one or two further instances in illustration of our remark. In St. John i. 18, notwithstanding the great amount of authority which has been adduced in support of the reading of the Sinaitic and Vatican MSS., "God, only begotten," instead of "the only begotten Son," the Revisers have allowed the reading of the received text to stand, and have contented themselves with the remark that "many very ancient authorities read 'God only begotten.'"

Again, in 1 Tim. iii. 16, in place of the reading, "God was manifest in the flesh," the Revisers, guided by the weight of ancient authority, read, "He who was manifested in the flesh;" and observe in the margin, which is reserved for such alterations as are connected with textual considerations, that the word *God*, in place of *He who*, "rests on no sufficient ancient evidence."

But whilst some, having regard to the fact that the New Testament Revision Company is composed almost exclusively of members of the Established English Church and of orthodox Nonconformist bodies, might suspect the majority of that body to be influenced by doctrinal prepossessions in favour of the genuineness of those passages which support the doctrine of the Trinity, there are others who may suppose that the fear of being unduly influenced by their prepossessions may have led them to make concessions in regard to passages bearing upon this doctrine which are not sustained by a sufficient amount of evidence. Now, we think that a careful and candid examination of the volume before us will dispose of this accusation as effectually as of the former. We turn, *e.g.*, to Acts xx. 28; and we find there that, notwithstanding the weight of those ancient authorities, including the Alexandrian MS., which read "the Church of the Lord," our Revisers retain the reading of the received text, and thus justify the conclusion at which one of the most learned of their number, Dr. Scrivener, had previously arrived, and which he has stated in the words which follow:—"The reading of the received text, though different from that of the majority of copies, is pretty sure to be correct. It is upheld by the Sinaitic and Vatican MSS., by *all* the known MSS. and editions of the Vulgate (except the Complutensian). Patristic testimony also slightly inclines to the same reading, *the Church of God.*"

We may observe, in connection with the present subject, that the last clause of 1 John ii. 23, which is printed in our present English Bibles in italics, as if of doubtful genuineness, is retained without any marks of doubtfulness by the Revisers of 1881, the real cause of the doubt respecting the words having arisen, in all probability, from the fact that some scribe, looking at the close of the verse, of which the three last words are the same as the three last of the preceding clause, supposed that he had written the second clause, when, in point of fact, he had only written the former. We may also notice here, although the correction strictly speaking falls under another class of incorrect or doubtful renderings, to which we shall have occasion to advert, that in Titus ii. 13, whilst allowing a place in the margin to the present rendering of the Authorized Version "of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ," the Revisers of 1881 insert in the text that which, it can scarcely admit of doubt, is the true rendering of the original Greek, "looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of *our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ.*"

We must deal very concisely with other alterations or marginal insertions which are dependent upon the results of textual criticism.[1]

The concluding verses of the Gospel of St. Mark, chap. xvi. 9–20, remain in the text—a break being made in the page, and a marginal note being inserted to the effect that the verses are wanting in the "two oldest Greek manuscripts, and some other authorities," whilst "some other authorities have a different ending to the Gospel."

A similar course is adopted in regard to St. John vii. 53; viii. 11. There is a break before and after these verses, and the reader is informed that they are omitted by most of the ancient authorities, whilst those which retain them vary much from each other. The doxology in St. Matthew vi. 13, which may have been inserted at a later period, under the influence of liturgical usage, is omitted; and a note informs the reader that some ancient authorities admit the words with variations. A similar note, as regards the omission, is inserted in the margin of St. Matthew in regard to the words, xvi. 2, 3: "When it is evening . . . . red and louring." In St. Luke ix. 54, the words "even as Elijah did" are omitted from the text, and a marginal note is inserted on verse 55, stating that some ancient authorities add the words "and said, Ye know not!" &c.; whilst others, but fewer, add also the words, "For the Son of Man," &c.; whilst at

[1] We are glad to observe in the Preface that from the University Presses will appear, with complete Greek Texts of the New Testament, the changes which have been made.

St. John v. 3, we meet with a note to the effect that many ancient authorities insert in whole, or in part, the words which follow—"blind, halt, withered," viz., the last clause of verse 3, and the whole of verse 4, which relate to the descent to the angel into the pool and the tumbling of the water.

We think that the verdict of those who are competent to pronounce an opinion on such a subject will be in favour of the manner in which these and other textual difficulties have, on the whole, been met, and that the sound judgment displayed in Bishop Lightfoot's prognostication in 1872 will be generally admitted, viz., that "the course which is most truthful" will, in the end, prove to be also the "most politic."[1]

We must now pass on from the notice of textual emendations to the wider question of faults, real or alleged, in the actual translation of the words.

We will refer, in the first instance, to a few of those cases in which ignorance of the doctrine of the Greek Article—an ignorance not peculiar to the Revisers of 1611, but common to the age in which they lived—has obscured or perverted the meaning of many passages of the New Testament. It has been well observed by Archbishop Trench, that, "in regard of the Greek Article our translators err both in excess and defect, but oftenest in the latter."[2] We will first notice one or two passages in which the Translators erred by way of excess.

In Rom. ii. 14, the insertion of the Article before the word Gentiles, as in the Authorized Version, might lead to the inference that the Gentiles did commonly obey the dictates of a moral law which was engraven upon their hearts, although such an inference could with difficulty be reconciled with the description of the heathen world which the same Apostle gives in the first chapter of that Epistle. The Revisers of 1881 having properly rendered the passage thus, "For when Gentiles which have no law, do by nature the things of the law, these have no law, are a law unto themselves."[3] Again, in 1 Tim. vi. 10,

---

[1] "On a Fresh Revision of the EnglishNew Testament," 2nd ed. p. 32.

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

[3] The error involved in the insertion of the article where it does not occur in the Greek is not confined in this place to the verse which we have quoted. It affects the rendering of the Authorized Version in the twelfth as well as in the following verses of this chapter, and is found again, in the opinion of some able critics, in other parts of the same Epistle (as iii. 19 and following verses) and also in the Epistle to the Galatians. So also in regard to the rendering of ὁ χριστὸς, the Revisers of 1611 have sometimes overdone the translation by the rendering "*that* Christ" (St. John i. 25) or "*the very* Christ" (St. John vii. 26), whilst elsewhere, as, *e.g.*, in St. Matt. xvi. 16; xxiv. 5, &c. &c., under the same conditions, they have not noticed the existence of the Article at all.

the Revisers of 1611 have represented St. Paul as affirming that "the love of money is *the* root of all evil," as if all evil of every kind sprang from one and the same source. The Revisers of 1881, observing that the definite article is wanting before the word ῥίζα, *root*, have rendered the passage thus, "For the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil (or of all evils, *marg.*)."

But the more common error into which the Revisers of 1611 fell in regard to the Greek Article was not by its insertion in the English when it does not occur in the Greek, but by its omission in the English when it appears in the Greek.

Thus, *e.g.*, in Rom. v. 15-19, as it has been frequently remarked from the time of Bentley, the Revisers of 1611 altogether ignored the contrast which is sustained throughout between "*the* one" and "*the* many;" and thus, as that great critic observed, they afforded opportunity for "some hurtful mistakes about partial redemption and absolute reprobation." The passage is too long to be quoted in full. We content ourselves with directing the attention of our readers to this passage as it appears in the Authorized Version, and as it is found in the Revised Version of 1881.

Again, in the rendering of St. Matt. xxiv. 12, there is a very important distinction between "the love of many shall wax cold," as we read in the Authorized Version, and that of the Revisers of 1881, who have properly rendered the passage, "The love of the many shall wax cold," *i.e.*; of the vast majority of Christians. So also in St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians i. 14, the same distinction between *many* and *the greater part* (or *most*) is overlooked by the Revisers of 1661, whereas the Revisers of 1881 represent the Apostle as affirming not that *many* but "*most* of the brethren," waxing confident by his words, were bold to speak the word of God without fear.[1]

Again, the force of Heb. xi. 10 is greatly obscured in the Authorized Version by the rendering "*a* city which hath foundations," instead of "*the* city which hath *the* foundations." Here, as in so many other cases, the Revisers of 1881 have rendered essential service to the reader, by referring him not only, as in our present English Bibles, to chap. xii. 22, and to chap. xiii. 14, of the same Epistle, but also by referring him, in connection with the word *city*, to verse 16 of the same chapter, and in regard to the words "which hath the foundations;" to Apoc.

Other instances of the insertion of the Article, or of the possessive pronoun by which it is sometimes represented, when it does not occur in the Greek, will be found in the renderings adopted in the Authorized Version of St. John iv. 27, "*the* woman" instead of "*a* woman," and in 1 Tim. iii. 11, "*their* wives," instead of "women."

[1] Similar instances occur in St. Luke xxiv. 10; 1 Cor. ix. 4; 2 Cor. x. 13. Our readers will do well to compare the Revised Version of 1881, with that of 1611 in other places.

xxi. 14, "And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb."

Once more, the omission of the Article in the Authorized Version of Rev. vii. 14, "These are they that came (rather that *come*) out of great tribulation," is corrected in the Revision of 1881.

We may here quote from the Victorian Version, without comment, a few renderings in the new text, of which probably all critical readers will approve:—

ST. MATT. v.—Neither do *men* light a lamp,[1] and put it under the bushel, but on the stand; and it shineth unto all that are in the house. Even so let your light shine. . . . .

vi.—Be not anxious for your life. . . . .

Be not therefore anxious for the morrow. . . . .[2]

1 Cor. i. 30.—Who was made unto us wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification, and redemption [marg. "both righteousness and sanctification and redemption].

xi.—For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death. . . . .

ACTS xxvi. 28, 29.—And Agrippa said unto Paul, With but little persuasion thou wouldest fain make me a Christian. And Paul said I would to God, that whether with little or with much, not thou only, but also all that hear me this day, might become such as I am, except these bonds.

iii. 13.—"his Servant Jesus." (The References here are valuable).

PHIL. iii. 20, 21.—For our citizenship is in heaven; from whence also we wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory, according to the working whereby he is able even to subject all things unto himself.

ST. JOHN x.—I am the good shepherd; I know mine own, and mine own know me . . . . and they shall become one flock, one shepherd.

ROM. viii. 29, 30.—For whom he foreknew, he also foreordained to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren: and whom he foreordained, them he also called: and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified.

HEB. x. 23.— . . . "let us hold fast the confession of our hope that it waver not. [Faith, hope, love.]

xii. 14.—Follow . . . . the sanctification without which no man shall see the Lord.

---

[1] So in chapter vi.: "The lamp of the body is the eye."

[2] So also in Philip. iv. 4, "In nothing be *anxious*." Here we may notice the rendering—"Let your *forbearance* (marg. *gentleness*) be known unto all men."—In Philip. ii. 6, instead of "thought it not robbery," we find, as a matter of course, "*counted it not a prize* to be on an equality with God" [marg. "a thing to be grasped at"]. And in ii. 10, we read—"*in* the name of Jesus."

2 PET. iii. 18.—But grow in the grace and knowledge. . . . .

COLOSS. ii. 6.—As therefore ye received Christ Jesus the Lord, *so* walk in him, rooted and builded up in him, and stablished in your faith, even as ye were taught, abounding in thanksgiving. Take heed lest there shall be any one that maketh spoil of you. . . . .

15.—Having put off from himself the principalities and the powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it.

23.—Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and severity to the body; but are not of any value against the indulgence of the flesh.

ST. JOHN vi. 10.—Jesus said, make the people sit down. Now there was much grass in the place. So the men sat down, in number about five thousand.

25.—And when they found him on the other side of the sea, they said unto him, Rabbi, when camest thou hither? Jesus answered them and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Ye seek me, not because ye saw signs, but because ye ate of the loaves, and were filled. Work not for the meat which perisheth, but for the meat which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of man shall give unto you: for him the Father, *even* God, hath sealed. They said therefore unto him, What must we do, that we may work the works of God? Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent [marg. *he sent*].

1 COR. i. 22.—It was God's good pleasure through the foolishness of the preaching [marg. *thing preached*].

In 2 Tim. iii. 16, we read:

Every Scripture inspired of God *is* also profitable for teaching,[1] for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness.

"Instruction" is explained in the margin "discipline." Also in the margin occurs the rendering "Every Scripture *is* inspired of God and profitable." But no explanation of the important word "correction" (which occurs only here) is given in the margin.

The text which is mainly appealed to in regard to the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, Titus iii., the Revisers of 1881 have not changed; but the word *laver* appears in the margin, and the words "*and* through *renewing* . . . ." are given in the margin. In Eph. v. 27, the margin has the word *laver*.

"Instead of "be converted," Acts iii. 19, the version before us has "turn again." So also in other passages.

(*To be continued.*)

---

[1] St. John vii. 27, "If any man is willing to do his will, he shall know of the teaching . . ."

Reviews.

The Early History of Charles James Fox. By G. O. Trevelyan, M.P., Author of "The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay." Second edition. Longmans, Green and Co.

THIS volume is written with ability, and is decidedly interesting. It contains but few fresh facts about Fox, the Tory orator who founded a new Whiggism; but the description of the Pitt and Fox period—particularly in regard to its social and religious character—is exceedingly good. The author's strongly Liberal partialities, as might be expected, are by no means concealed; they show themselves, indeed, we must confess, once or twice, to our surprise. To adapt a celebrated phrase, a good deal has happened since Lord Macaulay wrote; and students of history, who use neither Whig nor Tory spectacles, may find in the transition period, 1760–1780, as recent researches present it, much that justifies the attitude of the young King towards the oligarchy. Apart altogether from political partisanship, we are not able to agree entirely with Mr. Trevelyan's remarks on George III.

On the political career of Fox, the "Life of Lord Shelburne," by Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, throws much light. What was the moral character of Fox every reader knows. Mr. Trevelyan, indeed, asserts, "Never was there a more gracious child, more rich in promise, more prone to good;" and there is no doubt that his father led him into extravagance and vice, so that it is a wonder, perhaps, that he was not even worse than he was. In the spring of 1763,[1] we read, "The devil entered into the heart of Lord Holland;" to get rid of care, and for the sake of diversion, he took Charles from his books, and introduced him to the dissipations of the Continent. At Spa, Lord Holland's amusement was to send his son every night to the gaming-table with a pocket full of gold; and (if family tradition may be trusted where it tells against family credit) the parent took not a little pains that the boy should leave France a finished rake. No wonder that when this boyish Chesterfield returned to Eton, his Parisian experiences, aided by cleverness and an unbounded command of cash, produced a visible and durable change for the worse in the morals and habits of the place.

In 1764 Charles Fox left Eton for Oxford, being entered at Hertford College, under Dr. Newcome. According to the first Lord Malmesbury, who was in the same set as Fox, though not in the same college, the lads who ranked as gentleman-commoners, "very pleasant but very idle fellows," were never called upon to attend either lectures, or hall, or chapel. But though not compelled to do anything, Fox seems to have read hard; and it was not according to his own plans that he left Oxford in the spring of 1766. His father directed him to travel for two years on the Continent. In 1768 he waited upon Voltaire at his villa by the lake of Geneva; and in the same year, while amusing himself in Italy, he was elected

[1] Charles James Fox was born in 1749. His father was already tenant of the suburban palace from which he came to derive his title. Walpole, writing in 1747, says, "Mr. Fox gave a great ball in Holland House, where he is making great improvements. It belonged to the gallant Earl of Holland." Mr. Fox, the first Lord Holland, said Lord Shelburne, "educated his children without the least regard to morality, and with such extravagant vulgar indulgence, that the great change which has taken place among our youth has been dated from the time of his son's going to Eton."

member for Midhurst.[1] Before he was twenty years old, he took his seat; and in April, 1769, he made his maiden speech; while in the following month he distinguished himself in replying to Burke and Wedderburn on the Middlesex petition. "Wedderburn and Burke," says Mr. Trevelyan, "were still unanswered when Charles Fox rose; but when he resumed "his seat the supporters of the Ministers, and most of their opponents, "pronounced that the lawyer and the statesman had both met their "match. How commanding must have been the manner of the young "speaker, how prompt his ideas, and how apt and forcible the language "in which he clothed them, may be estimated by comparing the effect of "his rhetoric upon those who were present, and the fame of it among "those who heard it second-hand, with the scanty morsels of his "argument which have survived the evening on which it was delivered. "The two or three sentences which oblivion, so kind to him as long as he "needed her services, has permitted to stand in judgment against him "have a flavour of boyishness about them for which nothing could have "compensated except rare and premature excellence in the outward "accomplishments of the orator. He had still enough of the under-"graduate in him to imagine that he was speaking like a statesman, when "he informed the House that he should adore Colonel Luttrell to the last "day of his life for his noble action, and that he would not take the will "of the people from a few demagogues, any more than he would take the "will of God Almighty from a few priests."

From Horace Walpole, a grudging witness, we learn what an impression was produced on the old stagers of the Commons by the appearance in their midst of one who was born a debater, as Buonaparte was born a general. By one speech, while yet only twenty years old, Charles Fox took a leading position. In February, 1770, having won another victory over Wedderburn, he was appointed a Junior Lord of the Admiralty. He seems at this time to have been a thorough Tory; but in 1774 he left the Ministry, or rather was dismissed. He had been insubordinate, and Lord North informed him that his Majesty having ordered a new Commission of the Treasury to be made out, he did not see in it Mr. Fox's name. Then, and for good, Fox forsook the Ministerialists. He took a line of his own.

What was the state of London Society at that time? Before this question can be discussed it must be borne in mind that Society in the early years of George III.'s reign was what would have been termed exceedingly "small and select." It was intensely aristocratic and exclusive. In "Endymion" the late Lord Beaconsfield has described the great world as it was fifty years ago. But at the time when Fox was young, "good Society" was enclosed within ascertained and narrow boundaries. The extent of these boundaries was familiar to all who were admitted, and to all who were excluded.

When Lord Chesterfield was the oracle of Society, and George Selwyn its father-confessor, its moral character was of the lowest. Thackeray, in his "Virginians," has described it; and the book before us contains a picture of it. "The frivolity of the last century," writes Mr. Trevelyan, "was not confined to the youthful, the foolish, or even to the idle. There never will be a generation which cannot supply a parallel to the lads who, in order that they might the better hear the nonsense which they were talking across a tavern table, had Pall Mall laid down with straw

[1] The right of election rested in a few score of small holdings, on which no human being resided. In 1794 the number of permanent voters for Midhurst was returned as one. By that time Lord Egremont had acquired the burgage-holds at a cost of forty thousand guineas.

at the cost of fifty shillings a head for the party; or to the younger brother who gave half a guinea every morning to the flower-woman who brought him a nosegay of roses for his button-hole."

What was peculiar to the period when Charles Fox took his seat in Parliament, and his place in Society, consisted in the phenomenon (for to our ideas it is nothing else), that men of age and standing, of strong mental powers and refined cultivation, lived openly, shamelessly, and habitually, in the face of all England, as no one who had any care for his reputation would now live during a single fortnight of the year at Monaco. As a sequel to such home-teaching as Lord Holland was qualified to impart, the young fellow, on his entrance into the great world, was called upon to shape his life according to the models that the public opinion of the day held up for his imitation; and the examples which he saw around him would have tempted cooler blood than his, and turned even a more tranquil brain. The Ministers who guided the State—whom the king delighted to honour—who had the charge of public decency and order—who named the fathers of the Church—whose duty it was (to use the words of their monarch) "to prevent any alterations in so essential a part of the constitution as everything that relates to religion"—were conspicuous for impudent vice, for daily dissipation, for pranks which would have been regarded as childish and unbecoming by the cornets of a crack cavalry regiment in the worst days of military licence.

The Duke of Grafton flaunted at Ascot with a woman of no character, and paraded her at the opera when the royal party were in their box. The satire of Junius, scathing as it was, produced little effect; a crowd of smart gentlemen, who wanted commissionerships for themselves and deaneries for their younger brothers, were not ashamed to flatter the Premier's mistress. Rigby, the Paymaster of the Forces, was a hard drinker; the only merit, indeed, he cared to claim was that he drank fair; and at the Pay Office during several successive Administrations, he showed how loose were the limits within which public money could be diverted to the maintenance of private debauchery. As to Lord Weymouth, "it would have been well for him," says Mr. Trevelyan, "if his nights had been consumed merely in drinking; he was a passionate gambler, and by the age of thirty-one he had played away his fortune, his credit, and his honour. Made Secretary of State, he still boozed till daylight and dozed into the afternoon." That melancholy, but witty fribble, Horace Walpole, remarked, "If I paid nobody, and went drunk to bed every morning at six, I might expect to be called up by two in the afternoon to save the nation." Lord Sandwich, perhaps the most disreputable member, as he was the most eminent of the Bedford connection, shocked even his own contemporaries by the immorality of his private life. Corrupt, tyrannical, and brazen-faced as a politician—and destitute, as was seen in his conduct to Wilkes, of fidelity towards the partners of his secret vicious pleasures, an unabashed libertine of the coarsest type, political satire itself tried in vain to exaggerate the turpitude of Sandwich. "Nor did the Bedfords," wrote Junius, "care anything what disgraces England underwent while each of them had their thousand pounds a year, and their thousand bottles of claret and champagne."

To Charles Fox this Society was open. "Few have had the downward "path made smoother before them, or strewn with brighter flowers and "more deadly berries. He was received with open arms by all that was "most select, and least censorious, in London. Those barriers that divide "the outer court from the inner sanctum—barriers within which Burke "and Sheridan never stepped, and which his own father with difficulty "surmounted—did not exist for him. Like Byron, Fox had no occasion "to seek admission into what is called the highest circle, but was part of

"it from the first. Instead of being tolerated by fine gentlemen, he was "one of themselves—hand and glove with every noble rake who filled his "pockets from the Exchequer and emptied them over the hazard-table; and "smiled on by all the dowagers and maids of honour as to the state of whose "jointures and complexions our envoy at Florence was kept so regularly "and minutely informed. It would be unchivalrous to revive the personal "history of too many of the fair dames to whom, and about whom, Walpole "indited his letters, even though a century has elapsed since they were laid "elsewhere than in their husbands' family vault. What were the morals of "the bolder sex among Lord Holland's friends may be gathered from the "correspondence of the Earl of March in which a man past forty describes "to a man nearly fifty the life which, without affectation or concealment, was "led by persons high in rank, rich in official employments, well seen at "Court, and to whom every door in Mayfair was as freely open as to young "Lord Hardwicke or old Lord Mansfield."

At the age of sixteen Charles Fox entered Brooks's, and in this club he found himself surrounded with every facility for ruining himself in the "best of company." Brooks's was not political in its origin. In its first list of members, the Duke of Grafton and Lord Weymouth appear side by side with the Dukes of Richmond and Portland. Men who moved in the same social orbit desired to live together more freely than was compatible with the publicity of a coffee-house. The establishment was founded by one Almack, a wine merchant, who was succeeded by Mr. Brooks. The present house was built on the site of the old one in 1778, and not long afterwards Brooks—

> Who, nursed in clubs, disdains a vulgar trade,
> Exults to trust and blushes to be paid—

retired from the management and died poor. In this club dinner it appears was served at half-past four, and the bill brought in at seven. Supper began at eleven, and ended at half-past twelve. In regard to gambling, the club rules laid, practically, no restraints. Mr. Brooks was always at hand with a few hundred guineas, and players were welcome to go on losing as long as their adversaries were willing to trust them. But members of Brooks's, though they may have played more comfortably in the club than elsewhere, did not play for higher stakes. In those days Society was one vast casino. Whenever half-a-dozen people of fashion found themselves together, they began to gamble. Assembled together for music or dancing, or politics, or drinking the waters, the box was sure to be rattling, and the cards were being cut and shuffled. To bet freely and lose handsomely was a sure road into the graces of a fine lady. And the ladies—Mr. Trevelyan styles them "elegant harpies"—were eager to lay blackmail on their friends. "The ladies," wrote Horace Walpole, "game too deep for me." A lady's pin-money might be lost three times over in a single evening. During a long and fierce debate on Wilkes, eight or nine Whig ladies who could not find room in the gallery, played in one of the Speaker's chambers. At Bath there was high play, and no small amount of cheating. The ladies who cheated, however, were less dangerous than the ladies who could not pay. In 1770 Walpole wrote that young men lost five, ten, fifteen thousand pounds in an evening: "Lord Stavordale, not one-and-twenty, lost eleven thousand last Monday, but recovered it by one great hand at hazard." Selwyn, in his senses, cried out bitterly against gambling; "it consumed," he said, "four things—time, health, fortune, and thinking;" and, on being told that a waiter at Arthur's had been arrested for felony, he exclaimed, "What a horrid idea he will give of us to the people in Newgate!"

Of Fox's gambling, and of his debts, much is recorded; but passing

over this portion of the volume, we may quote from Mr. Trevelyan's description of the betting-book at Brooks's:

There exists at Brooks's Club a curious memorial of the society in which Fox lived, and of the constant and minute attention which that society bestowed on his proceedings. . . . .Fifty guineas that Thurlow gets a Tellership of the Exchequer for his son; fifty guineas that Mademoiselle Heinel does not dance at Opera House next winter; fifty guineas that two thousand people were at the Pantheon last evening; fifty guineas that Lord Ilchester gives his first vote in Opposition, and hits eight out of his first ten pheasants; three hundred to fifty from a nobleman, who appreciated the privileges of a bachelor, that the Duke of Devonshire, Lord Cholmondeley, and two given Commoners are married before him; five guineas down to receive a hundred if the Duke of Queensberry dies before half an hour after five in the afternoon of the 27th of June, 1773; a hundred guineas on the Duke of Queensberry's life against Lord Palmerston's; a hundred guineas that Lord Derby does not see the next General Election; and a hundred guineas, between two unusually discreet members of the club, that some one in their eye does not live ten years from the present date. The betting was hottest in war time, and during the period while a notorious criminal remained untried or unhung; for the disciples of George Selwyn were never tired of calculating the chances of people dying elsewhere than in their beds. The old yellow leaves are scored thick with bets that one of the Perreans would be hanged; that neither one of them would be hanged; and that Mrs. Budd would be admitted to bail; that Dr. Dodd would be executed within two months; that he would anticipate the gallows by suicide, and that if he killed himself it would be by pistol, and not by poison. Fitzpatrick, flying at higher game, laid five hundred guineas to ten that none of the Cabinet were beheaded by that day three years; and another gentleman, who believed the melancholy contingency to be not only possible but probable, was free-spoken enough to name his Minister. Still bolder spirits did not shrink from placing their money upon prophecies which the delicacy of a later age has taken effectual care to render illegible.

When Charles Fox first took rank among grown men, the head of the law in England (Chancellor Northington), and the head of the Church in Ireland (Archbishop Stone), were notorious as two among the hardest livers in their respective countries; and such a pre-eminence was then not lightly earned. Philip Francis, who sipped thimblefuls while his friends were draining bumpers, could not always get through an after-dinner sitting without losing his head. Two of his friends finished between them a gallon and a half of Champagne and Burgundy. The lives of such hard drinkers were short; at five-and-thirty a fit of the gout was welcomed, and at seven-and-forty old age was talked of. The pious king, however, set a good example; he would never admit that gout was wholesome: "I prefer eating plain and little," he said, "to growing sickly and infirm." "The habits and morals of the Royal Household," says Mr. Trevelyan, "were those which prevailed rather in the middle than in the upper classes." The first few hundred lines of the "Winter's Evening" show us what was "the aspect of a modest English home, refined by culture, and ennobled "by a religious faith, of which hardly a vestige can be traced in the records "of fashionable and ministerial circles. Cowper has elsewhere left a "reference to the astonishment with which the official world witnessed "the appearance in the midst of such a phenomenon as

"One who wears a coronet and prays

"in the person of Lord Dartmouth. Voltaire, writing in 1766, pronounced "that there was no more religion in Great Britain than the minimum "which was required for party purposes." But then, it is true, as Lord Macaulay pointed out, that Voltaire knew nothing of the grave part of mankind, or of the middle classes; living with the wits and people of fashion during his visit to England, the French infidel was not

likely to see traces of Whitefield and Wesley's labours. As Mr. Trevelyan observes: "There is just as much and as little trace of Christianity in Horace Walpole as in Pliny the younger." The letter in which the great letter-writer describes the first sight of Wesley, "if translated into good Latin, might pass muster as an extract from the familiar correspondence of Gallio."[1]

Private vices were reflected in the conduct of public affairs. Everybody who had influence in Parliament, or in Court, says our author, used it for the expressed and avowed purpose of making or repairing his fortune. Jobbery, corruption, and bribery were rampant. Horace Walpole, whose gains must have amounted to a quarter of a million, describes how his eldest brother was appointed Auditor of the Exchequer, his second brother Clerk of the Pells, and he himself (while still at Eton) Clerk of the Estreats, and ignoring the fleeced taxpayers, speaks of the tenderness of his father! One nobleman had £8,000 a-year as sinecures, and the colonelcies of three regiments; another, as Auditor of the Exchequer, inside which he never looked, had £8,000 a-year in years of peace, and £20,000 in years of war. The lucrative places which a Minister held in his own name formed but a part of the advantages which he made from his position. All services rendered to him were recompensed by inroads on the Exchequer. Lord Holland's recommendation secured for his son's tutor a pension out of the privy purse of £300 a year. Lord Sandwich rewarded with Crown livings the clergyman who wrote his lampoons. Cowper did not exaggerate when he wrote—

> The levée swarms, as if in golden pomp
> Were charactered on every statesman's door,
> "Battered and bankrupt fortunes mended here."

A pension was the resource when every desirable office was filled two deep; and when nothing could be done in England, the pluralist, or sinecurist, could scent a job across the seas. Ireland was the natural prey of the place-hunter; and America for many years was the hospital of England. Mr. Trevelyan's description of Irish and Colonial jobbery is graphic, and contains many telling facts.

The narrative of the proceedings in connection with the petition of certain clergymen praying to be relieved from the burden of subscribing to the Articles is especially interesting; and we should gladly give a few sentences from the fine speech of Burke, exposing the hollowness of the petition, but our space is exhausted, and we must refrain from further quotation.

The Official Report of the Church Congress held at Leicester. Edited by David J. Vaughan, M.A., Honorary Canon of Peterborough, Vicar of St. Martin's, Leicester, and formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. John Hodges. 1881.

THERE are many points in some of the important and interesting subjects brought before us in this volume on which we should gladly touch; but for criticism on the Report of the 1880 Congress the time has passed. We have looked here and there at certain papers and speeches which for

---

[1] "My health advances faster than my amusement. However, I have been at one opera—Mr. Wesley's. They have boys and girls, with charming voices, that sing hymns to Scotch ballad tunes, but so long that one would think they were already in eternity, and knew how much time they had before them. . . . Except a few from curiosity, and some honourable women, the congregation was very mean."

ourselves in Leicester had an especial interest, and, so far as we are able to judge, the reporting was of the best.

We must content ourselves with a few quotations, without comment, from the Paper on "The Internal Unity of the Church," by Dr. Boultbee. Oddly enough, no report of this Paper was last year printed. The explanation of the omission, no doubt, is simply that the Reverend Doctor had only one copy of his Paper, and this entrusted to the Official Reporter, as usual, was somehow mislaid. However this may be, no report of Dr. Boultbee's Paper, we believe, appeared in the London newspapers. The *Guardian* gave a summary, which was transferred to THE CHURCHMAN. It is with pleasure that we quote a few passages from the full report of the Paper. The subject was the "Influence of the Three Great Schools of Thought in the Church of England upon each other, and upon the Church."

Dr. Boultbee employed the terms "High Church," "Broad Church," and not "Low Church," but *Evangelical*. The term which temptingly completes the trio, *Low Church*, he avoided, "because it leads to a his-
"torical fallacy. It is the well-known title of a party of the days of the
"English Revolution, of which Bishop Burnet is the type. Every one
"who has read his Exposition of the Eleventh Article knows that he is
"not an Evangelical."

"The central doctrine of the real Evangelical is the necessity for indi-
"vidual conversion of the heart by a direct operation upon it of the Holy
"Ghost. That operation is not regarded in necessary connection with the
"Sacrament of Baptism. Thereupon follows the justification of the
"sinner by that faith which the Holy Ghost, and not the act of his own
"reason, has imparted."

The influence of one body of Churchmen on another Dr. Boultbee illustrated by the great struggle, thirty or forty years ago, on the Baptismal question.

"In the famous Gorham case, it was attempted by force of law to
"fasten on the Regeneration Clauses of the Service for the baptism of
"infants an absolute, invariable, unconditional meaning. If I have given
"a correct view of the central principle of the Evangelical school it will
"be seen at a glance that this would have been fatal by necessary logical
"consequence to the position which for 300 years they had held in the
"Church of England.

"I want to illustrate from this the influence of repulsion. Thereupon
"grew up in men of the Evangelical school a great, I had almost said
"excessive, caution in their mode of speaking of Baptism. Words which
"to the former generation, to Charles Simeon, or Edward Bickersteth, for
"example, would have been natural, were avoided through fear of being
"misunderstood in the dreaded direction.

"But why need I dwell on this? Reactions, whether political or
"religious, are sufficiently familiar phenomena of thought and movement.
"Principles must abide; but more courtesy does not mean less certainty.

"Surely we may all welcome" says Dr. Boultbee, "an abatement of harsh
"extremes. In Elizabeth's days the Puritans had two leading opponents.
"The vehemence of Whitgift, archbishop though he was, lies hid in moulder-
"ing volumes. The calm judicial defence of Hooker, looking forth over the
"field from the massive entrenchments of solid principles, is studied from
"generation to generation. Something of this moderated tone may
"perhaps now be recognized. I, at least, may not ungracefully acknow-
"ledge a more fair and honourable estimate of the labours of the earlier
"Evangelicals, if not of our living selves, than controversy used to allow
"within our own memory. And if this does not lead to weakness, should
"it not be welcomed? 'The wrath of man worketh not the righteousness
"of God.'

"But I must ask more individual questions. Has the influence of the "Broad Church school done nothing? They will pardon me if I am not "willing to give the palm for exact learning and sound criticism to their "school. But if their principles admit a freer play of criticism on the "sacred page, they must either by attraction or repulsion have drawn "men of other schools to follow or to anticipate them in such studies. "They must have stimulated the more exact, as distinguished from the "more spiritual, study of the Word of God.

"And, somehow, an unspeakable change has come over the great field "of Bible criticism. Look back on the shelves familiar to my youth—the "Patrick, Whitby, Hammond, Scott, Bloomfield, Horne. Look at your "shelves now, groaning under the weight of the most detailed and "elaborate results of vast learning brought to bear on the text, history, "and exegesis of Holy Writ. What the Biblical scholar of the next "generation will have to encounter I tremble to imagine. The load of "sound learning—I say nothing of unsound—becomes too heavy for any "shoulders but those of a giant.

"Who of competent learning will hesitate to recognize a sense of "security, of strengthened faith, as upon the whole resulting from "manifold labours of illustrious scholars of varied schools of thought? "They pass away, that motley array of assailants, rapidly fading into "dim shadows of vanishing human thought. They pass away, mutually "destructive, that Strauss, Renan, Colenso. Their objections fail, their "theories die, but 'The Word of God endureth for ever.'

"Again, doubtless the great High Church school has in our day been "prominent in care for varied acts and forms of outward worship and "organization. I am not speaking of extreme men and extreme practices. "They are out of my subject. I do not regard them as any true portion "of the great historical school which looks back with filial regard to "Sancroft and Ken and their compeers.

"Doubtless he must be blind who does not freely admit the vast "influence in this direction of the High Church school. Yet, were there "time, one might discuss how much may be due to them, and how much "to the spirit of antiquarianism, to the love of artistic conceptions, to the "revived study of music, to the restless power of fashion sweeping away "the mere mobile sections of humanity. But I must pass these and "many more.

"And has no influence gone forth from Evangelical thought and "labour? They look forth over the whole Church, and they think they "see it everywhere. Younger men do not know what the Church of "England was. Fifty years ago, to stand on the platform of a religious "meeting as Evangelicals alone did—to hold cottage meetings—was to "incur obloquy and contempt, if not something more. To sing hymns "instead of Tate and Brady was next door to heresy. To send missionaries "to Africa was blind fanaticism. To encourage the pious laity, men or "women, to speak for their Saviour to the lost ones to whom they could "obtain access was the most censurable irregularity. Extempore prayer "was a mark of virtual dissent. I have lived to see a meeting at Lambeth "of some sixty clergy of all the *three great schools*, and to hear the Primate "call upon members of *each* to address their Father in Heaven without "premeditation, and to hear each in full spiritual harmony calling then "upon Him."

THE MONTH.

ON the second reading of the Land Bill the Government had the large majority of 176. Several Conservatives voted for it. In the South, East, and West of Ireland the outrages grow worse. Mr. Dillon, M.P., and a Roman Catholic Priest, have been arrested under the Coercion Act.

The Bey of Tunis, yielding to an armed force, submitted to the demands of France; and the French Protectorate was quickly established. A feeling of alarm and anger prevails in Italy.

In regard to Mr. Bradlaugh, the Government was once more defeated. After "scenes," Sir Stafford Northcote moved that Mr. Bradlaugh be excluded from the House until his case could be carefully considered.

Mr. Thomas Collins has been returned for Knaresborough.

Not many clergyman probably will regret the rejection of a Bill which, if carried, would have allowed them to sit in the House of Commons.[1]

The Marquis of Salisbury has been chosen to lead the Opposition in the House of Lords.

The Rev. T, P. Dale, Rector of St. Vedast's, was presented to a living in the diocese of Lincoln. The Archdeacon (Kaye) resigned, supposing that he would have to institute Mr. Dale.

---

[1] Professor Thorold Rogers, in supporting the second reading of the Bill, said: "The compact made in 1662, between Lord Clarendon and Archbishop Sheldon, put an end to the powers of the clergy to levy taxes, and from that time forth they had the power to sit in the House of Commons, and, in fact, did sit up till the Act of 1801. That Act was entirely unconstitutional, having been directed, not only against an individual, but against the privileges of a class without the smallest justification. All persons who were liable to be taxed for their lay possessions were in justice and on constitutional grounds eligible to be returned to Parliament if they were untainted by crime and subject to no legal disqualification. The clergy had ceased to be represented for purposes of taxation in Convocation. Mr. Horne Tooke had been a clergyman. He had abandoned his living at an early period, and he took a very active part in politics. He was a very considerable politician, as well as a very considerable scholar, and also a great advocate of constitutional progress and reform. The passing of the Act against him was a scandal, being dictated by antipathy to a single individual. . . . . After emancipation was conceded, the same disabilities as attached to the Anglican clergy were extended to Roman Catholic priests, and he would not have the least objection to see a provision inserted in the present Bill stating that if an Irish constituency elected a Roman Catholic clergyman to that House their choice of such a representative should be respected." The Bill (Clerical Disabilities Act Repeal) was thrown out by 110 to 101.

Undergraduates and others of Christ Church, Oxford, have agreed to support a Mission clergyman in the East of London.

At the Forty-sixth Anniversary of the Church Pastoral Aid Society it was stated that there was a slight improvement in the income of the Society.

At the Annual Meeting of the Church Temperance Society, the Bishop of Chichester spoke of the comprehensive character of the Society.[1] Total abstainers and "moderate drinkers" are working well together in the good cause.

Mr. Grey has described his Church Boards Bill as intended to bring the Church into closer relationship with the people.[2]

At the funeral of Lord Beaconsfield, at Hughenden, the Prince of Wales was present.

On the following Saturday her Majesty the Queen paid a visit to his tomb.

At the Royal Academy banquet Sir Frederick Leighton pronounced an eloquent panegyric on the illustrious Earl, and Mr. Gladstone referred to him as distinguished among distinguished men.

Mr. Miall has passed away. Sometime a Congregational Minister, then editor of the *Nonconformist*, and Member of Parliament, Mr. Miall was for many years the leader of the "Liberation Society."

The York Convocation, in a session of two days, discussed the desirability of a new Ornaments Rubric. The Bishop of Manchester's proposal was adopted unanimously in the Upper House, but rejected by 28 to 26 in the Lower.[3]

The Carlyle controversy continues. In the *Edinburgh Review* Carlyle's complainings are sharply criticized. He had, it is said,

---

[1] Sir Richard Temple referred to India. He said: "The improvement in the army was great, and large numbers had been weaned from intemperance by the opportunities provided in the shape of reading-rooms, &c., for innocent enjoyment, but there were nevertheless hundreds of young soldiers languishing in military prisons in the East through the curse of drinking. On the other hand, 11,000 soldiers belonged to temperance societies, as well as 3,000 of the civil and mercantile community, and although the natives may fear that our vices might spread they know also that all that was best and noblest in England was favourable to temperance."

[2] At the York Convocation a proposition of Archdeacon Prest was agreed to unanimously:—"That this Convocation, fully acknowledging and appreciating the co-operation of the laity, is of opinion that the Church Boards Bill, introduced by Mr. Albert Grey, would in its present form tend to embarrass the work of the Church by placing the control of parochial affairs in the hands of parishioners who might have no real interest in the spiritual welfare of the Church."

[3] *The Spectator* says: "It has often been remarked that the Bishops show to greater advantage in Convocation than the clergy. They .... have a larger grasp of facts; they see more clearly the common-sense side of things; they are not so ready to run their heads against obvious and

"the incurable habit of referring all things to *himself*." "Of the three Apostolic graces or gifts, Faith declined, Hope grew dim, but Charity vanished altogether."

On the 17th the Revised New Testament was published. In Convocation, members of the Lower House being present, the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol presented a report from the Committee appointed May 5, 1870.

We have to record the death of a valued contributor to THE CHURCHMAN, the Rev. Charles John Elliott, Vicar of Winkfield, and Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. Mr. Elliott was an accomplished Hebraist, and a member of the Old Testament Revision Company.[1]

At the Salisbury Diocesan Conference the number of members present was larger than in any previous year—276, of whom 143 were laymen.

On Lord Shaftesbury's eightieth birthday the Ragged School Union presented to him an address and his portrait, in the presence of a large company, at the Guildhall. The chair was taken by the Lord Mayor, who was accompanied by the Sheriffs, and surrounded by many distinguished persons, amongst whom were the Baroness Burdett-Coutts and her husband:

The Earl of Aberdeen moved the first resolution, to the effect that the meeting desired to record its grateful recognition of the distinguished services rendered by the Earl, who, for more than half a century, had devoted his time and talents to improving the condition of the labouring classes, and bringing under humane and Christian influences the neglected and depraved juvenile population of London and other large cities, by which in London alone at least 300,000 of the youth of both sexes had been rescued from the ranks of the criminal and dangerous classes.

The Bishop of Liverpool will hold his first Diocesan Conference in the autumn. The work of Diocesan Conferences has been summarized in a Report of a Committee of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury. Although Diocesan Conferences are of comparatively recent growth, they now exist in all Dioceses except London, Llandaff, and Worcester. In the former Diocese, however, a Conference is to meet in 1882.

---

unmistakable walls. The Convocation of York has lately furnished an instance of this superiority. The Bishops have unanimously declared that, 'In view of the doubtfulness attaching to any and all the interpretations of the Rubric relating to the ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof, as it now stands in the Book of Common Prayer, and of the frequent litigation that has ensued therefrom, it is expedient that the said Rubric be expunged, and that a clear and distinct rule in the matter be established.' The attitude of the twenty-eight clergy who voted against the motion is to us wholly unintelligible."

[1] He had contributed several articles and reviews to this Magazine, in which he took much interest. He recently wrote a paper for "The Communicant," a little book on the Holy Communion. We hope, hereafter, to pay a tribute to his memory in these pages.