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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

DECEMBER, 1882.

ART. I.—STUDY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE IN THE FIFTH CENTURY.

THE treatment of varied readings found in the copies of Holy Scripture, the importance of an accurate text, the interpretation of words and idioms were the care of Augustine in the second book of his "Christian Learning." In the third book he proposes to examine modes of solving the ambiguities of the Bible, which may arise either from the use of words of uncertain meaning, or from figurative language. It will tend to more confidence in our own methods if we discover that no greater certainty, no surer traditional authority were known to the great teacher of the Fifth Century than to ourselves. With yet greater satisfaction we may find that while on the essentials of Christianity there has been little variation, the patient study of devout minds—the cultivation of science and learning—and the teaching of the Holy Spirit through these many centuries, have made the light of the nineteenth century on the sacred page less wavering and more clear and stedfast than that of the fifth.

Following the guidance of our teacher, we are first warned (c. ii. 2) to be careful in matters of punctuation and pronunciation. We are so accustomed to the traditional punctuation of our Authorized Version that its divisions exercise great sway over minds not destitute of some tincture of scholarship, while the ordinary reader is in bondage to chapters and verses and even to commas. Yet, perhaps, most persons who have used Commentaries at all must be aware that many fallacies and many variations lurk round commas and periods. To go no further than the familiar instance in Heb. x. 12, shall we punctuate it thus: "This man after he had offered one sacrifice for sin for ever, sat down on the right hand of God," or thus: "This man

after he had offered one sacrifice for sin, for ever sat down on the right hand of God?" The example Augustine gives is stigmatized by him as a heretical perversion of St. John i. 1. The order of the English words would not permit the arrangement he forbids, but there is nothing in the mere sequence of the Greek and Latin versions to prevent it. It runs thus, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and God was. This Word was in the beginning with God." Our interest in this chiefly lies in the comparison of methods. We should consider the grammatical exigencies of the sentence, the weight to be given to the position of nouns, verbs, and articles, the logical relation of the several words. We should also in differing degrees be influenced by the comment of former ages. To Augustine it is enough to say that the doctrine of the Holy Trinity excludes the punctuation in question. It is obvious that such a mode of arbitration is unsound and fallacious. We must not first settle what are the doctrines of Scripture, and then decide that the reading or the punctuation which to us seems most positively to set forth those doctrines is genuine. The first question is, What is the authentic Scripture? The second question is, What does that Scripture teach? But where no great doctrine is involved Augustine adopts the more grammatical process, which he illustrates from Phil. i. 22–24, where he deduces the right division of the clauses from a consideration of the connecting particles.

Akin to the question of punctuation is that of pronunciation, in cases where a difference of intonation or accent may change the force of a sentence or the meaning of a word. It is curious to observe that the nineteenth century and the fifth are precisely in the same position with respect to the familiar passage, Rom. viii. 33, 34, which is discussed by Augustine under this head. Our Authorized Version and the Revised are agreed in taking the responsive clauses in those verses without an interrogative :—

Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?
It is God that justifieth.
Who is he that condemneth?
It is Christ that died.

But Alford and many others take the responses interrogatively, thus :—

Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?
Shall God who justifies them?
Who is he that condemns them?
Is it Christ who died?

In this question Augustine decides in favour of the interrogative response on the grounds both of doctrine and rhetorical correctness.

In our own day the educated hearer sometimes instinctively says to himself, as he listens to the reader of the lessons, "that man does not know his Greek Testament." In the Latin Church of old there seems to have been yet greater liability to blunder. For example, the reader comes to Ps. cxxxix. 15: "Non est absconditum a te *os* meum. [My bone, English version, *substance*, was not hid from thee.] He is perplexed. There are two Latin words either of which that *os* may be. He must betray by his pronunciation his idea of the word. Either he will read it short, *ŏs, a bone*, or he will read it long, *ōs, a mouth*. Augustine sends him to the Septuagint to learn that the first of these two is right. He adds a curious remark. There was an ancient form *ossum* which in his day had become vulgar. He would prefer the vulgarism *ossum* to the usual form of the word, *os*, if thus the meaning of the passage might escape perversion. Another trap he notes into which the unfortunate Latin reader, unapt in his Greek Testament, has many a time fallen from that day to this. The word *prædico* comes full before him. Alas, there are two of them! There is *prædīco*, I predict, and there is *prædĭco*, I preach or declare. Ignorance is hardly "bliss" to the reader in such a case as this. However, Augustine thinks that either the context or a reference to the original will clear away most of such uncertainties.

Leaving these verbal ambiguities which are discussed, no doubt, often enough in the Bible class, though they have little ground in one who is fairly versed in Hebrew and Greek originals, we are brought (c. v. 9) to more difficult and more important investigations.

The interpretation of the figurative language of Holy Scripture, or the preliminary inquiry whether a figurative meaning may be admitted, presents the most weighty anxieties. Here we are warned of the danger of taking literally that which is meant figuratively. "The letter killeth but the spirit giveth life." "It may well be called the death of the soul," says Augustine:—

> When the understanding which raises it above the brutes is subjected to the flesh by following the letter. If he who hears the word Sabbath can think of nothing beyond the mere weekly recurrence—if he who hears of a sacrifice cannot raise his thoughts beyond the material victim or the presentation of fruits—what a mental servitude is this! What a miserable slavery to take the signs for the realities, and to be unable to lift the mental eye above the corporeal, created thing to drink in the eternal light!

In some sense, doubtless (c. vi. 10), the patriarchs of old were in bondage, having the signs rather than the realities of heavenly things. Still (c. ix. 13), it was a bondage not without

spirituality and freedom, since there was an apprehension of something beyond the sign itself. But since our freedom has been sealed by the resurrection of our Lord we are no longer burdened by the observance of the ancient rites, though their meaning has been opened to us. "But instead of many signs, we have some few, most easy of performance, most august in significance, most holy in observance. These hath the Lord Himself and apostolical discipline delivered to us. Such is the sacrament of baptism, and the celebration of the body and blood of the Lord."

"To take signs for realities, then, is bondage. But to interpret signs unprofitably is to fall into error."

But these are only general remarks. Is the ancient teacher able to give us satisfactory rules for guiding us in the discrimination of a true spiritual interpretation? He thinks he can. Reduced to its elements, his reasoning (c. x. 14, 15, 16) seems to be this: Scripture gives to us precept and doctrine. In doctrine, it "asserts nothing but the Catholic faith," narrating the past, predicting the future, describing the present. But always so as to strengthen love, and to root out lust, to which end all its precepts are directed. Hence, if there be anything in the Word of God which in its literal sense cannot be referred to the verity of the faith, or to that which is moral and honourable in life, we may recognize it as figurative. Augustine forgets not to warn us here that defects of education, evil customs, or erroneous opinions, may so pervert our judgment that we may fail to draw this line truly, taking that to be figurative which is, in fact, literal, simply because it does not harmonize with our own standard. And here, indeed, seems the weakness of this supposed rule. Is it not, after all, rationalistic? Does it not come to this?—The reader of Scripture has the rule of life and doctrine in his mind—by that rule he is to judge the WORD. If the literal sense will agree with that rule, well, if not, a figurative sense must be sought. Scripture needs a sterner, closer, more rigorous treatment than this. It is the WORD of GOD. None but God may judge the things of God. Augustine himself has already in the former chapter given us the only trustworthy criterion (2 c. vi. 8): "The Holy Spirit has so arranged the Scriptures that the obscurity of one passage is explained by the clearness of another." Nor does he fail in the present book (c. xxviii. 39) to draw back from any merely rationalistic method of interpretation:—

> When we have arrived at a meaning [says he] which presents uncertainties not soluble by sure testimonies of Holy Scripture, it remains for reason to do its part in making it clear, even if it be a sense perhaps unknown to the original writer. *But this method is perilous.* We walk much more safely by the divine Scriptures. When we would

search these darkened by metaphor, either that will be brought out which cannot be questioned, or if question arises it will be settled by testimony evolved from the same Scripture.

The diligent searcher into the harmonies of Scripture shall best learn the congruity and usefulness of some literal things at which beforetime he may have stumbled.

In years long afterwards this rule of Augustine, taken apart from the rest of this interesting treatise, was capable of a use which nullified the whole. When "the Catholic Faith," or "the Verity of the Faith," had been confused with the whole mass of mediæval teaching, it would become necessary to pronounce many very direct portions of Scripture figurative, as being opposed to the doctrine of the Schools. It may not be useless to notice in connection with this that little beyond the main doctrines of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation was understood when men spoke of "the Catholic Faith," in the fifth century. That venerable document, the Athanasian Creed, which reflects so strongly Augustine's teaching, illustrates this fact, whether the Creed belong to the fifth or to the eighth century: "This," it says with absolute explicitness, "this is the Catholic Faith." What? Not that which Trent, Augsburg, Geneva or Lambeth may have written. But the great mysteries of the Godhead in its Triune existence, and of God manifest in the flesh. "This is the Catholic Faith." Whatever else that creed may be, it is a perpetual witness to a faith greater and wider than any individual Church alone can ever testify. And when Augustine in this part of his treatise repudiates any interpretation of Scripture that will not cohere with "the Catholic Faith," he is thinking of nothing narrower than this.

The examples by which Augustine illustrates the working of his rule for classifying language as figurative, will not give more confidence in its accurate working than at first sight appeared. It seems rather to evade than to solve difficulties, which, to the modern inquirer, suggest moral hesitations. "Harshness or apparent cruelty in deed or word ascribed in Scripture to God or His saints (c. xi. 17), unless it be plain denunciation against sin, —or things said or done which seem sinful to the unskilled, whether attributed to God or to saintly men, are wholly figurative." It is an answer which would hardly satisfy modern objections to Jael's conduct, that it was simply to be understood as a figure illustrating the necessity for slaying every lust which finds entrance within the heart of a child of God. It would scarcely be admitted that Sisera could be reduced to an abstraction not much more substantial than Giant Despair in Castle Doubting. Nor, again, would Augustine's discussion of

the relations of David to his wives be thought very satisfactory either in detail or in the final result.

But is it not the true explanation of some confusion in this part of the treatise, that the *interpretation* and the *application* of a passage of Scripture are not clearly distinguished? Great strictness in interpretation, great, yet cautious and reverent, freedom in application seem to unite most accurately the varied uses of the Word of God. It has been observed in the former article, on this work of Augustine, how the revulsion from mediæval laxity led our venerable translator Tyndale to demand a close literal understanding of the Word of God. Yet he is careful not to narrow the application. For he tells us when the literal sense has been fully elucidated:—

> Then go we, and as the Scripture borroweth similitudes of worldly things, even so we again borrow similitudes or allegories of the Scripture, and apply them to our purposes: which allegories are no sense of the Scripture, but free things beside the Scripture, and altogether in the liberty of the Spirit. Which allegories I must not make at all the wild adventures, but must keep me within the compass of the faith, and ever apply mine allegory to Christ and to the faith.

It is an acute observation of Waterland,[1] that "They who judge that the Fathers in general do interpret John vi. of the Eucharist, appear not to distinguish between interpreting and applying." On considering the language of Augustine in the passage under review, it may be asked whether the Fathers themselves sufficiently made that distinction. It might also well be asked whether modern preachers are as careful as they ought to be in this matter. It is a very serious thing to assume that our own applications, however Scriptural in themselves, are really the meaning of the passage before us. Carelessness in this important matter may lead on the one hand to corruption of doctrine, as it did in the Middle Ages—or on the other hand it may lead by repulsion to the narrow dictum[2] of the Master of Balliol:—

> It may be laid down that Scripture has one meaning—the meaning which it had to the mind of the prophet or evangelist who first uttered or wrote, to the hearers or readers who first received it.

Bishop Butler,[3] by anticipation, answered this shallow assertion long ago:—

> To say that the Scriptures and the things contained in them can have no other or further meaning, than those persons thought or had who first recited or wrote them; is evidently saying that those persons were the original, proper, and sole authors of those books, *i.e.*, that

[1] "Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist," chap. vi.
[2] "Essays and Reviews," p. 378.
[3] "Analogy," Part II. ch. 7.

they are not inspired; which is absurd, whilst the authority of those books is under examination; *i.e.* till you have determined they are of no divine authority at all. Till this be determined, it must in all reason be supposed, not indeed that they have, for this is taking for granted that they are inspired, but that they may have some further meaning than what the compilers saw or understood.

If an opinion may be ventured on so weighty a subject, and amidst the utterances of great and venerable men, it would be this: Granting that *interpretation*, properly speaking, has often been so unduly stretched as to rob Scripture of the glory of its definite message from God—granting, nevertheless, that the *application* of Scripture seems hardly to recognize bounds, embracing as readily the concerns of the nineteenth as of the first century.—Whence comes this extraordinary fecundity of the Bible? There is no other book or collection of books in the world capable of such wonderful development from year to year, in every language and among every people. Must it not be that it contains, sometimes on the surface, sometimes deeply concealed under the surface, the true principles of human nature and its relations to God and to eternity? If so, the only safe mode of handling a passage must be to penetrate, if we may, to the inner fundamental principle. Then may we safely branch out into the multiform applications to human and divine things, evermore distinguishing the central principle, which is divine, from the human application, which by its diversity shows its capacity of error. This seems to be the real meaning of what Tyndale wrote about one literal meaning of Scripture, as distinguished from Dr. Jowett's cramped limitation. The one sees God, the other sees man in the words. The one meaning of the Infinite Mind may have harmonies running through all the ages. The one meaning of man must find continual boundaries.

These distinctions, and the dangerous consequences of neglecting them, were not present to Augustine. It was enough for him to rejoice in the fruitfulness of Holy Scripture (c. xxvii. 38):—

When from the same words of Scripture, not one but two or more meanings are deduced, even if the meaning of the original writer be undiscovered, there is no danger, if it can be shown from other passages of Holy Scripture that such interpretations are in harmony with the truth. Perhaps the author saw in his own words the meaning we have given to them. Certainly the Spirit of God, Who wrought through him, foresaw that the idea would occur to the reader. Yea, He also provided that it should occur to him since it rests upon the truth. Could divine Providence have made a more abundant and fruitful supply in the Word than that the same passage might be understood in many ways, all approved by the attestation of other words not less divine?

This is pious reflection, but it is not philosophical discrimination, critical accuracy, or theological carefulness.

One more distinction (ch. xvi. 24) requires notice:—

> If a passage be preceptive [says Augustine] forbidding crime or vice, or commanding a useful or beneficent deed, it is not figurative. But if it seem to command a crime or vice, or to forbid an act of utility or beneficence, it is figurative. "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man," saith Christ, "and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." He seems[1] to command a crime or vice. Therefore it is a figure, teaching us that we must have communion with the passion of the Lord, and sweetly and usefully lay up in our memory that His flesh was crucified and wounded for us.

Perhaps, if we believed in transubstantiation, we might manage to put a meaning on these words which should not seem incompatible with our faith. Yet is not the stronghold of that dogma, at least as far as it claims any footing in Scripture, the demand for a literal interpretation of this passage, and of the words of institution: "This is my body?" Yet, says Augustine, of the one before us: "It is figurative, else the thing were a crime. The mental and spiritual fact is that which is intended."

We cannot pause much longer over this discourse on the figurative in Holy Scripture; but in justice to Augustine it must be noted that, while he rather evaded than answered difficulties in the conduct of Old Testament saints, by resolving them into a figurative mist, he was not unconscious that their platform of morality was beneath that of the New Testament standard. He says (c. xxii. 32):—

> Though all, or nearly all, of the actions recorded in the Old Testament are to be taken not only literally but figuratively also, yet with regard to those which are to be read literally, if the actors are praised, while the acts themselves are not in accordance with Christian morality, let the reader strive to understand the figurative instruction, while he avoids the example in his own life. For many things in those days were matters of duty, which would now come of lust only.

How much more profound is the remark of Bishop Butler:[2]—

> I thought proper to say thus much of the few Scripture precepts which require, not vicious actions, but actions which would have been vicious had it not been for such precepts; because they are sometimes weakly urged as immoral, and great weight is laid upon objections drawn from them. But to me there seems no difficulty at all in these

[1] "Facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere: figura est ergo, præcipiens passioni dominiere communicandum, et suaviter atque ubiliter recondendum in memoria quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit."

[2] "Analogy," Part II. ch. ii.

precepts, but what arises from their being offences: *i.e.*, from their being liable to be perverted, as indeed they are, by wicked and designing men, to serve the most horrid purposes; and, perhaps, to mislead the weak and enthusiastic.

Our Lord has given the clue to the right interpretation of these things when he said of a part of the law of the Old Covenant, Moses, "for the hardness of your heart wrote you this precept." Many things of old time were adapted to an immature morality, and an undeveloped civilization. Revelation was *gradually* unfolded in all its parts. The key-note is always the same, but its modulations and harmonies swell upon the ear with even more full and richer chords as the ages pass. How should a full morality, any more than a full theology, stand forth before men until Christ was revealed? They cannot be severed now. They could not have existed before.

The lax ideas of interpretation entertained by Augustine lead to this very limited conclusion (ch. xxiv. 34):—

> The principal matter for investigation is whether the passage be literal or figurative. Once ascertained to be figurative by the rules previously laid down, it is easy to turn it in every direction until we arrive at the true meaning, especially when experience strengthened by practical piety is brought to the task.

Surely our difficulties would begin to be felt most strongly where those of Augustine end. We should be anxious not to import our own ideas into Scripture. We should desire not to deal with it arbitrarily. This, as we have already seen, does not appear to trouble him, provided the meaning may be somehow extracted from the words, and does not run counter to Holy Scripture.

Finally, on a review of the subject, which has been discussed in two numbers of THE CHURCHMAN, can it be said that this great theologian and illustrious Father stood upon a platform of advantage unknown to ourselves? He was nearly 1,500 years nearer the fountain head than ourselves. Had he stronger grounds of certainty, more sure means of information, clearer knowledge of the truth than are open to us? His personal and doctrinal relation to Holy Scripture was manifestly identical with that enjoined in our Sixth Article. If we feel ourselves differing from him in this respect, it is always on a point of detail, never on a fundamental principle. These considerations may be reassuring to some minds, and to all must bring many satisfactory and thankful reflections. Above all we shall feel ourselves in harmony with the venerated author in his closing remarks (ch. xxxvii. 56):—

> Students of these venerable books, who would learn the various kinds of expression in Holy Scripture, together with its usual modes

of utterance, should be warned watchfully to observe and mindfully to remember. But, furthermore, it is above all essential that they should be admonished to pray for the power of understanding. For in these very books, of which they are students, they read that, "the Lord giveth wisdom; out of His mouth cometh knowledge and understanding." The very desire to know His Word, if it be united to piety, they have received from Him.

T. P. BOULTBEE.

ART. II.—THE MOZARABIC RITUAL.

ON the right hand of the west door of the great Gothic cathedral of Toledo stands a small square chapel, presenting, as regards architecture and general decoration, but little to attract the visitor's attention. It is true that it possesses a large fresco, representing various incidents in the Conquest of Oran in 1509, by the celebrated Cardinal Ximenes de Cisneros, which was painted a few years afterwards, in 1514, by a contemporary artist, Juan de Borgoña by name. The merit of the work is not of a very high order; it doubtless represents truthfully the dresses, arms, and accoutrements of the period, and is valuable on this account to the antiquarian as well as to the student of history. But the chief interest of the chapel lies in the fact that it was founded to preserve in all its purity the forms of the Gothic or Mozarabic ritual, which was used by the Mozarabs, or Goths, who, after the conquest of Spain by the Moors, in 711 A.D., agreed to live under Moslem rule, and were allowed to retain their own mode of Christian worship.

Many and various opinions have prevailed as to the origin of the word "Mozarabs," or "Muzarabs," by which name the Gothic Christians, living in subjection to the Moors, were called. Some have derived the term from *Mixti Arabes*, two Latin words signifying a mixture of the two peoples; while others say that *Muza*, in Arabic, means a Christian. Others again have sought for its etymology in the word *Mustarabá*, meaning thereby Arabs who were not so originally, but who, having adopted the Arab mode of life, became Arabs to all intents and purposes.

It will be remembered that, on the overthrow of the Gothic kingdom in Spain, the Christians who escaped the power of the victorious Tarik, took refuge in the secluded cavern of Covadonga in the mountains of the Asturias. They did not, however, all so escape. A considerable number were left behind; and their conquerors, setting an example of toleration, alas! too rare in history, were content only to exact a tribute from them, leaving

them the free exercise of their religion. Thus, during the seven centuries of Arab dominion in Spain, the ancient form of worship, first called the Gothic, and afterwards the Mozarabic ritual, was allowed to continue, and the liberty to use their accustomed rite, was, as may readily be supposed, highly esteemed by the vanquished Christians. But this harmonious state of affairs was not suffered to continue unopposed. The opposition came, however, not from Mahometan Arabs, but, as has often been the case before and since, from fellow Christians, who held substantially the same faith, and only differed with respect to minor details of ritual.

The Popes, annoyed because the form of public worship established at Rome had not been received universally in the western provinces of Europe, had been for some time past endeavouring to establish a perfect uniformity in every part of the Latin world. Early in the tenth century John X. sent a legate to Spain to inquire as to the truth of certain rumours that had reached the Court of Rome, to the effect that the treaty made between the Christians and the Moors had been the cause of introducing into the Gothic ritual variations contrary to the unity of the Faith. But the report made by the Legate on his return proved that the rumours which had been circulated were unfounded, and the Mozarabic "use" was sanctioned and confirmed by the College of Cardinals. In the following century fresh legates arrived, one after the other, with a view to negotiating for the suppression of the national form of worship, but they were forced to return to Rome without attaining the object of their mission. The opposition they encountered was so great that they decided to submit to Pope Alexander II., who now ruled the destinies of the Church, the Mozarabic Missal, Breviary and Liturgy. This was accordingly done, and the Pontiff, acting on a report made to him by the Cardinals he had nominated for that purpose, decided that the Office of the Church of Spain should be neither condemned nor altered in any way. But the popular cause was only destined to enjoy a temporary triumph. The machinations of the Vatican were merely withheld for a time, to be again renewed at a more convenient season.

The Castilians were conspicuous among the inhabitants of Spain for the tenacity with which they clung to their accustomed mode of worship. But in other parts of the country the opposition shown by the people had not been so obstinate, and rulers had less difficulty in bringing their subjects to acquiesce in the Papal views. Arragon and Catalonia yielded at last to the conditions sought to be imposed by the Vatican; and only Navarre and Castile, but especially the latter, were determined in their resistance, and the efforts of the Court of

Rome to carry out its designs in those provinces had been so far fruitless, owing to the resolute attitude assumed by the people.

The haughty Gregory VII. now (eleventh century) ascended the Pontifical throne. No sooner was he seated in the Papal chair then he began to employ all the zeal and energy of his character for the promotion of uniformity of worship in all countries professing Catholicism. He was well aware that in order to do so in Spain, it was necessary to abolish altogether the ancient National "use," in those provinces where it still prevailed, and establish the Roman form in its place. To this end he addressed sundry letters to Sancho V. of Navarre, and to Alfonso VI. of Castile. The latter monarch had married a French princess, Doña Constanza, and both Alfonso and his Queen were eager to satisfy the Pontifical claims, being influenced in that direction by the monks of Cluny, to whom they had handed the control of their consciences. The Romish rite was in consequence introduced into Burgos in the year 1077.

This, however, did not take place without considerable resistance on the part both of clergy and people, so much so that it was decided to submit the question to the *Judicium Dei*, or judgment of God, the favourite method of settling controversies in the Middle Ages. Two knights were chosen, one of whom was to fight for the Roman Liturgy, on behalf of the King and the Pope, the other for the Gothic, on behalf of the clergy and the people. The Mozarabic champion, whose name, Juan Ruiz de las Matanzas, has come down to us, overcame his opponent, and the point at issue was apparently settled in favour of the ancient Liturgy. But in spite of this decisive victory the objectionable rite was forced upon the Burgolese, not, however, without murmurs from the clergy and laity who beheld with dismay their ancient traditions trampled upon and set at nought.

Such was the state of the question when (May 25, 1085) the reconquest of Toledo by Alfonso VI. took place. Soon after this fatal blow to the Arab dominion in Spain, Alfonso, firm in his intention to suppress the national rite, began to use all his endeavours towards promoting the establishment of the Roman form in his newly acquired city. But the difficulties in the way were so great that, contrary to all the rules of chivalry, the matter was, by agreement between the king and the clergy, again submitted to a fresh trial for final decision.

The ordeal this time was to be by fire, and the missals themselves were now to be the champions. An immense pile of wood was built up in the Zocodover, the old Moorish square in the centre of the city, where the Toledan Arabs used in former days to celebrate their victories and triumphs in many a joust

and chivalric encounter. The King, surrounded by the flower of his nobility, and the Queen, attended by her ladies, were present to witness the approaching ceremony. The famous French Archbishop, Don Bernardo, was also there; and crowds of people were collected, anxiously awaiting the issue of the trial. On a signal from the King, the Archbishop placed the two breviaries on the pile, which, on being lighted, was instantly in a blaze. Deep silence prevailed around; nothing was to be heard but the crackling of the wood, and the hissing of the flames. On a sudden, as the story goes, the Gothic missal leaped forth from the blazing pile, and fell intact at the feet of the king—not a leaf being so much as scorched. The Roman book, on the other hand, was reduced to ashes in the fire. The king—so the story continues—arose, and followed by his courtiers, proceeded to his palace—the ancient building constructed by Wamba, and restored by the Arab kings of Toledo. The Queen, the Archbishop, and the other attendants, retired slowly from the scene. Amazement, not unmixed with fear, was depicted on their brows. The people, on the other hand, were elated beyond all bounds. They felt convinced that their cause had carried the day in spite of every obstacle. In this, however, they were mistaken. They had yet to learn that the caprice of a despot is not to be so easily defeated. Although their cause had triumphed, although Heaven seemed to favour the Liturgy they revered, and out of which they taught their children, although, too, the voice of popular indignation reached even the steps of the throne itself, Alfonso VI. was none the less determined to disregard the cherished wishes of his subjects. His recent victories over the Moors had doubtless inspired him with confidence, and he felt no inclination to incur the displeasure of the Papacy, whose support he had secured. He feared also to offend his wife Constanza, and to make enemies of the monks of Cluny, his spiritual advisers. Soon, therefore, after the event above recorded, he issued a decree abolishing the Gothic rite, and substituting the Roman form in its place. Thus, the influence of Rome prevailed. Spain became the chosen son of the Church, and the way was gradually paved for the introduction of the odious Inquisition. An independence which had lasted well-nigh from Apostolic times was lost. The national cult was dead, and Spain sunk eventually into a condition of torpor and inactivity, from which it has only begun to recover in recent years.

Out of this event arose, in that land of proverbs, the famous saying, *Allá van Leyes, donde Quieren Reyes* ("There the laws go, where kings show"), which seems to give utterance, in accents of despair, to the outraged feelings of the people.

The Mozarabic Christians were, however, allowed to retain six

churches in Toledo—viz., St. Eulalia, St. Sebastian, St. Marcos, St. Lucas,[1] St. Justa, and St. Torcato—and large privileges were conceded to them by Alfonso, who seemed thereby to wish to atone to some extent for his despotic conduct. But Time, that devourer of all things, caused the rite to decay, and to lose its importance even in the churches set apart for its celebration. At last a few solemnities were all that remained.

Then it was that Ximenes, who did not wish that this respectable relic of antiquity should be altogether lost, and who perhaps was not sorry to show some sign of spiritual independence of the Vatican, caused the chapel referred to at the beginning of this paper to be founded in the Cathedral of Toledo. He also had the Liturgy printed, and he instituted an order of chaplains for the performance of the service. It is only in this chapel that the ancient rite is now celebrated.

Having thus lightly touched upon the leading events in the history of this curious survival, it only remains to add a few remarks on the Liturgy itself.

Cardinal Ximenes, as has been stated above, caused the Liturgy to be printed; but, as the manuscript he used is considered to have been of a comparatively late date, it is not easy to ascertain now what parts of the service are or are not really ancient. Roman Catholic writers have gone so far as to ascribe this Liturgy to the apostles who converted Spain. But although we may not unreasonably refuse to subscribe to this assumption, its claims to antiquity must be admitted to be considerable. There seems, moreover, good reason to conclude that it was framed originally, whether by one hand or more is uncertain, in independence of the Roman Church. On examination, various points have been discovered closely establishing its connection with the Liturgies of the Oriental Churches.

The Liturgy also contains prayers by Leander, Isidore, Eugenio, Ildefonso, and Julian, famous Visigothic luminaries, which were added when the Gothic king, Recared, and his subjects forsook Arianism and embraced Catholicism.[2]

The service is now but indifferently attended, and has become to all intents and purposes a thing of the past. A Reformed

---

[1] In this church an ancient picture may still be seen representing the trial by fire of the two missals. The Virgin de la Esperanza is depicted as presiding over the ceremony, and a number of cavaliers in Moorish garb are also present.

[2] Those curious in liturgical matters are referred to the following works for full information on the subject:—Migne, vol. lxxxv., "Dictionary of Christian Antiquities;" Palmer's "Origines Liturgicæ;" "Compendio del Toledo en la Mano," by Don Sixto Ramon Parro, as well as the larger work, "Toledo en la Mano," of which the "Compendio" is an abridgment; "Tradiciones de Toledo," by Señor Eugenio de Olavarria y Huarte, &c. &c.

Spanish Church has, however, recently sprung into existence; and the compilers of a new Liturgy, to be used in the service of that Church, have taken the ancient Mozarabic Liturgy as the basis of their operations. Thus, like a phœnix rising from its ashes, the old "use," or at all events some portions of it, may be destined to live on in Spain, and in the great Spanish colony of North America, for some time longer.

F. R. McClintock.

Art. III.—CHURCH COURTS.[1]

THIS subject is emphatically *the* Church subject of the day. Round it all the forces which, now for many years, have been engaged in the great Ritual struggle are collected. Here is the main point of attack and defence at the present time. Much more than a matter of merely historical interest is involved. The union of Church and State, and even our conception of the nature of the Church of England, cannot but be affected most seriously by the settlement of what is the proper constitution of the Ecclesiastical Courts. The magnitude of the issues at stake is pleaded as at once the sole and the sufficient justification for the following pages.

I had no notion, when I prepared the paper which I read at the recent Church Congress, that Canon Trevor, who preceded me on the same subject, intended to occupy the audience with a review of my little book on Church Courts. Had I known this, I should probably have been tempted to take a different course; but, as it was, I thought I should best fulfil my task by trying to bring before the Congress one or two practical matters of common sense rather than controversy, and by repeating in public a suggestion which I had already made as a witness before the Royal Commission, with regard to the revival of the study of English Ecclesiastical Law (not merely Canon Law, as I have been supposed in some quarters to mean) at the Universities. But as it might be assumed that, because I did not reply to Canon Trevor's criticism, no reply was forthcoming, I am anxious, having regard to the importance of the matter, to avail myself of the earliest opportunity of saying what I have to say by way of rejoinder. Indeed, I am not sure that the subject is not more fitly treated in the columns of The Churchman than on a Church Congress platform. I

[1] "Church Courts." A Paper read at the Derby Church Congress, by Canon Trevor, D.D.

confess to a shrewd suspicion that I should not have been allowed to say at Derby what I am going to write in my study-chair. Judging by the treatment accorded to subsequent speakers, I should probably have been howled down. Now, as I do not like being howled at, and do not find that it either stimulates my powers of memory or improves my reasoning faculties, I am not sorry to be amongst my books, where the howls, if there should be any, cannot penetrate, and where I can at least bestow upon the subject the attention it demands.

All who had the fortune to hear Canon Trevor deliver his paper must feel grateful to him for the good fun he was able to extract from a somewhat dry topic; and it is to be regretted that in the newspaper reports many spontaneous sallies, provoked by the enthusiastic applause of the audience, have not found a place. To a comic history of the Ecclesiastical Courts Canon Trevor's paper would form a valuable contribution; and, if he could be prevailed on to complete what he has so worthily begun, he might feel certain that his book would take a high place amongst literature of its class.

I have, however, to look at Canon Trevor's paper from quite a different point of view—to regard it as a serious contribution to the discussion of a serious subject.

Canon Trevor defines my theory thus: "It is for the Church to decree rites and ceremonies; the enforcing of the decree she leaves to the State. She keeps the doctrine in her own hands, and confides the discipline to the Crown." For the purpose of his paper, which only concerns itself with discipline, this is a sufficiently accurate statement of my view; but, to prevent mistake, I desire to point out, in passing, that as to doctrine, Canon Trevor has misunderstood me. The principle which throughout my book I have insisted on is that, while the discipline of the Church is in the keeping of the Crown or State, matters of substance and doctrine are under the *joint* control of Church and State. "The power of *altering* is vested in Church and State jointly; the duty of *maintaining* is vested in the State alone." Canon Trevor only deals with the latter half of this proposition. He denies that the Crown or the State is supreme over the discipline of the Church. Let us examine how he treats the question.

In the first place he does not attempt to deal directly with the evidence on which I ground the proposition in dispute. That evidence is entirely historical, and goes to show that from the Reformation till the present day the State has, in fact, exercised complete control over the discipline of the Church. I gather from Canon Trevor's paper that he does not admit the force of this evidence, but still he does not directly challenge it. I am not surprised, for his method of dealing with Statutes and

other documents and their construction is so novel and peculiar that he probably feels it would not meet with general acceptance. Certain parts of certain Acts of Parliament impress Canon Trevor as of first-rate importance. He forthwith introduces the rule of the Medes and Persians, and these particular enactments become in his eyes unchangeable. Subsequent statutes, no matter how plainly inconsistent with them, have no repealing effect; they are dismissed as "side-winds," and the obvious meaning of their plainest clauses is stigmatized as a "gloss." Of course the difficulty of such a mode of argument consists in selecting the particular laws which we thus dignify. Canon Trevor, as the inventor of this theory, possesses, perhaps, the best right to act as its high priest; and he does so. Thus, 24 Henry VIII., ch. 12, with its "famous preamble," belongs to the Median and Persian variety, while 25 Henry VIII., ch. 19, is only a "side-wind," and its ordinary construction a "gloss." His treatment of these two leading Reformation statutes is so good an illustration of his method that I am tempted into a little more detail. It will be remembered that these two Acts together dealt with appeals. Their short effect, so far as the Courts were concerned, was this (24 Henry VIII., ch. 12): "The Restraint of Appeals" provided that in matrimonial, testamentary, and tithe matters no appeal to Rome should be allowed. All such cases were to go from the Archdeacon to the Bishop, and from the Bishop to the Archbishop, "there to be definitively and finally ordered, decreed, and adjudged according to justice, without any other appellation or provocation to any other person or persons, court or courts." In any matter of the class named "touching the King," the appeal was to be to the Upper House of Convocation. This Act does not affect *spiritual* matters at all. 25 Henry VIII., ch. 19, "The Submission of the Clergy," abolished *all* appeals to Rome, and enacted that *all* matters (using the widest words) were to be dealt with according to the plan laid down in 24 Henry VIII., ch. 12, except that, "for lack of justice," an appeal was to lie from the Archbishop to the King in Chancery (the Court of Delegates). Nothing can be plainer than the combined effect of these provisions. The partial arrangement of 1533 is expanded in 1534, so as to embrace all ecclesiastical matters, and supplemented by the addition of a final appeal to the Crown. This is the common-sense construction of the words used, and this is the construction acted on at the time, and from that time to the present.

Canon Trevor, however, has quite a different view. 24 Henry VIII., ch. 12 (the limited scope of which, by an unfortunate oversight, he misses), defined for all time the course of ecclesiastical appeals and the finality of the Court of the Archbishop. "The right of appealing to the Pope is taken away."

Canon Trevor is so absorbed in that ravishing preamble that he does not notice that by this Act it is only taken away in matrimonial and testamentary and tithe cases. Then he comes to 25 Henry VIII., ch. 19. This statute, curiously enough, is made to have done nothing at all. It cannot undo the work of the former statute, because—I hardly know why—except, indeed, that it is a "side-wind." At any rate, it did "but restore the ancient law of the land as settled by the Constitutions of Clarendon in A.D. 1164." These were not originally Canon Trevor's words, but he has adopted them for a purpose for which they were not intended. It seems odd that the Parliament of Henry VIII. should busy itself, at a time of great change too, in passing Acts merely repeating and emphasizing the laws of Henry II. as to matters in which, according to Canon Trevor, Parliament had no legislative power. But let us recur to these Constitutions of Clarendon. I give the passage in Canon Trevor's words:—"If the Archbishop should be slack in doing justice, resort was "to be had to the King, by whose command the cause was to be "terminated in the Archbishop's Court and proceed no further." This reference by the King to the Archbishop means that "he "may require him to reconsider the case." If we are to read 25 Henry VIII., ch. 19, as equivalent to this, it must mean that the King in Chancery—*i.e.*, the Court of Delegates—could "recon-"sider the case." Accordingly, we are told, "the only change is "that instead of remitting the cause to the Archbishop's Court, "the King is to issue a separate Commission on each appeal to "persons of his own selection." Here Canon Trevor gets into a great difficulty, and pursues two lines of argument mutually destructive. First, he says, "for lack of justice," does not refer to a regular appeal, but to special cases of irregularity. He does not mention the words of the Act giving the Court "full power and authority to hear and definitely determine every such appeal, with the causes and all circumstances concerning the same." We are assured that nothing more was meant than the jurisdiction now exercised by prohibition and *mandamus*. But if that be so, how can 25 Henry VIII., ch. 19, be identical with the Constitutions of Clarendon? According to these Constitutions, when there is a "slackness of justice," the King can have the case determined in the Archbishop's Court, and it is admitted by Canon Trevor that this points to a re-hearing. I suppose to avoid this inconsistency we are presently invited to pursue a different line. The appeal is a real appeal, but the Commissioners, it is found, with the help of the *Reformatio Legum* (quaintly termed a contemporary *exposition*) mean "select Bishops or the Synod." By an amazing effort of historical intuition, Canon Trevor has ascertained that "this was the old practice of the Archbishop's Court." "The Archbishop sat

alone, or with three or four of his co-provincial suffragans; if the case was important enough, he summoned the whole Synod." In fact, the provision about the King in Chancery was a round-about way of referring to the full Court of the Archbishop. But Canon Trevor has surely forgotten that we are considering an appeal from the Archbishop's Court. It is inconceivable that all this elaborate legislation should aim at nothing more than to enable a litigant to appeal from the Archbishop's Court to the same Court again, or, to put it as favourably as possible, to make an appeal to the full Court practicable. Of course, if Canon Trevor's theory of the Provincial Court is correct, no Statute was necessary to enable the full Court to be assembled.

If I have succeeded in making myself intelligible, the absurd contradiction in which Canon Trevor's singular selective method has involved him, ought to be plain. This is the most important example, and it must stand for the rest.

Now let us return to Canon Trevor's criticism of the proposition that the State is supreme over the discipline of the Church. It may, perhaps, strike the reader to inquire why so much trouble is expended in attempting to show that the Reformation Statutes accomplished nothing, but were nearly all "side-winds," merely affirming pre-existing laws. The answer is simple. Canon Trevor has not only to dispose of the Court of Delegates as the Court of Final Appeal, and the immediate ancestor of the Judicial Committee; he has to show that all these Statutes dealing with Courts were nullities, for otherwise, as they were mere Statutes without any ecclesiastical sanction, they would be instances of the very principle he is combating. It is for this purpose that I have relied on them in my book. The only sort of direct answer which Canon Trevor offers to my argument is to minimize the effect of these statutes. Hence his efforts to show that they merely re-stated principles already acknowledged. But even so, he cannot get rid of all of them. His favourite 24 Henry VIII., ch. 12, at any rate accomplished something, so according to one of his two theories of construction did the Act of the next year. It is really amusing to observe how impossible Canon Trevor finds it even in stating his theory not to contradict it. Thus he says, "The Act proceeds to enact that appeals," &c. "The Archbishop's Court is restored to its authority." "The Statute 25 Henry VIII., ch. 19, "did not restore," &c. All which phrases, if they mean anything, mean that by Acts of Parliament the State exercised a control over the Church Courts, and modified their constitution.

But although Canon Trevor fails, and if he will forgive my saying so, fails rather ignominiously over the direct historical evidence, he has another string to his bow. The argument on which he places his principal reliance is this:—He says my

theory of State control over Church discipline cannot be true, because it is inconsistent with the very conception of a Church Court. He adds that this inconsistency is "self-evident," but that is a mere rhetorical expletive, for he proceeds to argue his point with some elaboration. Now what does Canon Trevor mean by a Church Court? I do not think he knows very precisely, for his explanations have a curiously confused tone about them. We are first told.—"A Church Court has no jurisdiction over persons or property; it proceeds *pro salute animæ* by purely spiritual censures; its authority is exhausted in excommunications." If any temporal effect is to follow it must be by the law of the land administered by the "secular arm." Now it is, I should have thought, "self-evident" that such an institution as Canon Trevor describes is no Court at all. The prelate, or his official, may sit in what he pleases to call his Court, fulminating his excommunications against those whom he may suppose to deserve them; but for all practical purposes he is as powerless as John Bunyan's Pope, who sat grinding his teeth and biting the nails at the pilgrims, but was unable to move by reason of the rheumatism and old age. Unless there is some power in the Court to summon persons before it, and some means to compel their attendance, the judicial determination of any question between individuals is impossible. Accordingly Canon Trevor himself admits this a little further on. "The powers of such a Court are twofold—first and principally the spiritual authority of the prelate's office in the Church, and secondly, the legal jurisdiction accorded him by the State." Here we get on to well-known ground. Canon Trevor is only following many high authorities in saying that the Judge of a Church Court exercises two sets of powers, a jurisdiction in *foro conscientiæ*, which he derives from the Church, and a jurisdiction *in foro exteriori*, which he receives from the State. Thus Archbishop Bramhall ("Schism Guarded," chap. ix.):—

> We must know that in Bishops there is a threefold power; the first, of *order*; the second, of *interior* jurisdiction; the third, of *exterior* jurisdiction. The first is referred to the consecrating and administering of the Sacraments; the second to the requirements of Christians in the interior court of conscience; the third to the requirements of Christian people in the exterior Court of the Church.

But let it be understood that a *Church Court* possesses both sets of powers. Canon Trevor would no doubt say that without the first there is no *Church* about it. I say that, without the second, there is no *Court*.

In fact, without the express sanction of the State no Court can exist lawfully. Canon Trevor quotes the Judgment of the Privy Council in the Colenso Case, and certainly it is very

relevant, though not quite in the way he supposes. It will perhaps be remembered, that Bishop Gray's condemnation of Bishop Colenso was declared to be ineffectual because the Letters Patent purporting to give Bishop Gray power to hold a Court were in this respect void.

> No Metropolitan or Bishop in any colony having legislative institutions can by virtue of the Crown's Letters Patent alone (unless granted under an Act of Parliament or confirmed by a Colonial Statute), exercise any coercive jurisdiction, *or hold any Court or Tribunal for that purpose.*

The general principle is thus laid down in the same Judgment:—

> It is a settled constitutional principle or rule of law, that although the Crown may by its prerogative establish Courts to proceed according to the Common Law, yet that it cannot create any new Court to administer any other law; and it is laid down by Lord Coke in the 4th Institute, that the erection of a new Court with a new jurisdiction cannot be without an Act of Parliament.

Archbishop Bramhall, in the work already quoted, asks, "Who can summon another man's subjects to appear when they please, and imprison or punish them for not appearing without his leave?"

We have arrived therefore at this:—Every Church Court exercises some power derived from the State, and no Church Court can exist except by permission of the State. The principle which I have advocated in my book is that the State possesses the right to mould and modify these Church Courts. Canon Trevor is shocked. He says, "This is what modern legislation has brought us to! When I was ordained there was not a single Court, and never had been one answering to any part of this theory." Now I do not forget that the issue between me and Canon Trevor at this moment is not as to facts, but as to whether the nature of a Church Court negatives my theory. I will therefore only observe in passing that to justify Canon Trevor's energetic denial we must leave out of view the Final Court of Appeal (both the Delegates and the Privy Council) and we must ignore the whole body of Acts dealing with Church Courts from the Reformation downwards. But to return. I think Canon Trevor is a little hasty in saying that the principle he disputes is so novel as to have been introduced "within his own recollection." I shall show, I hope clearly, not only that there is no novelty about this theory, but that it was pre-eminently *the* Reformation theory of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and further, that it was held in more recent times by the High Church divines, to whose views those of Canon Trevor correspond.

First, as to the Reformation. Canon Trevor states very glibly, as though he were running over a series of undisputed propositions, the theory of *inner* and *outer* jurisdiction. But I suppose he knows very well that our Reformers did not hold this theory at all. I do not say that it had no supporters amongst the Reformers, but I do most positively affirm that it was not the principle acted on or professed in the Reformation settlement. A very much higher view was taken at that period of the duties and powers of the Crown than is now fashionable amongst High Churchmen. A Christian prince was considered to have the same authority in matters of religion as was exercised by the Jewish kings. He was the source of all rule and jurisdiction in the Church no less than in the State. His functions were distinguished from those of the spiritualty by no refinements about the court of conscience and the external court, but by the broad division of preaching the Word and administration of the Sacraments on the one hand, and all rule and authority on the other. Thus, the 37th Article states the principle in the clearest manner:—

> We give not to our princes the ministering either of God's Word or of the Sacraments, but . . . . that they should *rule* all states and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal.

So anxious were the Reformers to leave no room for question as to their meaning that they took pains to use the very strongest terms to describe the plenitude of the Royal Supremacy. We find the illustration of a fountain continually made use of. All ecclesiastical jurisdiction and authority are said to flow from the Crown as from "one primæval fountain." Thus was it sought to emphasize in words the principle which was certainly adopted in practice. Now it follows, as a matter of course, that if all the powers exercised by the ecclesiastical judges came from the Crown, then the Crown is supreme over the Church Courts, and over the discipline administered by them. Accordingly we find this stated in the most unmistakable manner.

Thus, in 37 Henry VIII., ch. 17, (the Statute which enabled married laymen to be ecclesiastical judges) we find it recited that:—

> Albeit the said (Pontifical) decrees, ordinances, and constitutions . . . . be utterly . . . . abolished, ... yet, because the contrary thereunto is not used nor put in practice by the archbishops, bishops, archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical persons, *who have no manner of jurisdiction ecclesiastical, but by, under, and from your Royal Majesty, etc.*

And then the Statute goes on, without any synodical sanction be it remembered, to alter the status of the ecclesiastical judges.

Again, 1 Ed. VI., ch. 2, enacted that the writs and processes of the Ecclesiastical Courts were to run in the name of the King instead of that of the particular prelate. The preamble states (amongst other things):—

> Seeing . . . . and that all courts ecclesiastical be kept by no other power or authority, either foreign or within the realm, but by the authority of his most excellent Majesty, etc.

I quote this Statute as quite conclusive on the view taken at the time it was passed. Like all the other Reformation Statutes, it was repealed by Queen Mary. When Queen Elizabeth came to the throne it was not revived, not because there was any change of opinion as to the extent of the supremacy, but because it was not considered advisible that the Ecclesiastical Courts should use the Queen's name. We see, therefore, that the theory of which Canon Trevor fancies he remembers the origin, is as old as the Reformation, and was then generally adopted. The ecclesiastical judges, whether prelates or their officials, were regarded as charged by the Crown, with a jurisdiction emanating wholly from the Crown. If we admit the Reformers' view of the source of the powers exercised in Church Courts, Canon Trevor's objection to the principle of State control, that it is contrary to the nature of a Church Court, falls to the ground.

But I do not wish to ignore the fact that although the Reformation theory of spiritual jurisdiction was what I have stated, that theory has not been agreed to by many of the leading Divines of the Church of England in later times. In many respects a great gulf separates the leading Churchmen of the sixteenth century from those of the seventeenth. It is not my business to discuss how this happened, I only know that so it was. I have recently seen this marked change referred to and discussed in a very ably-written and interesting work, entitled "Romanism, Protestanism, Anglicanism."[1] The theory of a Bishop's jurisdiction being of two kinds—the inner, from God, and the outer, from the King—which Canon Trevor makes the basis of his argument, was no doubt held by many of the great Divines of the Stuart period. But admitting this, I do not see how the case against me is much advanced. Canon Trevor seems to think that it is a necessary consequence of the existence of the "inner jurisdiction" that the State cannot have control over the Church Courts. But I think he is again jumping to conclusions too hastily. We have seen that it is admitted that a part of the powers exercised by the Ecclesiastical Court came from the State; and further, that no Court can sit but with

[1] "Romanism, Protestantism, Anglicanism." Kegan Paul & Co. By "Oxoniensis" (a layman).

the sanction of the State. Is it very unreasonable to expect that a tribunal so largely dependent on the State for its existence and its authority should allow the State to make laws and regulations binding upon it? I suppose Canon Trevor will say that it is perfectly unreasonable. He will probably add—he generally does—Erastian. But that is not the view of the very men from whose works he has learnt about the inner and outer jurisdiction. I will quote two.

First. Bishop Saunderson, in his celebrated book on "Episcopacy," p. 31 :—

> That there can be no fear of any danger to arise to the prejudice of the Royal power from the opinion that Bishops are *jure divino*, unless that opinion should be stretched to one of those two constructions, viz., as if it were intended either, 1. That all the Power which bishops have legally exercised in Christian kingdoms did belong to them as of Divine right; or 2. *That Bishops living under Christian Kings might at least exercise so much of their power as is of Divine right after their own pleasure, without, or even against, the King's leave, or without respect to the laws and customs of the realm.* Neither of which is any part of our meaning.

Secondly. Bishop Stillingfleet ("Eccles. Cases," ii. 50) :—

> In the ordinary jurisdiction of bishops, there are two things especially to be distinguished—
>
> I. The original right belonging to their office, which they have from Christ, the Founder and Head of the Church, the Fountain of spiritual jurisdiction.
>
> II. The authority to execute such a jurisdiction within the realm, and the rules and measures of exercising it—which are prescribed by the laws of the land—to transgress the bounds so prescribed is an offence against the Crown and royal dignity.

I think these extracts will be sufficient to satisfy the reader that even adopting Canon Trevor's own theory of episcopal jurisdiction, the inference which he draws from it is not just, at any rate in the opinion of the men whom Canon Trevor professes to follow. The result is that, whether the powers wielded by a Church Court came from one source or two, the State has entire control over its constitution and administration.

I have now answered, to the best of my ability, the main arguments of Canon Trevor's paper. There are many minor matters which I should have liked to notice if I had not already written more than I intended when I began. I can therefore only refer to a few points. Canon Trevor cites from Coke's 4th Institute a passage to the effect that—"certain it is that this kingdom hath been best governed and preserved," when the ecclesiastical and temporal jurisdictions were kept distinct—as though it tended to show the independence of Church Courts. The quotation is altogether irrelevant for this purpose. Coke is

speaking, not of principles, but of actual facts, and he says, what of course is obvious enough, that the two sets of Courts actually existing get on best when they do not meddle with one another. According to Coke's view both are equally the *King's* Courts.

Canon Trevor lays great stress on the supposed similarity of the Judicial Committee to the High Commission Court. But, except for the purpose of raising a cheer, there is nothing in the point. When he says that "the Crown set up a quasi-Papal tribunal in the Court of High Commission," Canon Trevor shows as slight acquaintance with the history of this tribunal as his previous remarks betray with reference to the Privy Council. What are the facts? The High Commission Court was a Parliamentary Court, created under 1 Eliz., ch. 1, sec. 18. It gradually superseded all the regular Ecclesiastical Courts, including the Court of Delegates, and dealt with all Church matters as a court of first instance, the decrees of which were final. The quarrel of the nation with it was not that it unduly exercised the Royal Supremacy. Its parliamentary origin would have been a sufficient answer to such a charge. Coke (4th Inst., 341) argues that the Crown could by virtue of the Supremacy have granted a "Commission of Review" to rehear a case decided by the High Commission. It was the excess of its Parliamentary powers that constituted the offence of the High Commission Court in the eyes of the lawyers, while the people detested its tyrannical procedure and cruel exactions. It will be seen, therefore, that the causes which led to its overthrow were quite distinct from any which may be supposed to apply to the Judicial Committee. It is simply absurd to say that the "precedents" of the latter "are drawn from the illegal and pernicious tyranny of the Tudors and Stuarts in the extinct Court of High Commission."

In the same category of platform garnish I include tall talk about the Inquisition, and maledictions on lawyers. In these latter Canon Trevor's paper is especially rich. "The lawyers not to lose a profitable trade," &c. "It floods the Church with litigation, to the profit of the lawyers and the scandal of religion." "To soothe the bigotry of the lawyers." "Carefully shutting out the lawyers." These are some of the expressions by which Canon Trevor evinces his disapprobation of a profession, the members of which are, I hope, not quite so mischievous and sordid as he thinks. He possesses a happy knack of using strong language effectively, and these illustrations of his wit were most warmly appreciated by his audience; but I do not think I need encumber the pages of THE CHURCHMAN by attempting to reply to, what I trust I may be forgiven for calling, mere sky-rockets.

LEWIS T. DIBDIN.

ART. IV.—TWO YEARS' JOURNEYING IN SOUTH-WEST AFRICA.

IN THE CHURCHMAN of June, 1881, appeared a review of Major Serpa Pinto's work, "How I Crossed Africa." Major Pinto was one of the three officers sent out by the Portuguese Government, with the best wishes of his Majesty the King, Dom Luiz, to explore and survey in the South-west regions of Africa. The gallant Major's comrades were Messrs. Ivens and Capello, officers of the Royal Portuguese Navy. The expedition left Lisbon in July, 1877. The main object, according to the work before us,[1] was a survey of the river Cuango in its bearings with the Zaire and with the Portuguese territories on the West Coast, together with the region which comprises to the S. and S.E. the sources of the rivers Zambese and Cunene, and extends northwards as far as the hydrographic basins of the Cuanza and Cuango. In traversing some 2,500 miles of African soil, Messrs. Ivens and Capello say, they really covered a greater distance than lies upon the direct route between Benguella and Sofala. Although they did not "cross" the continent, they certainly have done good service; they had to make their way through the basin of the Congo, which, according to Mr. Stanley, is the most pestilential region in Africa; and their maps, with astronomical and other tables, supply proof of the thoroughness of their work. They pay a warm tribute to Mr. Stanley, whose descent of the Congo-Zaire relieved them of a dangerous task.

In Benguella, the place where "the illustrious explorer, Cameron, terminated his adventurous journey," the Portuguese explorers finished the organization of their staff. Benguella is a centre of Portuguese authority, and through it is carried on an extensive trade. Its custom-house revenues amount to £25,000. The imports are arms, powder, cotton goods, and other similar products. From the interior are brought in wax, india-rubber, and ivory; also gums, resins, skins, feathers, and fibres. In the streets may be seen, day after day, some four or five hundred Ban-dombes, Bailundes, Bihénos, and Ganguellas; some of these are not much given to trade, but make themselves useful as carriers. The life of a Portuguese merchant in Benguella is a busy one; the caravans which come in, the products that are brought forward, the prices reckoned current, and his negotia-

[1] "From Benguella to the Territory of Yacca. Description of a Journey into Central and West Africa, comprising Narratives, Adventures, and important Surveys of the Sources of the Rivers Cunene, Cubango, Luando, Cuanza, and Cuango, and of great part of the course of the two latter." By B. Capello and R. Ivens. Translated by Alfred Elwes, Ph.D. Two vols. Sampson Low & Co. 1882.

tions with the natives, absorb his time. Now-a-days the "commercial travellers," or *aviados*, are few; the trade is almost exclusively carried on by the natives themselves. The Bihénos are the chief habitués of the market; they are very shrewd, and will haggle for two or three hours with a merchant before they are satisfied with a bargain.[1] They take the European wares into the interior, and barter them at convenient marts, bringing back the produce of remoter regions.

It was November, 1877, when Pinto, Ivens, and Capello, set forth on their two years' wanderings. The long line of carriers who accompanied the Portuguese expedition, men, women, and children, all intoned at the same time the chant of the march, and with a guide at the head, the troop disappeared over the brow of the eastern hills. Thirteen miles from Benguella they made their first halt. A few days further on they were entertained by a Portuguese landowner; in fertile ground cotton flourishes well; there are extensive plantations of sugar-cane, and the production of *aguardente* is large. The women of the Ban-dombes, we read, are generally dirty and repulsive; their hair is surcharged with clay, or rancid butter, and the faces of some are painted with white or red stripes. The Ban-dombes are extremely superstitious; but of real religion, like other tribes, they have no notion.

Quillengues, a division of the vast district of Benguella, is a stopping-place for the caravans; its climate is said to be "bearable." Maize, beans, manioc, potatoes, ground nuts, sugar-cane, melons, &c., all are met with in abundance. Wild beasts commit great havoc among the flocks and herds. Bananas, orange trees, pineapples, and lovely shrubs meet the eye on every side. From this fertile region the travellers, recovered from fever, set forth on January 1st, 1878. One night they were suddenly awakened by a hoarse roaring: there was no mistaking the voice of the king of the forest; a very heavy breathing, however, was heard within their enclosure; and although at first they fancied the intruder was one of the donkeys, it proved to be a huge buffalo, alarmed most likely by the lion's roar. The donkeys, it seems, were a continual cause of trouble and delay. They were wont to flounder in a bog, or jam themselves and their loads between two trees, or rush into standing maize. Of the half-dozen brought from Benguella, five were drowned in crossing streams; and only one reached the Bihé

[1] The following prices are established on the seaboard:—
One pound of ivory (standard), 6*s.* 9*d.*
One pound of wax, clear, 9½*d.*
A quarter-hundredweight of india-rubber, 38*s* 3*d.*
A panther's skin, 9*s.*

country. The carriers, it seems, esteemed roast donkey a delicious dish; they were always pleased when one of the creatures died.

On the 8th the travellers reached the Portuguese settlement at Caconda. The rainy season had now set in; and the first care of the heads of the expedition was to secure shelter. At Caconda, a pleasant place, many Portuguese traders have dwellings. If only connected with Benguella by a regular road, we read, this elevated district would become very prosperous: sugar-cane, cotton, coffee and rice, as well as corn, might easily be raised. At Caconda our authors met with José de Anchieta, the eminent Portuguese naturalist, whose love of science had detained him in Africa for twelve years. To this "modest and untiring" explorer, it may be noted, they dedicate their second volume.

In a trip of thirty miles to the river Cuene, the explorers saw large herds of *galengues* (*Oryx gazella*) with long straight horns; also *palancas*, with enormous curved horns; also buffaloes, deer, and zebras. Lions, panthers, and leopards are frequent; in the Cunene are hippopotami and crocodiles. The stork and the crane were seen, and rats of various species in astonishing quantities.

At Caconda, the leaders of the Portuguese expedition separated. Major Pinto chose a more northward route to the Bihé; at that place the separation of the travellers was final, the gallant Major journeying across the continent to the Indian Ocean, while Messrs Ivens and Capello travelled in a N. E. and N. direction, returning southerly and westerly to the Atlantic. The prime motor of the separation, we read, was the interest of science. It seems to have been a mistake to send out an expedition without a head. Of the Ganguellas, whose territory lies on the route to the Bihé, Messrs. Ivens and Capello write in praise; ingenious workers in iron they easily make or repair locks, bolts, gun-barrels, assagais, knives, hoes, &c.; they are extremely inclined to music. In the Ganguella region the entomological fauna has representatives of almost every species:—

Black ants with large heads and huge mandibles,[1] and others of various shapes, cross one's path in perfect armies, making a special

[1] On p. 82 we read:—"Upon the road we met an enormous column of *bisondes* (black ants), with huge heads shaped like those of a bull-dog, which, as the natives affirmed, were returning from war. These insects fix on their prey with such tenacity that it is only by severing their heads from their bodies that they will let go their hold; they are therefore greatly feared by the natives. . . . . The object of their warlike incursion in the present instance appeared to have been a colony of termites." Long red ants are even more dangerous than the dreaded *bisondes*. On p. 19, vol.ii., we read of a strange species of black ants, nearly half an

whirring or humming sound, like that of the beetle in its flight. Numerous tribes of termites, which the natives style *Sala-lé*, were busy reconstructing their dwellings, recently destroyed by the abundant rains of the season, and literally covering the ground with their vermilion cones. Myriads of gnats, mixed up with butterflies, locusts, and other insects, darted and fluttered through the air in every direction, in company with the small African bees, which were white with the flour of the manioc they had been stealing from the *senzala* hard by.

On the 8th of March the travellers reached the Bihé; they were hospitably entertained by a Portuguese merchant, whose well-cultivated kitchen garden was surrounded by orange, lemon, and citron trees. Of the Bihé and the Bihénos, their account corresponds with that of Pinto (THE CHURCHMAN vol. iv. p. 194).

On the 19th of May the travellers broke up their camp, and on the 10th of July they arrived at Cangombe, were they were received by the great chief N'Dumba Tembo. His Majesty said that he believed the coming of a white man would bring them good fortune: he had told the Bihénos, who came for wax, to request the whites to visit them, but in vain. N'Dumba Tembo promised the carriers which the travellers required; and, after a few days, the expedition was divided into two parts, Ivens travelling on the west bank of the Cuango and Capello on the east. The surveying work was thus more fully done. On October the 18th they were reunited at Cassange, the rendezvous, on the eastern limit of the Portuguese territory.

The climate of Cassange is very unhealthy; and the Ban-gala,[1] although well versed in trade, are warlike and turbulent. Fetishism is supreme. Horrible cruelties are practised, and some of their ceremonies are most revolting. "The fertility of the natives in creating horrors," we read, "is something in-

---

inch in length, which emitted a most pestiferous ("stinking") smell when they were destroyed.

On p. 281 we read of the honey-bird or Indicator (*Cucus indicator* of naturalists) guiding the natives to a store of honey. An ant-hill, the presumed abode of termites, was pointed out; and one of the blacks driving his foot into the mound a swarm of bees immediately issued from the orifice. Burning bundles of dry grass, the natives obtained layers of comb; wax, honey and larvæ disappeared down their voracious jaws. The Indicator did not wait for a share of the plunder.

Mentioning the fondness of the Ban-gala for spirits our travellers write:—"When completing some zoological collections for despatch to Europe, we brought out and put upon our work-table some bottles containing reptiles and other animal specimens preserved in spirit, which owing to the length of time it had been in bottle, was so thick and unsightly that we determined to change it. Two days afterwards, however, noticing a very disagreeable smell, we hunted for the cause, and found, to our astonishment, that one of the bottles was completely dry, two of our fellows, we learned upon inquiry, having sucked out the contents."

credible. One would imagine that they were conceived in a fit of delirium, so foul are they and unnatural."

On the 19th of December, Ivens and Capello set out for the Cuango; and after nine days of fatiguing trial they reached that river, which was bordered by high grass. Their plight was pitiable: weakened and depressed by fever, without shelter, they were exposed to a furious tempest, with torrential rain; the water was soon up to their ankles: at intervals could be heard the beat of a war-drum. After a time they perceived a semicircle of armed natives approaching them. The black hordes brandished their bows and arrows, their assagais—six feet long—and other weapons, the while they kept on shouting with threatening yells. On the opposite bank of the river, also, appeared warriors, so that to advance or retreat was equally difficult. "Let us try and talk to them, senhors," was, plainly enough, the best advice; and an interpreter, waving a piece of gingham as a flag of parley, called out, "Friends, what harm are we doing?" The end of it was, the Sova, taking them to be traders, persisted in his opposition: "No, the whites should not cross the river" (*Cá ná bin-delle ca-pondola ocu-pita*). That most anxious night, wrapped in their dripping coats, the travellers could get but little sleep; in the pestilential air the fever grew worse; and their followers were almost unmanageable through fright.[1] To retreat was the only prudent course; and on Jan. 6, 1879, they again found themselves at "that wretched hole," Cassange.

At Cassange they took six weeks' rest. And here, at the close of their second volume, our sketch of their journeyings must stop. On March 20th they made the fortress of the Duque, where they were cordially received by the Portuguese chefe; on May 25 they reached the extreme limit of the Hungo;[2] on June 9 they reached their extreme northern point, on the border of an arid and silent desert; here they suffered much from lack of food, and decided to return south and west; on

[1] One of their carrier lads, that night, was stung by an immense scorpion, which the travellers caught alive. The repulsive creature belonged to one of the perfectly black varieties, and was nearly four inches long. The poor boy cried out as though, he said, a hundred needles were being driven into his flesh; clutching his wounded arm, he rolled over and over on the ground in agony; after half an hour he felt intense cold, inflammation following. Rejecting the several expedients proposed by the natives, S. Capello made two gashes in the form of a cross, and washed the parts repeatedly with ammonia.

[2] The Ma-hungo men do not plait their hair at all, but either leave the wool alone, or shaving portion of the head, adorn the sides with blue glass beads. They cut away the two front teeth to the gum, and sometimes the two lower ones also. They anoint their bodies with oil and clay. Both men and women smoke incessantly. *Nicotiana tabacum*, with a large lance-shaped leaf, abounds; also another quality. The men of the Hungo—and often the women—take snuff immoderately.

June 27 they again found themselves at the Portuguese outpost, the Duque. On October 11 they made the town of Dondo, and steaming by Cungo they reached Loanda on the 13th.

The story of how they got out of their difficulties on the borders of the desert district is well told.

Somma, an intelligent and active *mu-sumbi*, with three or four more, was instructed to make his way to the south in search of game, or anything else in the shape of food, while José, the guide, was desired to go northwards to see if he could meet with the habitations of man. We ourselves were meanwhile to keep watch and ward with the reserves over our goods, and wait for tidings from the scouts.

When they had departed we set to work to construct an encampment, and scour the neighbourhood in search of edible roots. As the quest was perfectly unsuccessful, we were fain to content ourselves with cold water and such scraps of flour as we could gather from the sack after it was turned inside out like a glove. Then we entered in our diary the laconic phrases which we literally transcribe :—

Portuguese African Expedition.

May 26th, 1879. Page 542.
Aneroid, 2,349ft. Temperature, 84° Fahr.

An awful day. Camped on a mount near the confluence of the Cu-gho and Fortuna. Completely cleared out of provisions. Very down and glumpy. Country deserted. Not a soul yet met with. Hungry, feverish, and sick. Horary for longitude :—

☉ at 2^h = 53,31. H=1^h 50^m 28^s 30^t. Azith.=369,9.
☉ mer.=67,97.

What next? We must wait.

It was the only thing to do, so we did it with resignation, while counting the minutes and listening to catch the slightest sound. But in the immense solitude there reigned a sepulchral silence which we ourselves scarcely ventured to break.

Meanwhile the sun ran his imperturbable course; passed through the stages from brilliant yellow to deep orange, and, nearing the horizon, irradiated the patches of cloud which floated beneath the azure vault of heaven, shot a few grand rays through a rent in the dense vapour, and then, in disappearing, carried with him our last lingering hopes!

"Nothing," we murmured sadly to each other; "otherwise they would have returned."

Night fell, and brought with it increased depression. Extensive fires in the east and the moon, which then rose, seemed to augment the solemnity of the prospect.

Hours passed over, when we were aroused by the report of a gun. It was Somma, with his party; and, shortly after, another report warned us of the arrival of Fortuna. They brought us, unluckily, no comfort; they had found no cultivation, no track, not a vestige of a human thing. The forest, they said, was all around us, but they had sought in vain for a path which could hint of its ever being traversed.

In José, now, lay the sole hope that was left us, and our readers

may believe that we did so with intense anxiety. His route had been northwards, and in that direction we looked and watched.

As early as four in the morning we were on the lookout. We had tried to sleep, but in vain; we had been listening the night through. The morning breeze, as it fanned our fevered temples, was an immense relief; but we were faint and sick for want of sustenance.

The sun reappeared, and lit up all the landscape; but to us it brought little relief as we regarded the worn and haggard looks of our companions in misfortune. As for ourselves, wrapped in our great-coats, seated on the ground, and our backs supported by the open trunks, we wound up our chronometers and recorded the readings of the thermometers, and, having thus performed our duty towards science, restored the instruments to their places, and once more gazed out upon the country.

There was nothing new in it; there was no change from the day before; the same valleys and the same woodland met our eyes, and the same silence reigned over all.

As time sped on, it became urgent upon us, we knew, to take some resolution, to make some effort, unless we intended to wait, with arms folded, for the approach of death by starvation. But what was that resolution, what that effort to be? To return? We were far from any inhabited place; by the road we had come it would take us two long days, and how were they to be got through, fasting, while we had already fasted so long? To go forward? Whither? Amid the frightful obstacles we beheld from our point of observation? And José? Could we, ought we, to abandon him? A thousand times no! Remain we must, and to remain we resolved, further determining to use our efforts to draw fish from the river and to scour the woods in search of game.

The idea was no sooner uttered than it was seized upon with avidity, and once again did the encampment display a semblance of motion. Anything that could serve for a net was hastily rummaged out; lead was cut into little pieces to make small shot for birds; some of the hands set to work to manufacture snares, and parties were in the very act of setting out for the river, when from the forest, in a north-west direction, the report of a couple of guns turned us for the moment into statues!

"It is José!" was the universal cry.

And as we looked, we saw José and his companions emerge from the wood with a firm and elastic step, which was in strong contrast with our own weakness.

From two hunters they found José had obtained, by barter, food sufficient for their present needs; manioc root and dried fish to men who had been next door to starvation was not to be despised; but the supplies were scanty.

The Cuango lay, to a certainty, in an east-north-east direction; and they resolved to push on, at all events, a little farther:—

Ill-luck appeared to pursue us upon this terrible journey, and with cruel irony placed food, so to speak, within our reach only to snatch

it away. As we plodded along, one of the carriers reported that he had seen upon the left, various dark, moving objects, which he took to be *palancas.*

We at once started in search, working round to leeward of the spot, so as to prevent their getting scent of us. In a few minutes we came in sight of them, and could observe their beautiful heads peering between the grass. They were large female antelopes, hornless, with long necks, elegant in shape, with very light and lustrous skins, having the appearance at first sight of a herd of wild asses. On our nearer approach, something caused them to take the alarm, and hesitating for a moment in restless attitude, they darted away with all speed. . . . .

This last misfortune seemed to deprive our crew of what little courage was left them. Ten hours, which appeared as many months in length, had elapsed since we left the banks of the river Fortuna, and still there was no evidence of human habitation. Surely, we thought, one more day of such suffering will decide our fate, and the caravan, already demoralized, must perish of inanition. The very Ban-Sumbi, the most robust of our men, were sinking beneath the strain put upon them, and we expected at any moment they would throw down their loads and refuse to carry them further. The young niggers hobbled along, bent like men; the women, in most instances, overladen with their infants, the perspiration pouring from them as they walked, took every opportunity of stopping by the way, more willing to resign themselves to their fate, if it brought them rest, than to go on seeking for what they deemed undiscoverable. We ourselves, though carrying no loads, did not suffer less than any other of our people. A general debility had taken possession of our entire organism, rendering it difficult for us to stand upright, owing to the indescribable pains in the back and loins.

To dwell at any length on these troubles, say our travellers, must seem to some persons a mistake, and quite undignified. To the man who has never had the misfortune to pass entire days of hunger and thirst with the temperature at 86° of Fahrenheit; who has never suffered from intense fever, aggravated by the anguish of dysentery, the terrible itching caused by parasites; who has never felt the excruciating suffering caused by scorbutic wounds in the legs and feet, so that the pressure of the boot is almost intolerable; the relation of travelling pains and penalties may appear wearisome and undignified. But Mr. Stanley's language about the "tortures" he suffered is not much stronger than that employed by Messrs. Capello and Ivens. Their narrative of the details of their misery at the end of May and beginning of June, is a tissue of suffering from fever, hunger, thirst, and struggles in an "awful desert."

In regard to Missionary work, our travellers quote the remarks of Major Pinto (CHURCHMAN, vol. iv. p. 201). Moreover, they are of opinion that the rivalry of Christian bodies tends to

increase the power of Mohammedanism. They suggest "the establishment of an international Catholic association, which would, by means of a general plan having identical bases, administer spiritual bread to the natives of the dark continent." If the representatives of Christian nations could thus agree to work in harmony, they would be able, these Portuguese travellers believe, to frustrate the efforts of the Arabs.

The region mainly explored by these travellers is, in some respects, one of the most interesting in Africa; its hydrographic system, as many readers of Livingstone's journeys will remember, is extremely complicated. Livingstone, in his first journey, wrote of the bewildering nature of the watershed; a very little, sometimes, would turn an affluent of the Congo into a feeder of the Zambesi.

For many years this region has been a favourite field for German explorers. They have been successful; but in communicating the scientific results of their explorations they did not, so far as we know, write lengthy narratives. In March, 1879, it seems (vol. ii. p. 61) Messrs. Ivens and Capello met Dr. Max Buchner. "We were seated at the entrance of our hut, when there suddenly appeared to our astonished eyes an European gentleman, mounted on an ox, and attended by two or three negroes." Dr. Buchner, a German explorer, introduced himself, and was hospitably entertained.

Art. V.—LITURGICAL IMPROVEMENTS.

LET the Church be careful, lest, while discussing other things of very considerable importance, she omit the practical question of Liturgical alterations and improvements.

This is a practical question, and ought to be dealt with speedily, so far, at least, as relates to the production of more "Offices." The need for additions is great, indeed. No earnest and observing clergyman, who tries to work his parish thoroughly, can be in doubt about it.

To this hour thousands who attend church know not how to find the needful "places" in the Prayer Book. This could be very easily remedied, although never remedied hitherto. Thousands attend church, but their voices are never raised in one act of worship. They appear as if their share of worship consisted in placing their bodies within the walls of a church, while others said or sung whatever was uttered.

The Prayer Book could easily be much enriched, and, by

simplification, also much improved; and, probably, even these things could be secured to a very considerable extent without legislation.

Certainly, the clergy have wisely ceased to regard the Act of Uniformity as the awful bugbear which it was thought to be some fifty years ago, when the very utterance of the term would hush an aspirant into silence, and continue others in the slumber which they loved. The Act of Uniformity may have been necessary in the times when it was passed, and under the sad conditions which suggested it. It has been improved and modified, as everybody knows. But I believe it was never intended to be what of later years it has been made to be—namely, a direful hindrance to any clergyman who simply, in his earnestness, desired to adapt the actions of the Church to the needs of the period.

The old Evangelical of fifty years ago perceived this, and wisely acted accordingly. He was in due time scorned and ridiculed as a law-breaker; but, after a while, the Ritualist and the earnest "High Church" Missioner both found the needs of the case, and appear by their proceedings to have discovered that the old Evangelicals were not so wrong in their instincts as they had been represented to be. Of late years we find celebrations of Holy Communion in which a large portion of that Office is omitted, without consulting law, bishop, or rubric; but it may be presumed that this has been tacitly allowed by the Bishop's perceiving the necessity of the omission under certain circumstances. Yet, if this is allowed, surely the omission of the long introductory portion of the Baptismal Offices may be omitted with at least equal propriety. If, *e.g.*, the public baptism of infants commenced with the third prayer, and were thus shortened about one-third, it could, perhaps, be introduced at the time appointed, although even then it would be abundantly and needlessly long.

As to the *administration* of Holy Communion, it is of great importance to shorten the lengthy period occupied in this part of the Office. They who desire to render the Holy Communion a mere celebration, at which hundreds may worship, while few partake, may see the policy of retaining matters as they are. But they who adhere to Christ's own injunction—"Take, eat, drink ye all of this," and who regard the act of eating and drinking to be just as essential in this sacrament as the *application* of water is in the other, will recognize, on consideration, the importance of the proposal. The number of communicants must increase rapidly everywhere, and it is of high importance to render the service shorter. This is done now by a bold act of omission. It could be done with far greater propriety by a very small change, which involves no principle or doctrine, but which

would hinder all undue lengthening out of the time occupied in the Communion. It is wearisome to many of the communicants, and wearying to the clergyman or clergymen officiating, to repeat two long sentences at the administration of the bread, and two more long sentences at the administration of the cup. If for these were substituted the very words of Holy Writ—"*The Communion of the body of Christ,*" "*The Communion of the blood of Christ,*" this would both shorten the time of administration very sensibly, and would secure the utterance of very comforting truth to every one communicated.

There is happily a revival of the practice of observing New Year's Day, and the Church feast day and the close of the year, with marked solemnity. It would be manifestly a wise thing to provide a suitable Collect for each one of these occasions.

Then, too, a study of the structure of that prayer of which Jesus said, "After this manner pray ye," will reveal that the mode of structure of our Offices should be characterized by Adoration of God, Submission to His Will, and Desire for the advancement of His Kingdom, before any prayer about ourselves.

This is not quite so fully manifest as it ought to be in some particulars. And it would be an effort in the right direction towards this, if at all the great Church Festivals a proper anthem were substituted for the *Venite,* just as is done now at Easter Day. The late Dean of Westminster (Dr. A. P. Stanley) did this (as the Cathedral Psalter testifies), and he claimed that he and any "Ordinary" could do this lawfully.

There is no doubt that the Act of Uniformity never was, and never was intended to be, half so stringent and severe even before modern alterations of it, as certain stiff Churchmen (interpreting everything on Shylock's principle) persuaded themselves and many others it really was. Such modes of interpretation generally end as Shylock's.

What need can there be for the clergy to apply to their Diocesan for leave to substitute other Lessons in place of the ordinary Lessons, or to select special psalms for special occasions, so long as the remarkable note between the two Books of Homilies is extant, and so long as in the Diocese of Lincoln the whole matter is so beautifully managed without this? The truth is that too many are not loyal to their Bishop in this matter, but alter psalms and lessons *without* informing him, on the allegation, when questioned concerning the proceeding, that it was certain the Bishop would not deny them. But there are greater things than all these possible and desirable.

Let any man who has the opportunity go to Antwerp Cathedral, and observe there on every weekday afternoon, the quiet assembling of a number of peasantry in an appointed part of the Cathedral, for private prayer probably, in the beginning, but

not for this only. Wait and watch. A layman comes in and reverently conducts a well-known service there in the Flemish tongue, and in which the people therefore can and do heartily join. Well, we need much lay agency, chiefly by unpaid and educated men, for they will do it best, especially anything inside the church. But we also need the labours of lay agents, paid and unpaid, learned and even unlearned, to do mighty and great works for God outside the building.

All these are wanting, and all can readily be obtained. None certainly ought to be employed within consecrated Church buildings except those who are duly licensed (as sub-deacons or teachers) by the Bishop. Much strife is made by many about the non-imposition of hands when so setting apart these men. But hands are laid on children in confirmation, so that there seems needless alarm in this particular.

But if laymen are to be employed in Church work, even outside the Church building, they greatly need a Book of Offices specially prepared for them and for the object in view, so constructed as to allow a place for brief *extempore* prayer when it seems necessary, and so expressed as to lead on to the higher offices of the Church services within the consecrated building, in the sacraments, prayers, and other offices, as being the ultimate aim, on earth, of all this outside lay agency work.

From lack of these things the Church has suffered. Many of her most devoted members have yearned after them. Will the longing never be supplied?

For forty years and upwards there has been a yearning for an occasional extra Sunday Service. It ought to have been given long ago. But now, before the compilers supply it, let them visit Freibourg, in Baden, on one of the occasional days on which a special service is used there. These are the Epiphany, Corpus Christi, Sunday in the Octave of Corpus Christi, and S. Michael's Day. Let the visitors witness the Service of the Confraternity Sanctissimi Corporis Christi. Let them examine its admirable construction for *united*, *hearty*, *public* worship. Let them hear it, and witness the devotion of which it is capable, and with which it is used. Then let them prayerfully set to work and give the Church here at home a service as equally full of beauty, as it may easily be, but free from idolatry and superstition, and they may rest assured that a great privilege and honour has been conferred upon them.

God grant the Anglican Church such a service as this would then be. It would be a blessing to the nation indeed, and a great power to the Church.

But how large is the work still then remaining! Why should our Sunday Schools continue to be the only organized disorganization in the world? Dame schools, village schools, and every kind of

day school have been shaped into form, wherein now all teaching is given by system, and plan, and with punctuality. But practically in Sunday Schools it is not so. The Church of England Sunday School Institute has done much, and probably will do much more; but Sunday Schools need almost a revolution ere they can meet the double revolution in the day schools of (*a*) omission of distinct and distinctive religious instruction; and (*b*) the introduction of thorough systematic graduated teaching. If this latter were well introduced and used in all our Sunday Schools, and if the lessons were duly examined, with the teachers, by the clergyman some time before they used them, the Sunday School would then take its proper position in the Church. Four, five, or six sets of graduated lessons are needed for every Sunday School. The highest but one of these ought to have for its object to secure a whole year's training for Confirmation. The highest set should be for the confirmed only, and should give some theology and a little Church religious history.

Then Rogation Days ought to be thoroughly revived.

The need of a very carefully constructed Office, to be used at the institution of every minister, is greatly felt, and ought to be without delay provided. It ought to differ in many particulars from any other Office, and the parishioners, led by a layman, ought to take an active part in the conduct of it. In fact, it should be more of a service conducted by the people for their minister than of a service conducted by the minister for his people. Carefully constructed and heartily carried out, it would be the means of at once introducing priest and people to each other in the best way possible.

Family prayers, too, are much needed, *constructed on responsive principles.* Ember seasons need something more than we now have, especially if one day in each were made a quiet day of devotion for a parish, or a deanery, or once annually also at the cathedral of the diocese.

It would be well if the Church would recollect that nearly every phase of schism originated in the earnest pursuit of some important truth which the Church almost failed to exhibit. The pursuit of that one truth may have carried its followers too far; but the Church ought never to have lost the exhibition of any one truth. Amongst these the solemn, silent hour of meditation has been much forgotten, until the Society of Friends restored it, and it would be wise if the Church appointed certain times for meditation within the sacred edifice, with occasional intervals for short exhortations, and prayers, and hymns.

Happily the need of many additional services has been recognized and declared. The Bishop of Norwich may be regarded as a very high authority on the subject. Known, in whatever parish he ever had charge of as its pastor, as amongst the most

diligent, orderly, and methodical of workers and organizers, as well as for the fidelity of his attention to all sorts and conditions of men, and for the faithfulness of his preaching, his opinion as a parish priest ought to be valuable. And when to this is added the experience of a quarter of a century, as a faithful, wise, and most devoted Bishop, the judgment of such a man is worth all respect and attention. And his Lordship's statement is that "many additional services ought to be introduced." Such evidence is simply conclusive. But, as he adds, "The question is, how to do it?" Now, on consideration, it does appear that very many of the things that are wanting, can be provided by the Bishops and Convocation.

Of course, so long as the Convocations of the two Provinces remain separate in every way as they are at present, they will not have much influence, because they will remain powerless for good. And, indeed, unless they unite (in practice, at least), they will hardly continue to exist much longer, although their ceasing to exist would be a great catastrophe. But even if the Houses of Convocation are bent on suicide, or resolved to die of inanition, the Bishops alone can provide a large proportion of the things that are wanting.

There is scarcely one of the things wanted, except the Additional Service for Sunday, which the Church could not secure and use without any reference to Parliament, or infringement of the Act of Uniformity, interpreted not by the Pharisaical spirit of a Shylock, but by the wise and loving mind of a Portia.[1]

[1] I have said very little about alterations in the Book of Common Prayer, and for reasons which I cannot give better than by quoting a declaration which I made at the Church Congress at Derby. It is as follows:—Many years have passed since I endeavoured, so far as my small influence enabled me, to urge upon the Church the importance of making a few alterations in her Book of Common Prayer. I thought that they would have been grateful to some myriads of her children, acceptable to many conscientious Dissenters, thoroughly in accordance with real catholicity, and quite free from the compromise of any one truth. I have now served three apprenticeships in Church Congress, and during that period I have also had the care of three important parishes. The result of the observation, inquiry, and experience of these twenty-one years is, that my judgment, right or wrong, remains unchanged in regard to this subject. I believe, however, that the Church lost a good opportunity some twenty years ago of making a few alterations, which in the present aspect of the times would be quite impossible now. I deeply deplore this, even as some, perhaps many, with equally good faith rejoice at it. But whether we weep or laugh, it seems to me to be beyond question that no changes can now be attempted in the Book of Common Prayer, except only those which adapt the use of the services to the necessities of the present time.

The wants of the Sunday School could all be provided by the Bishops, or through their consultation, arrangement, and approval, within another year.

The like may be said of many special services. No one can hinder the production of a Book of Offices for laymen to use, *outside* the Church at least, even if not *within* it.

Already ministers are instituted in the Diocese of Lichfield by a special service in church, and there is, it is believed, no legal difficulty whatever to the publication and use of a well drawn up service for the purpose. It is high time that these wants were fully supplied; and I will add, in spite of the unpopularity of the proposal, that a Book of Common Praise (a title which I suggested some twenty years ago) were printed for Church use.

If only the Church recognized her high calling by the assertion of holy deeds, and of provisions for the wants of her children, rather than by too much mere declamation about this, and would *act* because she *feels herself to be* the Church Catholic of this land, and would prove her *status* by her *performances*, the day would not be far off when she would be known by her manifested spirit of prayer and praise exhibited in almost every conceivable method, as well as by the chastened purity of all her doctrines.

Men love the term Catholicity. Are we fond of what it really means?

For Catholicity consists not in a cold and strict uniformity, but rather in orthodox varieties gathered up by true charity and bound together in one bond of loving unity.

If the Church of England be the pure, and scriptural, and one true branch in this country, of God's Universal Church on earth, which I confess to believe her to be, she will be very careful not to give one needless cause for schism or disunion, and she will do anything and everything within her power, not involving any true principle, to provide whatsoever Christians need, or can reasonably desire as a means of worship, or as an act of devotional ritual. The sooner the attention of the Church shall be fixed on these subjects, the better will it be for her, and for the well-being of the people.

GEORGE VENABLES.

Great Yarmouth Vicarage,
Nov. 4.

ART. VI.—THE GREAT COMET OF 1882.

THE appearance of a comet like that which made its perihelion passage on the 17th of September last, and is still visible in the south-eastern sky in the early mornings, is a sufficiently rare occurrence to attract the attention even of those who are not systematic observers of the heavens. According to a very high authority on such a subject, the late Sir John Herschell, a "*great* comet hardly occurs on an average more than once in fifteen or twenty years; though," he adds, "as sometimes happens in matters of pure accident, or in the course of chances, it not unfrequently happens (and we have recently had it remarkably exemplified) that two or three great comets follow one another in rapid succession." And so far at least as living memory extends, these words, penned in 1863, will be found in close accordance with the facts. If we exclude from this list (for reasons which will presently appear) the comet which is now visible, there have been only six comets, since the beginning of this century, that can claim to rank as *great* comets—viz., those of 1811, 1835, 1843, 1858, 1861, and 1862. That which will probably be best remembered by the present generation is the comet of 1858 (Donati's), which was so conspicuous an object in the evenings of September and October of that year. There are, however, many still living who can remember the comets of 1843 and 1835, and a few who can recall that of 1811, probably the finest that has appeared withing living memory.

It is not surprising that a phenomenon which occurs so rarely, which is so unlike any of the heavenly bodies with which we are familiar, and which presents so strange and, in many cases, so sublime a spectacle to the eye, should excite universal interest and give rise to many strange speculations and baseless fancies. And accordingly we find that history abounds with accounts of the excitement and alarm produced by the appearance of comets in the early and Middle Ages. For in those days the appearance of a great comet was looked upon in the light of a portent, as a sign of some great change impending in the political world, of the death of a king, the outbreak of a war, or some other event that might seriously affect the destiny of a nation. It is a matter of history that the abdication of the Imperial throne by the Emperor Charles V. was occasioned by the impression produced upon his mind by the great comet of 1556. He regarded the comet as a sign from Heaven, sent to warn him of the approach of death, and of the need of preparation for the eternal state into which he was soon to enter. And it would be easy to adduce other instances

of the same kind, showing the deep impression created by the appearance of a great comet in early times.

Thanks to the spread of truer views of the nature of the material universe, and of the relation in which man stands to the Creator and Governor of that Universe, the appearance of a comet is no longer the occasion of superstitious fears of this kind. But the spread of knowledge, while it has thus removed one cause of fear, has tended, at least in the case of those who are imperfectly informed on such subjects, to inspire another. It has relieved men's minds of the superstitious dread occasioned by the appearance of a comet in former times by showing them that a comet is after all only a member, a very erratic member it is true, but still a member of the great solar system, governed by the same general laws as the planets and their satellites, and moving in an orbit which, when once its elements have been satisfactorily determined, may be computed with almost as perfect accuracy as that of the earth itself. While doing this, however, it has at the same time suggested another cause of fear by indicating certain consequences of a physical kind which might result from the collision of one of these erratic bodies with our earth, or with the Sun. When, in the year 1832, it was announced that a comet would actually cross the earth's orbit, and that at a point not far from where the earth would be passing at the time, something like a panic seized upon the public mind, and though it soon became known that the earth would pass the point indicated a full month before the comet would reach it, it was by no means an easy task to allay the apprehensions that had been aroused, and it is said that not a few persons actually died of terror.

As there is no suggestion that the comet with which we are now concerned is likely ever to come into contact with our earth, we need not speculate upon the consequences of such a collision, though it may be reassuring to those who have any misgivings on the subject to know that in the opinion of Sir John Herschell, "had a meeting taken place, from what we know of comets, it is most probable that no harm would have happened, and that nobody would have known anything about it." But *there are* reasons, and very strong reasons, for supposing that the comet which is now visible will ere long come into collision with the sun: and it will be the object of the present article to explain, as briefly as may be, 1st, What are the grounds for believing that this will take place; and, 2nd, What consequences, if any, affecting our earth are likely to result from it.

(1.) The grounds for believing that the comet which recently made its perihelion passage will before long fall, or be drawn into the sun, though resting on abstruse and elaborate calcula-

tions, are in themselves so simple that I do not despair of making this plain to the least scientific of my readers.

Mention has already been made of the great comet of 1843. It was remarkable for the immense length of its tail, which extended from the horizon to the zenith, or halfway across the sky. But it was also remarkable for the exceeding closeness of its approach to the sun, its distance, when at its perihelion, or nearest point, being less than a tenth of the sun's diameter. Now, the first thing that is done by astronomers on the appearance of a new comet is to compute its elements, as they are called, or, speaking unscientifically, to determine from actual observation all the particulars of its position and movements in the heavens which are required to enable them to calculate its orbit and the probable time of its return. The next thing is to search the records of former comets, in order to ascertain whether the elements of the new comet are the same as those of any that has already appeared, in which case it may be assumed to be a reappearance of that comet. When, then, the elements of the comet of 1843 had been satisfactorily determined, and were compared with those of previous comets, they were found to bear a striking resemblance to those of a comet which had been observed in 1668, and though its identity was not regarded as a certainty, "there was considerable reason" (to quote again from Sir John Herschell) "to believe that it was a reappearance of that comet."

This would give it a period of 175 years—viz., from 1668 to 1843. But, strange to say, in the year 1880, or after an interval of only thirty-seven years, a comet appeared which, from observations taken in the southern hemisphere, was found to have almost precisely the same elements as the great comet of 1668 and 1843, and, stranger still, when after another interval of only two years the comet which is now visible presented itself, its elements were found to so closely resemble those of the last-mentioned comet, that its identity with it may be considered as practically established.

Assuming, then, as there seems every reason to do, that the comets of 1843, 1880, and 1882 were not separate and independent comets, as at first supposed, but reappearances of one and the same comet, how are we to account for the rapid shortening of its period from 175 years on its first reappearance to thirty-seven years on its second and two years on its third return? There appear to be only two ways in which such a contraction of the comet's orbit can be explained. It might have been caused by the comet's having come within the sphere of attraction of one of the planets, as was the case with Lexell's comet, which was completely diverted from its original orbit and started in an entirely new track while passing near the planet Jupiter; or it might have been brought

about by the retardation of its velocity occasioned by some resisting medium. As it is known that the comet with which we are now concerned does not pass near to any of the planets at any point in its orbit, the former explanation will not apply in the present case, and there seems no escape from the conclusion, with which all the facts agree, that the shortening of the comet's period has been brought about by the resistance it has encountered from the solar atmosphere in passing so near to the sun's surface. But this process is one which tends to repeat itself, and that with constantly-increasing rapidity. An astronomer who has given some special study to the history of this comet, Mr. R. A. Proctor, calculates that its next return may be expected in the course of a few months, and, if so, the time of its final absorption into the sun cannot be very far off.

(2.) And now let us consider, so far as the space at my disposal will allow of our doing so, what are the probable consequences of such a catastrophe. Two widely divergent opinions have been held on this subject, dependent on the views that have been entertained as to the nature and constitution of a comet's mass.

Sir Isaac Newton, who, in accordance with the prevailing views of his time, supposed that a comet was composed of solid matter, was firmly convinced that the collision of a comet with the sun would produce a conflagration such as would inevitably destroy our earth and the whole solar system. Speaking with reference to the comet which bears his name, he said: "I cannot say when the comet of 1680 will fall into the sun, possibly after five or six revolutions; but whenever that time shall arrive, the heat of the sun will be raised by it to such a point that our globe will be burnt, and all the animals upon it will perish." And if the body of a comet was, as he supposed it to be, "solid, compact, fixed, and durable, like the bodies of the planets," there can be no doubt that such would be the case. Sir John Herschell, on the other hand, who believed a comet to consist of matter in a state of almost infinite extension, or attenuation, held the opinion, as we have said, that the collision of a comet with the sun would produce either no perceptible effects at all, or effects so insignificant as not to be worth considering.

According to our present knowledge, the truth would seem to lie somewhere between the two views. There can be no doubt that Sir Isaac Newton was mistaken in his notion as to the solid nature of the material of a comet. On the other hand there can be as little doubt that Sir John Herschell, though nearer the truth, somewhat overstated the case in the opposite direction, when he hazarded the assertion that the whole mass of a great comet might possibly not weigh more than a few ounces. For however attenuated may be the material of a comet's tail, there

is reason to suppose that the nucleus is composed, if not of solid matter, at any rate of matter in a state of considerable condensation. Nor have we altogether got rid of a comet when we have disposed of its nucleus and its tail. We know that many, if not all, comets are followed by trains of meteoric matter, for it is the collision of portions of this meteoric matter with our atmosphere, that gives rise to the phenomena of shooting or falling stars as often as the earth passes through a part of its orbit which is intersected by the orbit of a comet, at or near the time when the comet's train is going by. And if we grant for the sake of argument that the effect of the rush of the comet's tail into the sun, even at the enormous velocity possessed by it at its perihelion passage, would be insignificant, we can hardly suppose that the impact of the nucleus of the comet as it plunges deeper and deeper into the sun's surface at each successive approach, and that of the meteoric train, can fail to have some effect in raising the temperature of the sun. For heat, according to the well-known definition, is only "a mode of motion." In other words, the sudden arresting of a mass in rapid motion develops an amount of heat proportioned to the velocity with which it is moving. And if a few scattered particles of a comet's train, entering our atmosphere with a velocity of thirty or forty miles in a second, develop sufficient heat to cause a blaze of light that will illumine the whole landscape on a dark night, and that has been known in some cases even to outshine the sun at noonday, what must be the effect produced by the nucleus of a comet (that of Donati's comet was estimated to be 1,600 miles in diameter) or by the whole mass of its train plunging into the sun with a velocity of more than 300 miles in a second? The answer to this question would involve considerations which would lead me far beyond the scope of the present article, and indeed the problem is too complicated to be disposed of in a few concluding sentences, even if we had the materials—which we have not—for arriving at a complete and satisfactory solution.

G. T. Ryves.

ON "THE CLAIMS OF THE CONVOCATIONS OF THE CLERGY."

To the Editor of The Churchman.

Sir,—I have considered the answer which Dr. Hayman has done me the honour to make, in your number for November, to my article on the Claims of the Convocations of the Clergy, which appeared in your numbers of July, August, and September.

I hope that my reply will not be much longer than the answer.

The proposition upon which Dr. Hayman and I are at issue is more fully expressed in the language I used in the July number (p. 294) than in the passage which he has quoted from the September number (p. 440). In the former, I said that the establishment of Queen Elizabeth's Liturgy—

> was the declaration of the great constitutional principle, that the nation has a right to prescribe for itself whatever system of public worship it shall think fit, and whatever forms of prayer, and ceremonies of devotion, it shall think proper to use, by whomsoever composed; and that that right may be so exercised by the nation, without the assistance of either of the two provincial Convocations of the clergy, or of any other clerical co-operation whatever; and even in direct opposition to all the bishops of the realm for the time being, and, therefore, necessarily in opposition to the Convocations of which they form essential component parts, without whom the Convocations themselves could not be constituted.

I had also said in July (pp. 293-4), that the power of Parliament was absolute, subject only to the moral limit which I mentioned; and that absolute power must reside somewhere; and I had afterwards (p. 297) quoted Blackstone, to show that it is one of our strongest constitutional principles, that Parliament is uncontrollable; but that it would not be so, if the Convocations could control it.

Dr. Hayman calls these statements a "novel theory" (p. 152).

He does not dispute the fact that all the bishops did oppose the Elizabethan statute; nor does he, *in terms*, resist the irresistible inference, that that opposition proved that the statute *must* have been passed without the assent of either of the Convocations. Later on, however, he adduces a document to show that "Convocation" did, in fact, assent to the statute. The effect of this document, and of some further evidence of my own, as to the fact of this assent, will be discussed hereafter.

In the meantime, Dr. Hayman says (p. 152):—

> The Elizabethan statute, upon which this novel theory is wholly built, was, *if* enacted without the consent of Convocation, utterly without justification in precedent; and, so far from striking the key-note of the constitutional doctrine on the subject, was, *if* passed under the conditions represented, wholly unconstitutional.

The two "ifs" are italicized by me. He afterwards[1] says the Elizabethan statute—

> is doubly invalid; once, as a temporal statute, because it had not the support of the spiritual peers; and again, because it deals with matter with which it was, by every precedent, unconstitutional to meddle, without the Convocations having previously advised.

I had cited a passage from Blackstone,[2] to show that a statute will be both constitutional and valid, although all the Lords Spiritual dissented from it. Sir Edward Coke and Selden, whom Blackstone quotes, had said the same thing before, and had cited several instances to prove it. The *dissent* of the Lords Spiritual necessarily involves the *non-assent* of the Convocations, as already explained.[3]

It is impossible for any lawyer of experience to treat as an open question the constitutionality or validity of a statute which has been the foundation of the public worship of the nation for 323 years; having been continued in force by our present Act of Uniformity.

---

[1] P. 154. [2] Sept. p. 439, 1 Blackst. Com. 156. [3] Sept. p. 439.

A "justification in precedent" is never essential to any statute; although the existence or non-existence of precedent may influence the members of the Legislature in passing it, or in declining to pass it. When passed, it *makes* a precedent, if there was none before.

It is, therefore, perfectly "constitutional" to avoid going back beyond the Elizabethan Act of Uniformity: and if that Act was really novel, it becomes confusing, as well as unnecessary, to go back to earlier times.

A proof of the confusion, as well as of the needlessness, of so going back, is afforded by the evidence of earlier times, which Dr. Hayman adduces to show want of precedent and unconstitutionality.

Dr. Hayman seems even to deny that Parliament is absolute; because he says (p. 151) that—

no such notion as that of investing Parliament with the absolute power of Church legislation was present to the mind of Henry VIII. and his advisers;

and afterwards (p. 152) he uses the expression:—

If the absolutism of Parliament is a true doctrine.

Are we, at this day, to justify disobedience to an Act of Parliament, because Henry VIII. or his advisers would not have proposed it? Or because it is contrary to what Dr. Hayman elsewhere describes (p. 152) as—

Some other *dicta* of King Henry the Eighth?

Dr. Hayman refers (p. 151–2) to a case, as proving, in effect, that the absolutism of Parliament is not a true doctrine. It is that of the authority given, by the Act of Submission, 25 Henry VIII., cap. 19, to thirty-two Commissioners, half clerical, half lay, and continued afterwards for a time, to sort out the existing ecclesiastical laws, by retaining some, and rejecting others; and then, to the king, to assent to the result of their work; whereupon, the retained parts only were, thenceforth, to be in force, and the rejected parts were to be treated as repealed. This royal assent was never given; but Dr. Hayman thinks it clear that, if given, it would have been a making of law *by the King himself or the Commissioners*, and not by Parliament; whereas the contrary would have been the legal effect, because it is a fundamental legal principle, that the execution of a power derives its force, not from the person or persons executing it, but from the instrument creating it;—in this case the Act of Parliament.[1] Besides which, the effect of the king's assent was to be, not to make any new laws, but to confirm the rejection of old ones.

When Dr. Hayman proceeds to the evidence of the necessity of convocational concurrence in church legislation, he relies strongly on recitals and preambles to several old Acts of Parliament. Such recitals, in *any* Acts, are no further important, than as they show the meaning of the words in which Parliament has legislated. In *old* Acts, they are often inaccurate, and, often, mere *flourishes* of language, which, if taken apart from the object to which they related, might be made to prove anything and everything. Their use is never extended, at the utmost, beyond the general objects of the *enacting* parts of the statute in which they are found.

An instance of this is afforded by the Act 24 Henry VIII., c. 12, which Dr. Hayman mentions (p. 151) preventing appeals to Rome, in four sets of causes; which became of little importance in the very next

[1] See Sugden (Lord St. Leonards) on Powers, *passim*.

year, when, by Statute 25 Henry VIII., c. 19, *all* appeals were taken away from Rome. The four sets of causes were Tithes, Oblations, Wills, and Matrimony. The only object of the flourish of language in the first of them, was to gratify the "Spiritualty," by telling them, or rather by making the Lords Spiritual say of themselves, that they were as competent for the final determination of such causes as the Pope could be.

Of a similar kind is the parenthetical expression, upon which Dr. Hayman relies (p. 153) in the present Act of Uniformity (1662), that the Prayer Book of Elizabeth was "compiled by the Reverend Bishops and Clergy." It is needless to inquire whether this is strictly accurate; for it amounts only to a passing eulogium upon the Book of Elizabeth; and its practical bearing, if any, is only a justification of Parliament's choice, in substituting that Book for other Service Books of a different tendency, *which had also been adopted by Bishops and Clergy*—namely, the Roman Catholic "Uses" of the time of Henry VIII., which were then in force; having been revived, as from the 20th of December, 1553, by the Statute of 1 Mary, session ii. chapter 2.

Even the notorious Statute of 32 Henry VIII., c. 26, always considered personal to him, by which he was empowered to declare, of his own will, provided he had certain assents—not necessarily of "Convocation," as will be shown—what religious doctrines were to be "believed, declared, and obeyed," seems to Dr. Hayman (p. 153) to contain a constitutional principle, valuable for use at this day; for he treats it as evidence of the general law of the land, existing *before* that time, instead of evidence of the violent character of Henry VIII., for he says that—

> This right of the Spiritualty, here so plainly set forth, remained intact up to 1540, as this Act shows; [and] it is incumbent on the opponent to show when they lost it, so as to create a new point of departure in 1559. This has not been done, and I believe cannot be done.[1]

The authority given to Henry VIII. by this Act is more arbitrary than Dr. Hayman states it to be, for the only concurrence made necessary was that of "the said archbishops, bishops, and doctors, now appointed, *or other persons hereafter to be appointed*, by his royal majesty, or *else* by the whole clergy of England," which latter is a body evidently too large to ascertain the concurrence of.

Dr. Hayman finds,[2] in an Act of 1540, 32 Henry VIII., c. 25. the expression "to *make* a synod universal of the realm," and says that these words show that I "flatly contradicted" this Act, when I asked, What is "the sacred synod of this nation?;" and when I added that this nation had had no such synod since the days when Papal Legates were allowed to hold councils here, and that the English Constitution, *since the Papal power in England ceased*, knows only one national synod—namely Parliament.

Dr. Hayman makes out the supposed contradiction, by saying, that the Papal power "ceased, in England, by the successive statutes of 1529–34—this was six years later, 1540."[3]

The Papal power was, certainly, *interrupted* by the statutes of 1529–34; but it did not *cease*, until after the accession of Elizabeth. It was never greater, in England, so far as the law was concerned, than when Queen Mary and Cardinal Pole died on the same day, the 17th of November, 1558.

In Pole's character of Legate *à latere*, he held one or more Legatine Councils in England, particularly one held by Royal Licence, on the 2nd

---

[1] P. 153. [2] P. 153. [3] P. 153.

of December, 1555, and several subsequent days:[1] and on turning to the records of the Upper House of the Canterbury Convocation, in 1555, it will be seen that a summons for a Legatine Council superseded the appointed meetings by prorogation of the Provincial Convocations of the Clergy: for the Canterbury Convocation had been prorogued to the 15th of November; and the record says that before that time had approached, Cardinal Pole summoned both Provinces (*utramque provinciam*) to a Legatine Synod, to be held on the 2nd of December.[2] The Act of Submission of the Clergy, 25 Henry 8, c. 19, had then been repealed.

Dr. Hayman adduces no instance of a "Sacred Synod of this nation" having been held after Cardinal Pole's time; and therefore my original statement would be unaffected by showing (if it could have been shown) that there had been such a Synod in 1540; but it is a great object with Dr. Hayman to prove that the present ecclesiastical system is *not* that of Elizabeth, but that of Henry VIII.: and, for that purpose, he adduces (p. 153) the instance of the dissolution of the marriage of Anne of Cleves, on which occasion he finds, in the Act of Parliament for that purpose, 32 Henry VIII. c. 25, the expression above mentioned, "to *make* a Synod Universal of this Realm." That expression is used, not by the Act of Parliament itself, but by the two Archbishops, when they made a report to the King, which the Act sets forth, of the result of a reference made to them and all the other Prelates, *and the whole clergy of both provinces;* which result was, that they had determined that he had never been lawfully married to Anne of Cleves; whereupon the Act dissolved the marriage. The report recites the terms of the reference; upon reading which, it will be seen that *it was not a reference to either or both of the Convocations*, but to the whole clergy of both Provinces; a special reference, which the Archbishops say that they have acted upon, so as "*to make* a synod universal of the realm;" an assembly meeting for that special purpose only, and not being, then, or afterwards, either or both of the two established Provincial Convocations of the Clergy of the Realm.

It is always to be remembered, *that the Church Legislation of Henry VIII.'s time*, so far as it is now in force, *derives its force* not from its original enactment, but *from its renewal in Elizabeth's time*, before which it had been wholly swept away.

Dr. Hayman says (p. 152) that he passes over "the Philip and Mary period." But that must not be; for the church-legislation of that period was much promoted by the Convocation of Canterbury; and the results of that legislation had a great influence upon the passing of the Uniformity Act of Elizabeth.

The session of Parliament convened for the reconciliation of England to Rome met on the 12th of November, 1554, and continued till the 16th of January, 1555 (N.S.).[3] In the course of that session, the Lower House of Canterbury presented a petition to the Bishops, in which, among other things, they prayed as follows:—

> And that the *Bishops and other Ordinaries* may, with better speed, root up all such pernicious doctrine, and the auctors thereof, we desire that the statutes made anno quinto of Richard II., anno secundo of Henry IV., and anno secundo of Henry V., against heretics, Lollards, and false preachers, may be, by your industrious suit, revived, and put in force, as shall be thought convenient, and, generally, that *all bishops and other ecclesiastical ordinaries* may be restored *to*

---

[1] See Wilkins's "Concilia," vol. iv. p. 130, &c.
[2] See Cardwell's "Synodalia," ii. 445.
[3] See the Heading of the Statutes in the Record Commis. Ed. 1819.

their pristine jurisdiction, against heretics, schismatics, and their fautors, in as large and ample manner, as they were in *the first year of King Henry VIII.*[1]

In accordance with this "desire," the Convocation of Canterbury, as *a whole*, petitioned the King and Queen, that the Bishops' former jurisdiction, which had been abrogated, might be revived; which unquestionably meant the same jurisdiction as the Lower House's petition had desired; because the ordinary jurisdiction of the Bishops' Courts had not been taken away. The Convocation, by the same petition, asked that, for the sake of peace, it might be left to the arbitrament of the Cardinal Legate *à latere* (Pole) to confirm the grantees of the spoils of the monasteries in their possessions; a condition obviously meant to propitiate the lay Lords in Parliament, in favour of the revival, just asked for, of the old statutes of heresy. This Convocational Petition is fully set out in the Reconciliation Act, 1 and 2 Philip and Mary, c. 8; and it may also be read in Cardwell's "Synodalia."[2]

The revival of the three old statutes of heresy was accordingly made, as from the 20th of January, 1555 (N.S.) "for ever," by stat. 1 and 2 Philip and Mary, c. 6; and the confirmation of lay rights to monastic spoils was embodied in the Reconciliation Act, 1 and 2 Philip and Mary, c. 8. The respective positions of chapters 6 and 8, on the Roll, are unimportant; as, in those days, and long afterwards, the practice was for all chapters of a statute to receive the royal assent at one time—the end of the session.

Of these three old heresy statutes, thus revived, the first and third had been used as auxiliary to the second. They related to the detection and imprisonment of heretics; but the second—viz., 2 Henry IV. c. 15, prescribed the mode of trial and punishment. That statute had been in uninterrupted force, from 1401, for more than 130 years, until, by 25 Henry VIII. c. 14, it was repealed, with the substitution of other enactments, scarcely less severe, also repealed before Mary's accession.

Under the statute 2 Henry IV. c. 15, any bishop, *or* his commissary, might declare *anything* to be heresy; might pronounce any person, upon any evidence, to be an obstinate heretic, if he or she refused to abjure, or a relapsed heretic, after abjuration, and might send for the sheriff of the county, or the mayor of the town, to be present, to hear the sentence of obstinacy or relapse pronounced; whereupon it became the absolute duty of the sheriff or mayor, in either of those cases, to carry away the heretic, and put him or her to death, in the fire, *without any other authority whatever, royal or otherwise.*

This is no exaggeration. It is the language of long and intimate familiarity with the precise terms of the statute 2 Henry IV. c. 15, and with the actual course of the proceedings taken under it.

Under this revival, all those deaths in the fire took place, which we call "The Marian Persecution," except Cranmer's: for no severities beyond detention in prison, and their accompaniments and consequences, had before taken place, since Mary's accession. It is probable that all these deaths were liked, well enough, by Mary; but she was not the doer of them; except by warning the sheriffs to attend to their duties in this respect. Their number, according to the lowest accounts, was 284, or 283 if Cranmer's case be deducted;[3] but, even if less, they must have been much more than an average of one every week, during the three years and three-quarters for which they continued; up to Mary's death.

---

[1] Cardwell's "Synodalia," ii. 434–5. [2] Vol. ii. p. 440.
[3] See 2 Rapin, folio 48, and Notes.

Is it *possible* to believe that the people of England, at Elizabeth's accession, when a new Parliament was necessarily called, would not return to it representatives pledged to insist upon the repeal of the Act of Revival?

That Act *was* repealed, in the first session of that Parliament, by a clause in the Supremacy Act, 1 Elizabeth c. 1. Was the assent of the Convocation of Canterbury essential to that repeal? It was certainly not given; and yet the revival had been made at their instance.

The same Parliament, in the same session, substituted the Elizabethan Ritual for the Roman. We have already seen, and shall presently see, more distinctly yet, that that substitution would not have been made, if the Convocation of Canterbury could have prevented it.

But Dr. Hayman adduces a curious reason for a belief,[1] that "the Convocation" did really give their assent to the passing of Queen Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity before it became law. It consists of a document in the State Paper Office, which he describes as being in "a known handwriting, which dates it, approximately, 1608."[2] It is taken from the book of the Rev. J. W. Joyce, called "The Sword and the Keys," 2nd ed. p. 25; where Mr. Joyce says of it that, "if genuine and authentic," it "tends directly to corroborate the position now maintained," viz., the necessity of convocational concurrence.

We find, in Mr. Joyce's book, that the exact words of the paper, slightly abridged by Dr. Hayman, begin thus:—

> The Book of Common Prayer, published primo Elizabeth, was first resolved and established in the time of King Edward VI. It was re-examined, with some small alterations *by the Convocation* [my italics], consisting of the same bishops and the rest of the clergy, in primo Elizabeth; which being done *by the Convocation* [my italics], and published under the Great Seal of England, there was an Act of Parliament for the same book, which is ordinarily printed in the beginning of the book.

Then Mr. Joyce states that this memorandum, which he calls "this State Paper," "is in the handwriting of Sir Thomas Wilson, the first Keeper of the State Paper Office, established by King James I, in 1608; and the date of the document may, therefore, thus be approximately assigned." Then he states that the writer of the paper had "first detailed the names of the Bishops who, from banishment, returned to England on the death of Queen Mary, and the accession of Queen Elizabeth," and that the writer had then written what has thus been quoted; and then Mr. Joyce proceeds thus:—

> Upon this evidence, therefore, it appears, *while it is admitted that the Elizabethan Prayer Book was not submitted to that Convocation which met Jan. 24, 1559, concurrently with Queen Elizabeth's first Parliament* [my italics], yet that the book was authorized by a Synod or Convocation of English Bishops, unjustly and uncanonically deprived in the last succession, but now restored to their rightful authority, and of the rest of the clergy.

In the margin of this statement, opposite the words "while it is admitted," &c., are these two references—viz., "Conc. M.B. iv. 179;" "Strype's Ann. i. 56" (meaning, by "Conc. M.B.," Wilkins's book, intituled, "Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ."

This passage assigns a very different meaning to the words of the paper from what must have been meant by the writer, when he twice mentions "the Convocation"—namely, that the second Book of Edward VI., now about to be made, with a few alterations, the Prayer Book of Elizabeth, was re-examined and altered by the same bishops

[1] P. 155. [2] *Ibid.*

who had approved it in Edward VI.'s time, and had been deprived by Queen Mary, and had now returned from exile, and of "the rest of the Clergy," and that those Bishops had now been "restored to their rightful authority."

Of this supposed revision by the exiled bishops, no evidence whatever is adduced, nor of the revision by the "rest of the clergy." It is admitted that this supposed "Synod or Convocation of English Bishops" consisted of persons different from "that Convocation which met Jan. 24, 1559, concurrently with Queen Elizabeth's first Parliament," and which *must* have been the only legal Convocation for each province; and, therefore, they could have no Convocational authority: and as to their being "now restored to their rightful authority," if *that* had been the case, they would have been members of the House of Lords, and would have *supported* the Elizabethan Book there, instead of *opposing* it, as we have already shown that every one of the bishops in the House of Lords did; and the fact that they were *not* restored at this time, is quite certain; and it is expressly declared by Strype, Mr. Joyce's own authority, in a passage closely following upon the reference which Mr. Joyce makes to him, in which he says, after tracing the proceedings of the Convocation of Canterbury (so far as its existing records allow) to its end, at the dissolution of the Parliament, on May 8, 1559:—

> All this while, the clergy that favoured sincere religion were but private standers by, and were not consulted with, ... there being neither any order taken for the restoration of the old Protestant Bishops to their Sees, whereof there were four surviving, nor of the inferior clergy, that married wives under King Edward and were deprived under Queen Mary, to their former dignities and benefices.[1]

As to revision by "the rest of the clergy," there is no evidence at all. Such a revision, if made, would be wholly beside the question, as it would not be by the Lower Houses of the Convocations then regularly assembled; but, besides Mr. Joyce's admission that the Book was *not* submitted to the Convocation of Canterbury, there is clear evidence that the Lower House of that Convocation did all they could to prevent the book from being adopted. That evidence is contained in the very passage from "Conc. M.B.," usually called Wilkins's "Concilia," which Mr. Joyce vouches. It is in Latin there, and was published in 1737; but it is also contained in English, in the very passage which Mr. Joyce vouches from Strype's "Annals," published in 1725. The Latin version is also given in Cardwell's "Synodalia," published in 1842.[2] Both Wilkins and Cardwell take it, independently of each other, from the Register of the Upper House of the Canterbury Convocation.

Mr. Joyce states, in the same page of his book (p. 25), that "the fact that the Convocation Registers were burnt in the disastrous fire of London, in 1666, has rendered any satisfactory investigation of this subject extremely difficult." The burning, however, was confined to the Registers of the Lower House; and it will be from the Registers of the Upper, that the views of the Lower will now be stated, as embodied in certain *Articuli Cleri*, sent by the Lower to the Upper, and the proceedings upon them.[3]

These *Articuli Cleri* contained declarations of opinions of the Lower House, which they desired the President of the Upper House to present to the *House of Lords*, and which he did present, accordingly, to the Lord Keeper of the Great Seal, when sitting in the House itself; which

---

[1] 1 Strype, 56, ed. 1725. [2] Vol. ii. p. 490.

[3] See 2 Card. Syn. 490, &c.; 4 Wilk. Conc. 179; 1 Strype Ann. 56.

propositions the President reported to the Lower House that he had, in fact, presented to the Lord Keeper, who, as the President said, appeared to receive them thankfully, *but returned no answer at all (omnino)*. The President (acting) was Bonner, Bishop of London; the Lord Keeper was Sir Nicholas Bacon.

The propositions will be seen to be such as were quite inconsistent with the Book about to be adopted by Parliament. The Lower House prefaced them by a statement that it had come to their knowledge that many religious doctrines, particularly those below written, had been brought into doubt, and, therefore, that they felt it a duty to state their faith, as followed. They were obviously meant as a protest or warning against the intended Book.

The propositions were these:—

1. That in the Sacrament of the Altar [after the words spoken] there is really *(realiter)* present, under the species of bread and wine, the natural body of Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary; also His natural blood.
2. That, after consecration, there remains not substance of bread and wine, or any other substance, except the substance of God and man.
3. That in the Mass is offered the true body of Christ, and His true blood, a propitiatory sacrifice for living and dead (*verum corpus, verus sanguis*).
4. That to the Apostle Peter, and his *legitimate successors in the Apostolic See*, as to the *Vicars of Christ, is given the supreme power* of feeding and governing the Church Militant of Christ, *and of confirming his brethren*.
5. That the authority of treating of and defining those things which belong to faith, sacraments, and ecclesiastical discipline, has always hitherto belonged, and ought to belong, only to the pastors of the Church, whom the Holy Spirit has placed, for this purpose, in the Church of God, *and not to laymen*.

Strype has observed that—

The three former of these were solemnly disputed at Oxford, the first year of Queen Mary, as the great *criterion* of Popery, against Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer.[1]

The promise in Magna Carta, that the Church shall be "free," which Dr. Hayman quotes (p. 155), must, of course, be read in the light of subsequent legislation. One (at least) of its meanings was, that Church-property should be free from taxation, a meaning well understood in former times; for instance, in the year 1554, when the Lower House of Canterbury, *quoting Magna Carta*, prayed to be relieved from the burden of "first fruits, tenths, and subsidies."[2]

The reply to all Dr. Hayman's denunciations of the consequences of the notion that Parliament, in making a certain Prayer Book the Prayer Book of the Nation, claims to define religious doctrines, and to impose them upon the clergy, is, that Parliament undertakes no such functions, except so far as to decide which of several sets of forms shall be used in the nation's churches by those who choose to attend them.

Yours faithfully,

R. D. Craig.

---

[1] 1 Strype, Ann. 56.

[2] See Cardwell's "Synodalia," vol. ii. p. 435.

Short Notices.

The Quarterly Review. No. 308. John Murray.

THE current *Quarterly*, which reached us too late for a notice in the November CHURCHMAN, contains several articles which invite us to comment and quote. But *the* article of the number, in our judgment, is "Dr. Pusey and the Church."

The article which reviews Canon Cook's recent publications is worthy of serious study. Quoting from Dr. Hort, the *Quarterly* thus concludes:—"What then is the result, on Dr. Hort's own showing? It is that he rejects the text used by all the Ante-Nicene Greek writers not connected with Alexandria, and by all the fourth-century Fathers without exception, in favour of a text originally, no doubt, connected with Alexandria, but now represented almost solely by two MSS. which every critic except himself regards as careless in the extreme; a text, too, which is contradicted again and again in matters of the highest importance even by the Ante-Nicene Alexandrian Fathers and by the Egyptian Versions. Most readers will, we think, be quite content to possess in their ordinary Testaments the same text in substance as was used by the vast majority of the great Christian writers of the second, third, and fourth centuries."

The *Quarterly* review of the book by "the prophet of the new Religion of Nature," contains some telling passages. *Natural Religion*, says the *Quarterly*, is terribly disappointing:—

> For sixteen years we have been waiting for the fulfilment of the promise held out in "Ecce Homo," that "Christ, as the Creator of modern theology and religion, will make the subject of another volume," and at last we are put off with a farrago of science and culture, a pseudo-religion, from which Christ and God have been ejected to make room for Humanity and Nature. Instead of the bread we hoped for, a stone has been thrown to us; instead of a fish we have been mocked with a serpent. The inference, we fear, is inevitable, that the author's own faith has meanwhile receded. True, he disclaims a personal interest in the new religion, and avows himself unable to be satisfied with it; but to have propounded it seems to us to argue a despair of anything better surviving the conflict of Christianity with modern speculation; and despair in such a case is within a measurable distance of disbelief. Faith, whatever be our modern confusions and negations, can confidently anticipate the ultimate triumph of the doctrine of Christ, and say, "Magna est veritas et prævalebit;" but the converse is also true, that to doubt of the triumph is also to doubt of the truth of the doctrine.

The article which reviews the recent work of Professor Montagu Burrows, an excellent edition of the Register of the Visitors of the University of Oxford, from A.D. 1647 to A.D. 1658, rebukes the intolerance of the "despotic" Chancellor Laud, and of the Puritans of the Commonwealth. And it is added that, "*If Charles II. had kept his promises*

made to the Presbyterians at Breda, the English Church might never have witnessed the secession of the Nonconformists."

The *Quarterly* article, "The Justification of Lord Beaconsfield's Policy," is precisely what might be expected.

From "Dr. Pusey and the Church," we are tempted to make long extracts. The article is written with singular ability, candour, and good judgment; not a trace of "party" narrowness or roughness can be traced.

As to the exaggerations of too many *In Memoriam* writers, the Reviewer says :—

We have observed with regret in not a few notices of Dr. Pusey a one-sided tone of exaggeration, as though the Tractarians had been the sole source of the revived life of the Church of England. Nothing could be more unjust, whether to the Evangelical clergy[1] or to men like Dr. Hook, who were energetically asserting the characteristic principles of the true High Church party years before the Tractarians were heard of. Dean Hook became vicar of Coventry in 1829, and at once commenced to set on foot in his parish the principles and the system which were subsequently reinforced by the genius of the writers of the *Tracts*. Those writers gave to High Church principles a vitality and strength they had not enjoyed for a century and a half; but it is entirely accurate and unjust to speak of them as if they had been the sole restorers of vital religion, or even of Church life, throughout the country.

"Having done justice, continues the *Quarterly*, to the many admirable, and "in some respects saintly, elements in his (Dr. Pusey's) character, and to the "rare services which in many respects he and his early friends rendered to "the Church of England, we feel reluctantly compelled, alike by the claims "of truth and by a conviction of the dangers to which the Church is at "present exposed, to draw attention, in the way of warning, to another "aspect of his later career. It would, we believe, be a fatal injury to the "very principles for which, in his best days, he contended, and to the "very cause which the original Tractarians had at heart if, now that the "lapse of a little time allows a calmer review of the past, we were to be "content simply to join in the all but universal tribute of honour and "admiration which his death has elicited. Of late years, owing to the "respect which his age and his character commanded, there has been a "natural reluctance to challenge his authority, and his name has thus "been allowed to cover with the shield of reputed High Church prin-"ciples an ever-growing mass of practices and doctrines which are pro-"foundly alien from the spirit of the true High Church party. It was

[1] The *Quarterly* says :—"Dr. Pusey, it must be remembered, did not fail to recognize the depth and strength of the work done by the Evangelical clergy in bringing home the great truths of the Faith to individual souls. Still less did Dr. Newman, who was indebted to them for the primary impulse of his own religious life. Mr. Mozley's travestie of that great school of religious thought is a most unworthy feature in his book; and we are glad to see that the Archbishop of Canterbury repels with just indignation his disparaging account of it. 'Mr. Mozley,' he says, 'has spoken with such bitterness of this party in the Church as would seem to argue some incapacity for appreciating its worth.' Dr. Pusey often spoke of them in very different terms."

"impracticable to speak candidly on the subject during his lifetime "without the risk of a controversy with which it would have been "painful to disturb his last years. But now that he has passed away, "the time has come when the truth must be spoken; and that truth is, "that *it would be disastrous to the Church of England if*, out of venera- "tion for Dr. Pusey's personal excellences, *the principles and practices "with which he was identified of late years were to be admitted as having a "legitimate place in the High Church party, OR IN ANY PARTY, within "her pale.*" The italics and capitals are our own. Dr. Pusey, it is stated, justly and rightly as we think, surrendered himself a too willing captive to "a web of sophistry." "For the last thirty-five years of his "life he acted on the avowed principle that he was prepared *to strain "our formularies* in favour of any doctrine or practice for which he "could find a precedent in 'antiquity.' The proof of this has been "placed fully before the world in some letters, published with Dr. Pusey's "consent, in the 'Life of Bishop Wilberforce.'" Such "straining" of formularies has worked, we believe, in more ways than one, incalculable mischief.

Referring to the secessions at Leeds, in 1847, the *Quarterly* points out that Dr. Pusey was directly responsible:—

> St. Saviour's, Leeds, was consecrated under the auspices of Dr. Pusey and his more immediate adherents; and in a very short time the work of Dr. Hook's life was in great measure undone. "In spite of his earnest remonstances and of the Bishop's, the clergy of St. Saviour's persisted in doctrines and practices which he reprobated. One after another in rapid succession they fell away to Rome."

"For this lamentable result at Leeds," continues the *Quarterly*, "Dr. "Pusey was directly responsible: and it has been repeated on a larger "scale throughout the Church of England. The true High Church party, "which held a high place in the confidence of the English people, has, "mainly through his influence, become identified with a Romanizing "school who are utterly alien from the spirit and the history of our "Church. If High Churchmanship means the Churchmanship of Dr. "Pusey's later years and of the Ritualists, there is no place for it in the "Church of England, and a struggle to cast it out, which might develop "into a fatal convulsion, is inevitable. During Dr. Pusey's lifetime, as "we have said, men have hesitated to assert these convictions; but now "that he has passed away, and there is no risk of personal conflict with "a man who in many respects deserved high honour, it will be necessary "to face this question as one of vital moment to the existence of the "Church. In the interests of the High Church party, we appeal to the "better judgment of the High Churchmen against the Romanizing sect "with which, under Dr. Pusey's misleading influence, they have of late "years allowed themselves to be associated. It will be observed that we "have not been expressing any opinions of our own respecting the true "character and principles of the High Church party. We have been, as "it were, making 'an appeal from the New to the Old Whigs.' We "appeal from the degenerate, Romanizing, and disingenuous school

"fostered by Dr. Pusey's later years, to the manly, the English, the "Protestant, the Primitive Church party, represented by the great name "of Dr. Hook; and we point to the testimony, not of a hostile witness, "but of a Bishop [Wilberforce], whose chief fault was, perhaps, an undue "weakness towards Dr. Pusey and his friends. We have been, and we shall "ever remain, staunch in vindicating the principles of the great historic "school of English High Churchmen. But for that very reason we cannot "cease to protest against the perversion, or rather the supersession, of "those principles supported by Dr. Pusey during the latter part of his "life; and now that the controversy is no longer complicated by personal "feelings, we call on High Churchmen to clear themselves of this "Romanizing leaven without reserve. It is not too late to do so; but it is "the eleventh hour; and Dr. Pusey's death marks, in all probability, the "critical moment. Once more we prefer to employ the language of a "High Churchman whose name carries unquestioned authority; and "we are glad to be able to sum up our remonstrance against Dr. Pusey's "example in this respect in the following admirable letter from Dean "Hook, addressed in 1850 to the Editor of *The Guardian*" ("Life," vol. ii. p. 277):—

I am not conscious of having changed a single principle during the last thirty years; but, on the contrary, I am only more confirmed in my admiration of the principles of the English Reformation, and more persuaded that the Church of England "is the purest and best reformed Church in Christendom." For asserting this I have been called a High Churchman, and I assert it still. As far as the Church of England goes I will go, but not a step farther. Neither will I intentionally come short of her requirements. . . . . It is very true, as the writer of the paragraph states, that I have for some time expressed my dissatisfaction with the proceedings of the Romanizers whom the writer calls Tractarians. . . . . When I now find them calumniators of the Church of England, and vindicators of the Church of Rome; palliating the vices of the Romish system, and magnifying the deficiencies of the Church of England; sneering at everything Anglican, and admiring everything Romish; students of the breviary and missal, disciples of the schoolmen, converts to mediævalism, insinuating Romish sentiments, circulating and republishing Romish works; introducing Romish practices in their private, and infusing a Romish tone into their public devotions; introducing the Romish Confessional, enjoining Romish penances, adopting Romish prostrations, recommending Romish litanies, muttering the Romish Shibboleth, and rejoicing in the cant of Romish fanaticism, assuming sometimes the garb of the Romish priesthood, and venerating without imitating their celibacy; defending Romish miracles, and receiving as true the lying legends of Rome; almost adoring Romish Saints; and complaining that we have had no Saints in England since we purified our Church; explaining away the idolatry, and pining for the Mariolatry of the Church of Rome; vituperating the English Reformation, and receiving for the truth the false doctrines of the Council of Trent; when I find them whispering in the ears of credulous ignorance, in high places as well as in low, that the two Churches are in principle the same; when they who were once in the pit on the one side of the wall, have now tumbled over on the other side, and have fallen into "a lower deep still gaping to devour them;" I conceive that I am bound as a High Churchman to remain stationary, and not to follow them in

their downfalling. I believe it to be incumbent upon every High Churchman to declare plainly that it is not merely in detail, that it is not merely in the application of our principles, but in our principles themselves, that we differ from the Church of Rome; and that no man can secede to Rome, the system of which is opposed to the truth as it is in Jesus, without placing his soul in peril and risking his salvation.

It is sometimes asked why we should be continually attacking the Church of Rome? When this question is put to us, I admire the subtlety, but not the candour, of the querist. It is not against *Romanists* but against *Romanizers* that we write; against those who are doing the work of the Church of Rome while eating the bread of the Church of England. To these we will put the opposite question—"Why are you always defending the Church of Rome? Why are you propagating Romanism and condemning the Church of England?" When you cease to propagate Romanism, then we will take into consideration the propriety of not writing against it.

. . . . . .

Although I have not left any party or joined any party, but remained stationary, I cannot be blind to the fact, that many who are now reputed Low Churchmen are what would have been called thirty years ago High Churchmen; and *I do heartily wish that these, and all who are really High Churchmen, would forget past differences and bygone controversies, and combine to resist the aggression of Romanizers on one side and of Rationalists on the other.* [The italics are our own.] The only bond of union that can be formed is that which rests on the principles of the English Reformation, and the doctrine of Justification by Faith only.

Ancient Ballads and Legends of Hindustan. By TORU DUTT. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1882.

There is always an interest about the poetry of youth, especially if the poet be dead; and for this reason the rich promise of Chatterton is measured in a degree quite incompatible with what he achieved. This interest is increased when the poetry comes from a foreign land, and we see our own language used to convey the thoughts of a different age and a different clime. The "Ancient Ballads and Legends of Hindustan," unite both these elements of interest. They are the work of a young Hindu girl, who died at the age of twenty-one; but who, nevertheless, lived long enough to give to the world a novel and two volumes of poetry. The life of this young and gifted authoress has been so well portrayed in the introductory notice by Mr. E. W. Gosse, that it is unnecessary for us to give here any more than the briefest outlines. Born in Calcutta in the year 1856, of a well-known native family, several members of which have since achieved distinction, educated in the Christian faith to which her family had recently been converted, she was sent to Europe with her sister Aru in her thirteenth year for educational purposes. After four years she returned to India, where, in the seclusion of her native home, she produced her first work, "A Sheaf Gleaned in French Fields," followed soon afterwards by a novel written in French. In August, 1877, she died, leaving behind her as a legacy to posterity the volume now under review.

This collection of poems is eloquent of such a career. It has the stamp of youth on every page, that freshness and vivacity which makes the life of the early ages so charming, that simplicity which is the soul of purely imaginative poetry. In the "Legends of Hindustan" the authoress found a congenial field of research. A Christian by education,

she looked to the Veda, not for instruction, but for poetry; the Hindu Pantheon was nothing more to her than Hermes and Zeus are to us; and yet her nation's Legends and Ballads possessed that same charm which the Greek mythology will never lose, when we consider them in their fresh simplicity as man's unguided strivings after truth.

There are several passages which provoke a smile by their quaint expressions and strange use of the English language. There is sometimes the spirit of Homer clothed in the metre of Tait and Brady; but elsewhere again there are passages which remind us strongly of Browning's best efforts.

Months passed, and lo, one summer morn
As to the hermitage she went
Through smiling fields of waving corn,
She saw some youths on sport intent,
Sons of the hermits, and their peers,
And one among them tall and lithe,
Royal in port—on whom the years
Consenting, shed a grace so blithe,
So frank, so noble, that the eye
Was loth to quit that sun-browned face;
She looked and looked—then gave a sigh,
And slackened suddenly her pace.

Their eyes just met—Savitri past
Into the friendly Muni's hut;
Her heart-rose opened had at last,—
Opened no flower can ever shut.

There is no rationalizing, here, as in the Epic of Hades; no mysticism as in Rosetti's "Beryl Stone;" the several scenes are described naturally and easily: the freedom of the girl's life, her first sensations of love, the Indian scenery, the marriage ceremonies,—all these with their rich oriental colouring possess the essentials of true poetry, harmony of ideas, and suitable modes of expression.

It is difficult to assign to Toru Dutt her proper place in the realm of poetry without either underrating the difficulties with which she had to contend, or making too much allowance for them. But as in reading "Childe Harold" our thoughts instinctively revert from the hero to the author, so in reading the "Legends and Ballads of Hindustan," we must be content to travel in fancy to the seclusion of a native girl's home in Calcutta, to trace the growth of thought and feeling during the short visit to Europe, and the influence of the rich ancestral poetry which formed the subject-matter of her literary efforts. With these as our guides, we shall welcome a book so full of fresh and genuine feeling, of rich and beautiful fancy; and where it fails in expression, or is deficient in melody, we shall be ready to condone its deficiencies out of consideration for its simple pathos.

Facts on the Sunday Question, showing how far the Lord's Day Differs from the Sabbath. By J. E. Bythway, B.A. London: Elliot Stock. 1882.

We have read this *brochure*, written by a Wesleyan, with considerable interest. It is fresh, bold, and bears marks of ability. The views expressed break away from recognized Wesleyan doctrine and, if accepted, would lead that body into new paths of teaching and of practice. We think in this matter the old lights to be clearer and better than the new. The *brochure* is distinctly and emphatically *Anti-Sabbatarian*. The writer concludes that the Lord's Day is not the Sabbath—has not been substituted for the Sabbath—has no proper relation to or connection

with the Fourth Commandment, and that the Fourth Commandment is simply a Jewish peculiarity. In this pamphlet, in fact, are reproduced in a short and taking form, the views of many teachers in different ages who have started on their Sabbatic studies from certain misunderstood statements of St. Paul, and who, arguing backward from their starting-point, have read their misconception of the Apostle into Prophecies, Psalms, History, and Decalogue. Undoubtedly if St. Paul, writing to the Romans, Galatians, or Colossians, condemns *the Sabbath*, the controversy is ended; but if, as is distinctly the case, the inspired teacher condemns the keeping of Jewish *Sabbaths*, and forbids the introduction into the Christian Church of the burdensome observances of the Ecclesiastical year which, since then, have intruded into the professing Church and have culminated in the Romish system, in which the One Sabbath of Jehovah, the True Resurrection Day of Rest, is hidden and lost in a host of holy days, and practically subordinated to them; if, we say, this was the point of Paul's teaching, there is left unrepealed and unaffected the whole teaching of the Word of God touching the existence, the authority, and the perpetuity of the Sabbath Law, by which one-seventh of our life (in equal portions of one day in seven) is separated from toil and ordinary earthly employments unto Worship and Rest.

Mr. Bythway, we venture to remark, handles St. Paul's teaching rather carelessly. On p. 1 he writes, "The important passage in Colossians, where *the Sabbath Days* are spoken of as vanishing away with the Jewish Ritual." Referring to or quoting the same passage several times afterwards he substitutes the singular for the plural, and always speaks of *the Sabbath*. Of all these references only the first is correct. Sabbath days—not the Sabbath—are condemned. This we think is an instance of unconscious dishonesty. Another unintended unfairness is in the designation of the Sabbath as Jewish. The writer should learn that those whom he designates Sabbatarians hold as firmly as he does that every *Jewish* Sabbath is dead, only the pre-Jewish and post-Jewish Sabbath remains. "Sabbatarians" plead for that only.

The writer makes too much of the difference of reading of the Fourth Commandment as found in Exodus and Deuteronomy, and builds on it more than it will bear. Two reasons are assigned for the observance of the Sabbath, one general and the other national, one founded on creation, the other on the deliverance from Egypt. The limited character of the second reason detracts nothing from the universal character of the first.

The writer omits the whole of the forcible arguments for the identity of the Sabbath and the Resurrection Day, which sprung from a comparison of the ii. and the cviii. Psalms with Acts iv. and xiii. and from the Sabbatic passages of Isaiah, and so fails to see the glorious harmony of the old and new Sabbath and the beautiful filling in of Old Testament Sabbath outlines with the fulness and blessedness of the Resurrection Day.

There are instances of quotations in this *brochure* which are scarcely just. The Sabbatizing against which some of the early Fathers protest, was not the keeping the Lord's Day as the Sabbath; it is quite as often the addition of Jewish Sabbaths to the one Sabbath—the faults and sin against which Paul pleads. We think, too, that the writer is unjust when he directs the ridicule, which is well merited by individual idiosyncrasies and oddities, against those who are indeed Sabbatarians, but who are neither fools nor oddities—those who reverence the Sabbath as an ordinance which is holy and just and benevolent, but who neither Judaize nor act with childish scrupulosity. In conclusion, and with reference to a frequently repeated statement of the writer, we may commend to him

these words, which, with slight differences, occur in all the Gospels:—Και διαγενομένου τοῦ σαββάτου . . . . λίαν πρωΐ τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων. They have not received the attention which they deserve, and they have a frequently unnoticed bearing on the whole question in debate.

Another pamphlet, "The Sabbath," written by the venerable Dean Close (Hatchard; the Lord's Day Observance Society) which was some months ago recommended in THE CHURCHMAN, may serve in many respects as an antidote to Mr. Bythway's. It is Sabbatic, and we think it is conclusive. It appeals less indeed than the other to Fathers and Councils, but it seeks to expound holy Scripture, and to learn what is the revealed will of God on the matters under discussion.

Andrew Fuller. By his Son, ANDREW G. FULLER. Hodder & Stoughton.

This little volume, one of the series, "Men Worth Remembering," has a peculiar interest. Andrew Fuller died in the year 1815; and his son, who lived in the same house with him, and witnessed scenes of his life which were witnessed by no other person living, now gives "personal reminiscences" of no small value. It is just a hundred years ago that Mr. Fuller became Baptist pastor in Kettering, the town of Dr. Gill, the commentator, and William Knibb, whose memory is linked with that of Clarkson and Wilberforce. His work, "The Gospel worthy of all acceptation," was published in the year 1784. Whether the origin of the Baptist Missionary Society is due to him or to Carey, is a question which can scarcely be settled.

Andrew Fuller was born in 1754, at Wicken, a village in the Cambridgeshire Fens. Both by his father and mother he was descended from a line of Puritan ancestors; but the father's earliest known ancestors were members of the Church of England. They were working farmers, who earned their living by the sweat of their brow. We read that:—

His parents being Dissenters, and his mother a member of the Baptist Church, he was of course compelled to attend their place of worship, and it is highly probable that the preaching to which he listened while a boy proved a hindrance rather than a help to him in his searching for the truth. Mr. Eve, the minister, was a Baptist professing doctrines of high Calvinism: his sermons were addressed almost exclusively to the "elect." He said nothing to arouse the unconverted, and, consistently with his principles, entirely neglected to point sinners to the Lamb of God.

The boy's first thoughts on those subjects seem to have been suggested to his mind when he was between thirteen and fourteen years old. He had heard the preacher talk about faith, and began to wonder what it was. He was occasionally overwhelmed with strong conviction, which rendered him extremely unhappy. "One winter evening," he says, "I remember going with a number of other boys to a smith's shop to warm ourselves by his fire. Presently they began to sing vain songs. This appeared to me so much like revelling that I felt something within me which would not suffer me to join them; and while I sat silent in rather an unpleasant muse, those words sunk into my mind like a dagger, 'What doest thou here, Elijah?' I immediately left the company; yet, shocked to reflect upon, I walked home murmuring in my heart against God, that I could not be let alone and suffered to take my pleasure like other young people."

His love of reading and the scarcity of books within his reach, induced him to peruse those of a religious character; of these he mentions particularly Bunyan's "Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners," and "The Pilgrim's Progress." But that which exerted at this time the most powerful influence upon his mind was Erskine's "Gospel Sonnets," that part entitled "A Gospel Catechism for Young Christians; or, Christ All in All in our Complete Redemption," entirely riveted his attention. He says, "I read, and as I read I wept. Indeed, I was almost overcome with weeping, so interesting did the

doctrine of eternal salvation appear to me; yet there being no radical change in my heart, these thoughts passed away, and I was equally intent on the pursuits of folly as heretofore." . . . .

In April, 1770, when he was sixteen years of age, he was baptized.

The Church Catechism Simply Explained. By the Rev. T. ALFRED STOWELL, M.A., Hon. Canon of Manchester, Rector of Christ Church, Salford, and Rural Dean. Elliot Stock.

This is a welcome contribution to the increasing store of material which, in these days, is so carefully made ready to the hands of those who are engaged in the teaching of the young. At one time, there appeared to exist amongst writers and teachers of the Evangelical School of thought, the present writer believes, a disposition to pass over the Church Catechism; or, at all events, a reluctance to give it any very prominent place in their instruction. We are glad to see that that feeling has well-nigh disappeared; and that the whole provision made by the Church of England for definition of doctrine and instruction in it, is now recognized as being in full accordance with what were considered as the distinctive tenets of the Evangelicals. Canon Stowell's name on the title-page of this little work is a guarantee of its evangelical character. The Manual is a valuable one, especially as a foundation on which to build confirmation addresses. It has the qualities of simplicity, Scripturalness, clearness, and conciseness, especially in definition. Indeed, in some points, it seems almost too concise, and the reader might wish that a little more of comment and illustration had been given. In treating of the moral law, the writer has been careful to make very plain the inner principle or pith of each several commandment, showing how it bears on the soul's life in every age of the world. We note the careful correction of various small, but at the same time not unimportant, mistakes in wording, into which children, and sometimes their teachers also, are liable to fall. For example, not "duty *to* my neighbour," as though I were responsible to him, but "duty *towards* my neighbour," in matters pertaining to him, in regard to which his and my Master will hold me responsible. Again, not "save and defend me *from* all dangers ghostly and bodily," a prayer, of course, inconsistent with a life of trial, but "*in*" them, that I may be saved in passing through them. We observe also the clear explanation of the word "creature" as the antithesis of "Creator," which experience has shown us that children very often misunderstand. The most important doctrine of the Redeemer's perfected provision and the Holy Spirit's progressive work in the heart is well set forth in few words:—

We are taught that this work of the Holy Spirit is now incomplete and being carried on in the elect. He *sanctifieth, or is sanctifying,* whereas Christ's work of redemption is finished and complete. He *hath redeemed.* We must always remember that we are not saved *by* holiness but *to* holiness.

An objection has often been made against the closing clause in the "duty towards my neighbour" that it tends to repress the laudable desire to rise in this world; as though the youth were never to look beyond the present state of life in which Providence has placed him. The author of this manual comments thus upon the clause:—

We may desire to succeed in business, or to excel and rise in life if we do not do so sinfully, with discontent at our own lot, and envy at the lot of others.

We can confidently recommend this manual as likely to be of great help in popularizing the Church Catechism, and rendering plain its spirit and teaching. We have reason to believe that the work will shortly be reproduced in a more extended form. We hope it will then contain a

larger amount of illustrations, which appears to be the only thing needed to complete its efficient character.

M. A.

Twilight Talks. "Easy Lessons on Things Around Us." By AGNES GIBERNE. The Religious Tract Society.

"An Introduction to Physics." Such a title would frighten off not a few who would otherwise procure this author's "Talks;" but her little work makes no such grand pretensions. In "easy" language it gives lessons on Atoms, Gravity, Cohesion, &c. Well meant, we have some doubts whether such an effort will succeed.

The Decalogue of Charity (1 Cor. xiii.) *considered with more especial reference to Sunday School Work.* By W. PAKENHAM WALSH, D.D., Bishop of Ossory. Church of England Sunday School Institute.

The substance of the twelve papers in this volume appeared in the monthly numbers of the *Church Sunday School Magazine*, during the year 1881. Few words on our part are necessary in heartily recommending the honoured Bishop's book; most of our readers, no doubt, are well acquainted with the valuable periodical published by the Institute, and also with other writings of Bishop Walsh. These suggestive expositions of the clauses of 1 Cor. xiii., "Thou shalt suffer long and be kind," "Thou shalt not envy," "Thou shalt not vaunt thyself," . . . . &c., will be read with much interest, and with profit. The Bishop thus writes in his preface:—

Although the divine grace of Charity has been viewed from a particular standpoint, and treated with a special reference to Sunday School work, it is hoped that the general reader will find something in the following pages to enlarge his admiration of this "Queen of Graces," and to assist him in bringing her influences to bear upon the whole circuit of Christian life.

To those for whom it was mainly intended, the author affectionately presents it, as embodying the experiences of a fellow-labourer who, either as scholar, teacher, or superintendent has been for more than half a century connected with Sunday Schools, and who still feels the deepest and most prayerful interest in the important work which is committed to their care.

The Good News in Africa. Scenes from Missionary History, with Geographical Details and Illustrations. With a Preface by the Rev. E. H. BICKERSTETH, M.A. Seeley, Jackson, & Halliday.

This is one of the many interesting and useful books, for which readers specially drawn to Missionary writings are indebted to Messrs. Seeley. We need do little more, in heartily recommending it, than quote from the preface. Mr. Bickersteth says:—

Having been requested by my sister to write a few lines of preface to her "Missionary Scenes in Africa," I can only say that if her readers find as much pleasure in studying the complete work as I have found in glancing at the proof sheets, no ordinary treat awaits them. There is enough of geographical research and natural history given in these pages, enriched as they are with numerous and instructive woodcuts and a map, to make the scenery of each mission a vivid reality.

In a few graphic sentences and paragraphs you are transported to Sierra Leone, Yoruba, Caffraria, the Victoria Nyanza, Mombasa, Abyssinia, Madagascar, Cairo; and then, almost unawares, you are engrossed with the authentic stories of Johnson, the Hinderers, Bishop Crowther, Dr. Moffatt, David Livingstone, Dr. Krapf, Mr. Sterne, Mr. Ellis, and other of God's heroes and heroines in the missionary field.

This volume will form a most acceptable present for schoolboys. The indomitable courage, the hair-breadth escapes, the noble victories of faith, will

satisfy that longing for adventures which beats so strongly in every generous young heart. It will also supply most valuable reading for working-parties and mothers' meetings, and be a welcome addition to many a village library. Nor will the missionary lecturer be unrewarded who gleans in these fields before he tells others of the wonderful works of God in our own age.

Morality. An Essay on some Points thereof addressed to Young Men. By MAURICE C. HIME, M.A., LL.D., Head Master of Foyle College, Londonderry. 4th edition. Pp. 156. London: J. & A. Churchill, 11, New Burlington Street.

An ably-written little book. A very delicate subject has been treated with much tact and good judgment. Dr. Hime's suggestions are deserving of careful consideration, not only at the hands of schoolmasters and tutors, but also of fathers. There has been a good deal of correspondence, during this autumn, concerning the morality of our great schools. That vice and sensuality among the upper classes is on the increase may or may not be true; but the subject of chastity, in any case, ought not to be shirked, as commonly it is.

From Egypt to Canaan. For Little Children. By Mrs. G. E. MORTON. With four Illustrations and a Map. Pp. 250. Hatchards.

Recently, in reviewing that excellent book, Miss Arnold-Forster's "Heralds of the Cross," we mentioned Mrs. Morton's "The Story of Jesus for Little Children." A working man asked the present writer to lend him that "Story," that it might be read "for all of us" by the fireside; and the book, we heard, was most welcome to every member of the family. Mrs. Morton's "From the Beginning, or Stories from Genesis," is also an admirable book; and the well-written work now before us—which is intended as a sequel to "From the Beginning"—merits hearty praise. It will do good service, we doubt not, in thousands of schools and home circles.

On the Rock, and other Short Allegories. By the Author of "Under the Lime Trees," &c., with eight illustrations by T. Riley. Pp. 180. Seeley, Jackson, & Halliday.

It is a reviewing mistake, no doubt, to lay much stress on the fact that a book before us bears on its title-page "by the author of" this and that, books which are well known and much liked. To lay *much* stress, we say, is a mistake, but due weight ought to be given to the fact. At all events, the book now under notice is by an author, several of whose stories have been warmly praised by the present writer. We were predisposed in its favour. But "On the Rock" is a good and honest piece of work, and can stand on its own merits. The stories are simple; they illustrate and unfold Scripture truths in a very helpful manner.

The Interpreter's House, and What I Learnt There. New Lessons from an Old School. By the Rev. J. E. ARNOLD. R.T.S.

The writer of this well-intentioned little book has endeavoured to present a development of the original idea on a larger scale than the nature of "Pilgrim's Progress" permitted. It is a bold undertaking to "develop" Bunyan's masterpiece, unique, and matchless; and we cannot think Mr. Arnold's imitation is a success.

A well-written little book, practical and suggestive, is Mr. JOHN PALMER'S *Active Service; or, Counsels for the Newly-Confirmed,* pp. 60. (Griffith and Farran.)

Cassell's Old and New Edinburgh. Its History, its People, and its Places. By JAMES GRANT, Author of "Memorials of the Castle of Edinburgh," &c. Illustrated by numerous engravings. Vol. II. Cassell, Petter, Galpin, & Co.

About a year ago was noticed in these columns the first volume of "Old and New Edinburgh;" and we have now the pleasure of reviewing the second volume. Our only regret is that from lack of time we are unable to do it justice. The volume now before us indeed seems rather better than its predecessor; it is, at all events, quite as interesting and quite as attractive, which is saying a good deal. Some twenty years ago we concluded our searchings and visitings in dear Auld Reekie, and its fair surroundings; every odd nook and corner, every coigne of vantage, every beautiful prospect, every historical "close," bit of wall or piece of ground, was, as we thought, well known to us. And now, as we mark the illustrations of this enjoyable volume, dipping here and there into its chatty pages, our discoveries—social, artistic, archæological, historical, and what not—are brought vividly before us. Every page of the book seems to have an interest of its own; the biographical bits are all, we judge, remarkably well done; the engravings—full-paged or smaller ones—all most carefully executed, are delightful.

A Complete Concordance to the Revised Version of the New Testament. By JOHN ALEXANDER THOMS. Printed under the authorization of Oxford and Cambridge Universities. Pp. 531. W. H. Allen & Co., 13, Waterloo Place.

This is a really valuable volume. In his interesting preface, Mr. Thoms remarks, with truth, that a Concordance is nothing, if not accurate; and we can well believe that every practicable care has been taken to secure correctness. It is not likely, however, that a work of this kind, including more than 60,000 references, should be quite free from mistakes. We have not discovered any yet; but, promising ourselves continual use of the work, we may, after a time, find a few; a second edition will afford an opportunity to point out errors. The book is clearly printed.

Memoir of Daniel Macmillan. By THOMAS HUGHES, Q.C., Author of "Tom Brown's Schooldays," &c. London: Macmillan & Co.

Cambridge graduates, and undergraduates of some thirty years ago, who were wont to "look in" at the well-known resort opposite the Senate House, will read this Memoir with a real interest.

Of Mr. Macmillan's defence of Maurician views we need say nothing. In his preface, Mr. Hughes remarks that this biography tells "the story of a young Scotchman born in a peasant home, who, with no schooling but what he could get in a small provincial town, before he was twelve, and in spite of want of means and wretched health, won his way to the front rank in a difficult business, and died at forty-four, the founder and head of a well-known firm of publishers. Such a career is rare, but not so rare as to call for any special commemoration. Many young Scotchmen have come south, and made fortunes, and founded great houses of business, in the book trade, and in other trades, to whom no special interest attaches outside their family circle and personal friends. Besides, in our day, the self-made man has been somewhat too much glorified, and we are tired

of worshipping the mere power of getting on. It needs some quality of a finer and higher kind than usual in the man himself, or something peculiar in his surroundings, or dramatic in his life, to make the world he has left desirous of hearing more of him than that he lies safely in such a cemetery or churchyard, and has left so many thousand pounds behind him."

The Life of Jean Frederic Oberlin. By Mrs. Josephine E. Butler. Pp. 200. The Religious Tract Society.

This is a readable book, to be recommended. The scene of Oberlin's labours has frequently been described in periodicals at home and abroad, by visitors attracted there by veneration for this "great apostle of charity, this saint of the Protestant Church," as his countrymen delight, and with reason, to style him. "A visit to the Ban de la Roche," says a writer in the *Eglise et Patrie*, of September, 1880, "is not a visit in the ordinary sense; it is a pilgrimage." The late Mr. and Mrs. Cunningham made this pilgrimage in 1820, and an interesting sketch of the country, and of the character and work of Oberlin, given in a series of letters from Mrs. Cunningham to friends in England, was embodied in the "Memoir of J. F. Oberlin," published in London, 1829. The appearance of the country has undergone some change since that time; and a more modern picture of it is presented to the reader of the interesting biography now before us. A good map of the Ban de la Roche is added.

Hid in the Cevennes. A Mountain Refuge. Pp. 200. The Religious Tract Society.

A few sentences may be quoted from this well-written Tale. A short passage will show what the story is like. On page 55 we read:—

> The next day was a sabbath, a day that is strictly kept by the Protestants in the south. In the morning, Geraldine appeared in his new clothes, looking so neat and nice, that two old men said that they could not help expressing their satisfaction. A meeting was to be held in the environs of Durfort, between Saint Félix and Manoublet, in a retired field; for all the Protestant temples in the whole of Languedoc, except two, had been either burnt or razed to the ground in the reigns of Louis XIV., the Great, or Louis XV., the Well Beloved; and they were being built very slowly. At that time, about 1842-3, and to this day, the traveller passing some lonely field or desert place might have heard the voices of many hundred Cévenois singing the psalms of Clement, Marot, or Théodore de Bèze, the voice of the preachers, or the sound of prayer.

Holy Thoughts on Holy Things. A Treasury of Reference on the Higher Life of Christian Believers and Kindred Subjects. Selected from the best Authors of all Ages, and arranged by the Rev. E. Davies, D.D., Author of "Select Thoughts on the Ministry of the Church," &c. Pp. 728. Ward & Lock.

This is a bulky book; yet we cannot say it is too big. The title, "A Treasury of Reference," precisely explains the character of the work. We have read, here and there, with a good deal of interest; and the selection everywhere has seemed to us sensible, with a spiritual tone; all that devout readers could desire. The "Holy Things" are arranged, of course, alphabetically. There is an Index of Authors. The passage to which is appended the name *Purton*, is given incorrectly, probably from some

newspaper; it is an extract from one of the devotional writings of the Rev. W. O. Purton, Rector of Kingston-by-Sea.

Trying to Enter. By AGNES GIBERNE, Author of "The Upward Gaze," &c. Seeleys.

This is a little book, but it richly deserves the epithet *multum in parvo*. We agree that a book was wanted for persons not yet anxious; there are "anxious inquirers," but there are many who are sorry that they are *not* anxious.

Expelled. By BERNARD HELDMANN. Nisbet & Co.

Mr. Heldmann has written several stories for boys; "Dorrincourt" and "Boxall School" are the best known. His new book, about a youth who was "expelled" from school, shows skill; there is a deal of "go" about the story; some of the incidents are striking; the tone and drift are exceedingly good. The older schoolboys are sure to like it. We should add that the volume is well illustrated, and has a tasteful cover.

Picturesque Scotland. Its Romantic Scenes and Historical Associations, described in Lay and Legend, Song and Story. By F. WATT, M.A., and the Rev. A. CARTER, M.A. Pp. 510. Sangster & Co.

A gilt-edged volume, with emblazoned red cover, containing a good many illustrations. The work describes, in a popular manner, the great landmarks of Scottish scenery, with historical, literary, and legendary associations: Burns's country, Loch Lomond, Killiecrankie, Culloden Moor, Arbroath, &c. Open where one may, something readable is sure to present itself.

Precious Stones. Collected by H. L. SIDNEY LEAR. Pp. 212. Rivington.

Many of the pieces in this book are exceedingly good; but far too many, as we think, have been taken from Faber, Newman, and St. Francis de Sales. Mr. Lear would have had no difficulty in selecting from a writer of the English Church a better bit on books than that by "Mgr. Dupanloup."

The Parallel New Testament, Greek and English. Oxford: at the University Press.

This is a delightful book: as to type, paper, general "get-up," and binding, unexceptionable: a most serviceable edition, and deserving hearty thanks. We have here, in four parallel columns, the Version of 1611, the Version of 1881, the revised Greek text, and the readings displaced by the Revisers; in the fourth column there is space for MS. notes. With this volume by his side and Dean Burgon's book in his hand, the student can copy criticisms to his heart's content; and, certainly if the R.V. has done nothing else (and we ourselves have no desire so to limit its usefulness) it has stimulated study in a wonderful way.

Parables of the Spring. The Resurrection and the Life. By Professor GAUSSEN. R.T.S.

This is a charming little volume. Dr. Gaussen's parables are illustrated. A brief memoir is an interesting addition, and, in fact, crowns the whole. In 1863 Dr. Merle d'Aubigné wrote an *In Memoriam*; no other memoir has been published. We cordially recommend this tasteful volume.

Readings for the Seasons. By the Right Hon. Earl Nelson. S.P.C.K.

The "Readings" in this very tasteful volume, Lord Nelson hopes, may be found useful before Family Prayer, or for Private Meditation. When used for families the Versicles and Psalms, says the noble Earl, may be chanted, and the Hymns sung. For ourselves, here and there, we should make some alteration; but the arrangement will probably commend itself to many heads of families; the book is rich, and deeply devout.

Isabeau's Hero. A Story of the Revolt of the Cevennes. By Esmè Stuart, Author of "The Belfry of St. Jude," &c. &c. S.P.C.K.

This is a really interesting and attractive story. All the chief events, as well as most of the characters of the Tale, are historically true; and Jean Cavalier, the "hero" of the great struggle, is skilfully and, doubtless, correctly painted; a simple mountaineer with great military genius, and with the fire of religious zeal, though not without faults. The author has made good use of M. Peyrat's "Histoire des Pasteurs du Désert." She shows no bigotry, to say the least, in pointing out the persecuting, thoroughly Papistical, policy of Louis XIV. in regard to his inoffensive Protestant subjects.

Records of the Life of the Rev. Wm. H. Havergal, M.A. By his daughter, Jane M. Crane. Pp. 384. *Home Words* Publishing Office.

Canon Havergal is so well known that the Memoir before us, written by his eldest daughter, needs but few commendatory words. Mrs. Crane, in her preface, remarks:—"Now that my youngest sister has also joined 'the spirits of the just made perfect,' a double interest will be felt in his memory as the father whom Frances Ridley Havergal so intensely and admiringly loved." The book is well printed in large type.

Under the common title, "Aids to the Inner Life," have been published five volumes (Rivingtons) viz.:—

Scupoli; *Spiritual Combat.*
Keble; *Christian Year.*
Grou; *Hidden Life of the Soul.*
S. Francis de Sales; *Devout Life.*
T. à Kempis; *Imitation of Christ.*

Four of these volumes bear on the title-page the statement:—"Edited by the Rev. W. H. Hutchings, M.A., Sub-warden of the Home of Mercy, Clewer."

We dislike this set, and on two grounds: (1) Of these five "Aids to the Inner Life," only one is a Church of England work. Why are English Church folk invited to study Grou and Scupoli? Why is such a work as Keble's *Christian Year* bound up as one of such a series as this? Five tastefully got up little books; very "Churchy" looking; one, you see, says some would-be buyer, is "The Christian Year!" (2) We dislike this set, because the writings of Romanists are "*adapted!*" We believe that "adaptations" of this sort are mischievous; on literary grounds, we think, they are indefensible. What is omitted; what is altered, toned down, and remodelled?

That we may do no injustice to the Sub-warden of Clewer, we will quote his own words:—

"*The process of adaptation* in the case of this volume *is not left to the reader* but has been undertaken with the view of bringing every expression, *as far*

as possible into harmony with the Book of Common Prayer and Anglican Divinity.

The italics, of course, are our own.

A Biographical Sketch of Alexander Haldane, of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law, J.P. We have quoted the title of this deeply-interesting publication, printed by Messrs. Spottiswoode; but in addition to the exquisitely written biographical sketch, communicated to the *Record* of July 28, 1882, we find an excellent leading article of that journal, and several quotations from private letters. For ourselves, in gladly paying our tribute of sincere respect, we cannot do better than quote what is said on page 32 :—

A few extracts from letters to conclude these reminiscences will be fitly introduced by the glowing words of an easily-recognized master of sentences which accompanied the first public announcement of Mr. Haldane's removal :—

"One who had enjoyed for more than thirty years his society and his "friendship wishes to say a few last words in memory and honour of a "man who has left a deep and indelible mark on his generation. Pos-"sessing a strong intellect, a cultivated mind, and wide knowledge, he "devoted them all to the furtherance of religion and morality, to the "honour of God, and the welfare of the human race. Intense in his love "of the Lord Jesus Christ, and full of faith, and cherishing above all "things the hope of the Second Advent, he laboured throughout his life "for the advancement of that kingdom to which, by God's goodness and "mercy, he is now translated. "S."

A good gift-book is *The Vanguard of the Christian Army* (R.T.S.); *or, Sketches of Missionary Life*: by the Author of "Great Voyagers: Their Adventures and Discoveries." The Missionaries whose lives are here pleasingly unfolded, are Schwartz, Martyn, Judson, Burns, Brainerd, Livingstone, and some ten others. Some of the "lives" are too short and sketchy. The author might have consulted with advantage the Bishop of Ossory's charming series of Missionary Biographies. The volume has a tasteful cloth cover and is gilt-edged; there are several illustrations.

Across the Water (R.T.S.) is a well-written and wholesome story; it relates the experiences of an orphaned family who sought a home in America. The sketches of life under difficulties are well drawn; the story—like the style—is simple. Edith, the mother-sister, at last finds a new home on the beautiful green hills of Kentucky.

A well-written tale—short and simple—is *A Runaway* (S.P.C.K.); wholesome sketches of village and seafaring life. But we cannot recommend it. There is an exclamation, on p. 74 and in other places, "My God!" On p. 124, we observe, "Good God! is this true?" From a second edition such serious blots should be removed.

A tiny book, very tasteful, is *The Light of the Morning*, by ANNA WARNER, Author "Of the Melody of the 23rd Psalm" and other devotional books (Nisbet). Soothing and encouraging words about the love of Jesus.

From Mr. Frowde, Oxford University Press Warehouse, 7, Paternoster Row, we have received two new editions of *The Parallel New Testament:* the A. V. and R. V. printed side by side. One edition is cheap, neatly got up, and printed in clear but small type; the other is

tastefully bound in flexible morocco, in a convenient cover-case; a charming edition for a present.

Two more of the "Colonists' Handbook" series (S.P.C.K.) have been published: *New South Wales* and *Queensland.*

The November *Quiver* (Cassell's) begins a new volume and begins it well. We have always had a kindly feeling towards the *Quiver* as a thoroughly wholesome as well as an attractive family magazine.

The Kitten Pilgrims, "Great Battles and Grand Victories." By R. M. BALLANTYNE, author of "The Three Little Kittens, who Lost their Mittens," &c. Illustrated by the author. (Nisbet & Co.) We have copied the title-page of this amusing and instructive quarto for little folks. Nothing further is necessary. Mr. Ballantyne stands at the head of all our childrens' story-tellers; *facile princeps.*

Of *Selections from the Writings of H. P. Liddon, D.D.* (Rivingtons), we need say little. Canon Liddon's writings are well known; and the editor of this volume appears to have executed his task of selection and arrangement with good judgment.

About the *Fairy Tales of Every Day* (S.P.C.K.), as a literary work, we should have only to write in praise; and many young ladies who know Miss Thackeray's "Five Old Friends and a Young Prince," will be glad, no doubt, to read the present adaptations of Cinderella, and so forth. But although for little folks simple moral lessons are sufficient, we think that the distinctively religious element should sanctify and strengthen "Fairy Tales" for maidens. And is it well that the heroine, an English Churchwoman, should marry a (Roman Catholic) Italian Prince? If we are not to have in these Tales any "*Church*" teaching (and we should be glad to see some) at least let us have a little really sound Christian principle.

We have received from the Religious Tract Society four works of a devotional character; useful, handy volumes: *Rest from Sorrow,* by W. GUEST, F.G.S.; *The Scripture Half-hour at Mothers' Meetings; The Holy Spirit in Man,* by the Rev. A. D. MACMILLAN, and *The Human Sympathies of Christ,* by the Rev. CUNNINGHAM GEIKIE, D.D. All four are good. The last-named is a work of great merit; Dr. Geikie's wide learning and graphic style impart a pleasing freshness to his expositions; he is always suggestive and strong; never poor or common-place. In the readings for mothers' meetings the language now and then is hardly simple enough. How is it that in books for the working classes one so often finds long sentences and difficult words?

We have received from Messrs. Macmillan a new volume of *Sermons,* by Dr. MACLAREN. In referring, recently, to sermons widely known, we made mention of the eminent Baptist preacher, Dr. Maclaren. His very carefully written, polished, and eloquent discourses, preached—we have heard—with oratorical grace and vigour, are read by thoughtful persons in a very wide circle. They are simple, yet suggestive, eminently *real.*

Referring to the address from the Dean and Clergy of Bristol, *The Congregationalist* (Hodder & Stoughton) says:—"The friendly greetings of the clergy of the Church of England at the Bristol meetings were a new feature, and were also a gratifying sign of the times. They were an indirect testimony to the growing power of Congregationalism, but they were also a direct manifestation of a more Catholic and Christian spirit among the clergy themselves. The men who offered them did honour to

the Union, but they did even more honour to themselves, and most of all to the true spirit of Christian unity, which is wider, deeper, and more enduring than any sectarian distinctions."

A new and revised edition of *The Englishman's Brief on behalf of his National Church* has been issued by the S.P.C.K. A full review of the book at the time of its publication appeared in THE CHURCHMAN.

The Religious Tract Society has sent us some specimens of their Almanacks for 1883; good and cheap, as usual.

From Messrs. T. & T. Clark we have received two volumes of the "Meyer's Commentary Series," Dr. HUTHER on James and John, and *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, by Professor LÜNEMANN; the second volume of Dr. MARTENSEN'S *Christian Ethics*, and the first volume of *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, by Dr. WEISS. These, of course, belong to Messrs. Clark's "Foreign Theological Library."

From Messrs. Rivington we have received four elegant little volumes, "gems," tiny editions of the Allegories of the Rev. W. ADAMS—*The Shadow of the Cross*, the *Distant Hills*, &c.

Messrs. S. Hildesheimer & Co. (14 and 15, Silk Street, Whitecross Street, E.C.), whose charming Cards we commended last year, have sent us a parcel of their new ones; splendid in the extreme.

The Church of England Book Society (11, Adam Street, Strand) has issued a fourth edition of *Words from the Waves;* a brief Memoir of C. L. Layton, a youth who was drowned at Weston-super-Mare, in the year 1874.

An admirable work, very short but full, as well as clear, is *Romanism in the Light of the Gospel*, by Miss E. J. WHATELY (R.T.S.), out and out the best book of the kind, so far as we know. We heartily recommend it.

From the Artistic Stationery Company (7, Dyer's Buildings, Holborn, E.C.) we have received some splendid specimens of their Card publications Cards and etchings so choice, we think, have never before come under our notice.—We have also received several Cards from the lady whose charitable efforts in this direction were noticed in THE CHURCHMAN a year ago; Miss E. J. Riddell, Devonshire Lodge, Buxton, chromos with Scriptures. Of several other publications of this kind our notice must be delayed.

The Annual of *Sunshine*, an illustrated Magazine, edited by the Rev. W. MEYNELL WHITTEMORE, D.D., Rector of St. Katherine Cree, London, is bright, wholesome, and cheap. (G. Stoneman, 67, Paternoster Row.)

A capital gift-book for the younger readers is *Katie Brightside*, by RUTH LAMB, the Author of "Sturdy Jack," and other good books (R. T. S.). This story tells in simple language how Katie made the best of everything. The type is large, there are "original drawings by R. Barnes," and the cover is charming.

We welcome another volume of *The Illustrated Missionary News* (E. Stock); attractive and informing; a cheap gift-book. We see that American Missionaries have reached the Bihé country, about which the Portuguese traveller, Pinto, lately wrote.

We heartily recommend the Annual of *Home Words*, edited by the Rev. CHARLES BULLOCK, B.D. (*Home Words* Office, 1, Paternoster

Buildings, E.C.) *Home Words* is a very cheap and useful Magazine, well illustrated, with well-varied matter. We have found that parents as well as the elder Sunday Scholars, in town and country parishes, read it with interest; it may confidently be recommended as a really good "Church Magazine for heart and hearth."

From Messrs. Eyre & Spottiswoode (Great New Street, Fleet Street, E.C.) we have received some thirty prize Christmas and New Year Cards, and one Almanack. The cards are of several sizes, and, of course, the price varies; some of them are simple, and very cheap; but all are tasteful and good. Considering the artistic nature of these pretty presents, one wonders how they can be issued at so low a rate. Sunday School teachers and managers will do well to ask for Messrs. Eyre & Spottiswoode's low-priced cards.

From Messrs. Longmans & Co. we have received, too late for notice in our present issue, *Common British Insects*, by the Rev. J. G. Wood; a capital gift-book for boys. From Messrs. Wells Gardner, Darton & Co. (Paternoster Buildings), we have received the annual of our old friend, *Sunday Reading for the Young*, and three other excellent gift-books for little people.

THE MONTH.

THE SALVATION ARMY.

AT the Chichester Diocesan Conference, lately held at Horsham, a paper on the Salvation Army was read by Mr. W. E. Hubbard, Jun. Kindly acceding to our request, Mr. Hubbard has sent us the Paper for THE CHURCHMAN.

The Salvation Army should be a cause of rejoicing to every earnest man.

In spite of a general increase of civilization and an increase of spirituality in certain classes, vice and infidelity still keep great masses of the people under the thraldom of Satan.

Consider the state of London, which is perhaps not worse than many other large towns. It has been said, and I do not think that the saying is exaggerated, that "London is the most heathen city in the world." Its population now approximates to four millions, and I think it would be within the mark to assert that not more than half of that number ever go to church or chapel; leaving two millions of heathen people in the metropolis of Christian England.

Churchmen and Nonconformists are alike struggling hard to reverse this awful state of things, but in the sight of this spiritual famine can one condemn any means which are found effectual to bring these heathen within sound of the Gospel. God grant that the Salvation Army may never be disbanded; may it be guided in its operations by Divine wisdom, and may it put away whatever in it is erroneous and contrary to the will of God.

In the opinion of many its methods are faulty and even hurtful to the cause for which it is fighting. Humanly speaking its prospects are certainly marred by great haste, irreverence, over-confidence in itself and an occasional want of consideration for other Christians.

There is little respect for the Sacraments which we believe Christ ordained as means for our salvation. There is risk of its more impulsive members presuming on an immunity from sin, there is the danger of reaction common to all revivals and the consequent strengthening of Satan's rule upon earth.

These are imperfections and risks which are apparent; in every human organization there must be many such imperfections.

Against these imperfections the general results of the work must be weighed and our opinion formed accordingly; may we consider the subject with humility, impartiality, and charity, and may we be guided to a right judgment in this matter.

[Mr. Hubbard here gave statistics (which lately appeared in THE CHURCHMAN) concerning the Salvation Army.]

The object of the Army is to awaken sinners to a sense of their present danger and to induce them to lead a definitely holy life. With this in view almost any means which are not immoral are considered to be allowable.

Many of these means may be distasteful to us, some dangerous, or even in our opinion contrary to God's teaching. These errors, so far as they exist, we must deplore, but on the whole I believe the work gives us more cause for hopefulness and rejoicing.

We find in it a strong protest against vice and infidelity, and an extraordinary effort undertaken in God's name to carry the tidings of salvation to sinners. It has evoked a spontaneous outburst of religious zeal, appealing to, reaching, and in great measure supported by, a class which no religious body has as yet been able to win over to an active participation in Christian work.

When we see large numbers drawn from a class of whom the Church has almost despaired, who have long been depicted as steeped in vice and infidelity, and about to overturn all churches and all thrones in a convulsion of communistic atheism; when we see such men fighting for Christ, we must rejoice at their demonstration in support of holiness and pureness of life.

The beginning was small and weak; the magistrates condemned the Salvationists and the mob persecuted them; but now the common people hear them gladly and the wise men are convicted of a mistake.

They succeed because they are sincere and terribly in earnest. Of that there can be no doubt, they may not be wise, they may not be orthodox, but their faith has moved mountains, and our hearts must be colder than stone if we can witness that and remain unmoved at the sight.

The movement is not so unprecedented as it is sometimes represented to be. It is simply the most recent wave in the tide of religious manifestations with which God has blessed these modern times.

The mission of John Wesley, the Evangelical revival, the Oxford movement, the marked progress of the Church during these last twenty years, the preaching of Moody and Sankey, and finally the campaign of

the Salvation Army have all, I believe, been God-sent voices calling us to repentance.

It is said that enthusiastic revivals effervesce and leave no permanent effect, but just as every wave of a rising tide gains some ground, even though it apparently recedes after breaking on the shore, so every religious revival, even when it seems only to have a transient effect itself, makes some impression on cold hearts and prepares the way for the next.

It is objected that the Salvationists are extravagant beyond all reason, that although Moody and Sankey were wild and ephemeral preachers, they were humdrum and dull compared with this outburst of fanaticism.

It is asked, can such an extraordinary exhibition be from God? To the best of my knowledge and belief, I answer——YES.

"God fulfils Himself in many ways."

Is it impossible that, looking in His infinite compassion upon these heathen masses, spiritually starving in the midst of plenty, God may not sanctify even these means of drawing his sons and daughters to the throne of grace when all other means have failed to avert the awful alternative of the loss of their souls for ever?

We are shocked by unseemly language and an apparent want of reverence; this is sad enough, but is it not sadder still that people have been lost because the most solemn preaching and the most beautiful forms of worship utterly failed to awaken their conscience?

The Salvationists may be extravagant, their language is strong and sensational; but so unhappily is the every-day thought and language of the people they address. Their ideas of refinement are very different to ours; they are not conscious of being irreverent; they say simply what they think. Most decidedly their services are conducted in the "vulgar tongue;" but they are "understanded of the people;" they may be grotesque in their phrases, but they are grimly in earnest in their work.

One man prayed to God to make him "a perfect nuisance to the devil." The grotesqueness offends one's taste, but it is not really profane; it is a most pious and praiseworthy wish, and all must desire that his prayer should be granted.

A lady once refused to hear the Army on account of the gross irreverence to her mind, of a certain placard; she said "that horrid placard keeps me out," but the man who invited her said, "to that placard I owe all my happiness; it drew me in." So surely one man's meat is another's poison.

I remember during the Church Mission of 1869 a depraved woman coming to seek for pardon because, as she said, she could not bear the sight of a great black cross that seemed to frighten her every time she passed the church. This was a plain cross, printed at the head of a mission placard. It certainly was large and distinct; but the cross without any words had arrested that woman's attention and reminded her of the punishment of sin. She said she had passed it once or twice with increasing fear and trouble of mind, and then she suddenly broke down and came and was healed.

You may truly say that only the Spirit of God could have softened her hard heart; but the placard was the outward channel by which her senses were awakened to the danger of her soul.

In this case it was the most sacred emblem of the love of God that stopped this poor woman in the course of sin. But let us bear even with startling vulgar placards and exhibitions if it is found that they do arrest those who have long been callous to all other appeals; let us bear with anything that is not wrong, that in any way causes a searching of heart among the careless ones of this world.

Another grave objection to the Salvation Army is its despotic system. There is no doubt about it,—it is a new Popedom, in so far as that the rule of the General is absolute.

Absolutism is certainly repugnant to our ideas, and it is contrary to experience that it should be permanently successful. Mr. Booth's defence is very brief and at present it is much to the point: "All other known systems have been tried and have failed; this is successful." I think something may be said for it. During a time of peace the affairs of the British Army are regulated very much by the War Office and Parliament, but in war time the Commander-in-Chief has liberty to do much as he pleases and is almost absolute. Now the Salvation Army aims at being an army in reality as well as in name; and further, they say that while they are in existence they must be always at war,—they say they will not settle down into ordinary Church life. If this is so it follows that they cannot have discussions and differences of opinion; they must wage war on one plan organized and directed by one head. The Army is not a forced one; the members voluntarily take their places in the ranks, and necessarily submit to the discipline they find established.

May we not learn a lesson from this,—that as we are verily in the presence of a powerful enemy, it were well to put aside for the time our differences of opinion and to maintain somewhat better discipline in our ranks?

Their doctrines have been said to be insufficient and unsound. Perhaps the first charge may be answered in the same way. They constitute an army in the field; they do not pretend to be a fully-organized Church; and there is a great difference between the work of converting sinners and that of edifying the converted. The Salvationists merely reiterate the one question: "Are you saved?" and, when they get an answer in the affirmative, they say, "Go and work." They say: "We show you a faith professed with the mouth and proved by work for God; what more do you want?" They give their converts a Bible, and they urge them to study it. There is no lack of prayer among them; but apparently they hold their warfare to be so urgent that they have no time to study deeper doctrines or to develop more of the spiritual life.

Faith in the blood of Jesus, and surrender of the life to Him is what they exhibit; and if that is really and sincerely maintained, are we quite sure that their doctrine is insufficient? As to the unsoundness, I do not know that I can judge them; but I recognize the danger of over-confidence of salvation. They may presume too much upon God doing all for them without sufficient study and self-examination on their own part.

Mr. Booth entirely repudiates the doctrine of sinless perfection. He distinctly asserts that the best men are liable to temptation and to fall if they quit their hold on God. But he does say that so long as a man surrenders himself to God and leans entirely upon Him, without for a moment suffering his faith to fail, then he is in a state of entire sanctification, and in that state he cannot fall.

So far as I know, if the premiss is right the inference is sound; but it is contrary to experience that even the best men have always been able to maintain such an entire surrender of the will to God, and the danger of this doctrine to ordinary minds is that they may think that this perfection of holiness is easier of attainment than God's saints have ever yet found it to be. We can only say, "With God all things are possible."

Many people trouble themselves about the future of the Army. Is it worth while to do so? Whatever in it is from God will stand, if He so orders it; whatever is not of God will come to naught.

A sudden collapse would do harm; but there are no present signs of it. The last five years have witnessed a very sudden expansion of the movement, many say too sudden to last; but it must not be forgotten that the foundations were being laid for twelve years before that, and the leaders were acquiring their experience. It is not unprecedented that men should toil all the night even for nothing, and then in a moment be rewarded by such rich results of their labour that they are almost overwhelmed thereby.

Most emphatically Mr. Booth declaims against the Army becoming what is called a sect. Of course it may yet be so; but if it does, it will not be a sect split off from other Churches, but a sect carved out of the great mass of external heathenism; and even a new sect under such circumstances should not cause much regret to true Christians.

Even if the existence of the Army as such is ephemeral, certainly the gist of the question is whether its present work produces a permanent effect upon its hearers. People say it is a failure, and that only twenty per cent. of its professed converts are true to their professions. Well, I think those twenty are worth saving; it is a larger percentage than would have sufficed to save from destruction the wicked cities of the plain.

The procedure at their conversion services is on the same lines as an ordinary Church Mission. Addresses, hymns, prayers, an after-meeting with more direct appeals to individuals, private prayer and pleading with them, fervent intercessory prayer. The struggles of those still halting between two opinions and then the joy of the passage of the converted soul from darkness into light.

People say there is too much excitement. I am not sure where we can draw the line. I have seen weak, excitable men and women on the platform, but the majority appear to be as quiet, steady, matter-of-fact people as you could find anywhere. There is excitement, but there is plenty of earnest, practical work too.

I have mixed with them going out after their services, and I wish Church people had the same earnest, solemn look on their faces while they are leaving God's House.

One other matter I noticed: that the prayers and addresses given

by women were listened to with much more respect and had apparently more influence on their audience than those given by men.

As to the reality of their conversions there is much difference of opinion, but there is much direct testimony in its favour. Only the other day a poor woman in Brighton said, "I only know this, that since my man has taken to go to these meetings he has given up the drink and left off knocking me about." I call this a real conversion, and I believe their converts are genuine as a rule, because they have no easy time of it after confession. No hypocrite could stand either the work or the discipline for a week. Every soldier must do something: attend their services, take part in them, and obey his officers; they must give up all intoxicating drink, and must give up smoking. Women must give up all ornaments and anything like a smart dress. Their officers must devote their whole time to the work, they have to conduct three or four meetings every day and an almost continuous round of services on Sunday. They have to visit the members of the Army during at least eighteen hours per week; and last, not least, keep an elaborate set of returns and accounts to be forwarded regularly and punctually to Head Quarters.

The Orders and Regulations of the Army compiled by Mr. Booth are a very remarkable instance of shrewdness and common sense, combined with an extraordinary grasp of the minutest details.

It has been said that the extravagance of the Salvationists causes religion to be evil spoken of. But I fear this risk is inseparable from active Christian warfare. It is at all events certain that the movement is doing some good when Satan bestirs his servants to blaspheme its object. The more a Church strives to extend her Lord's kingdom the more strenuously will Satan strive to discredit her in the eyes of the world. Nothing is easier than to have only smooth words spoken about you. Keep your religion to yourselves, give up proselytizing in Satan's kingdom, and your object will be attained; yet surely the most desperate fight would be preferable to a peace won by so dishonourable a surrender.

It is extremely difficult to say what the position of the Army is in relation to the Church. It is not antagonistic. Mr. Booth wishes it to help all Churches and to rival none. His work was first described simply as the Christian Mission, and that is exactly what it is,—a Mission conducted by the people in their own way without the aid of the clergy, not always, I fear, in a very considerate spirit to those who have been working to the best of their ability long before the Army came into existence, but still in no spirit of antagonism to them. I may mention that already 400 men and women converted by and trained in the Salvation Army have been engaged by various Christian bodies as ministers, missionaries, bible women, and the like.

To sum up, whatever are their faults I believe the good they are doing in "Heathen England" far outweighs any evil that may attach to their mode of operations, and that therefore the movement should be a source of rejoicing to every one who desires to see England become in reality as well as in name a truly Christian country.

The question as to whether the Church can do anything in the matter has already been referred to the Upper House of Convocation,

and it will be a subject for great congratulation if they can answer it in a definite manner.

I do not think that the Church can incorporate or identify herself with the Army.

Some imitations of the Army on what are called Church lines have already sprung into being; God grant that this may be a move in the right direction. Of course the Church could do the work better than the Salvationists if she had the will.

We have got better machinery, we can copy the organization; but have we got the fervour, the steam that alone can start the machinery and cause it to do its work successfully?

It is more important to discuss what we are to do with the masses of unconverted people around us than what we are to do with the Army.

The Church has long cried, and cried aloud in her invitation to the heathen, but the people do not hear; they do not care to hear; the Army, however, goes out into the streets, into the highways and hedges, and compels them to come in.

The Church has too long waited for the people to come to hear the Gospel. The people now flock to the Salvationists. But the Salvationists began by going out to the people.

We are rather too fond of hiding our religion under the guise of semi-secular things, as if it were a medicine so nauseous as to need some sweet disguise; we try and coax the people to come to Church. The Salvationists put the blunt alternative before them: "Go to the Saviour and get salvation, or you will be lost eternally." We indirectly pay poor people to come and hear sermons; the Salvationists have an offertory at every service, and expect the people to pay for the privilege of coming.

We cannot at all events regard such a movement with apathy. Woe to the Church that could do so! Surely her candlestick would before long be removed out of its place.

Thank God for it, the Church of England is not callous to a spiritual awakening; she is in many places alive and stirring; and it is only a question as to the direction in which her chief officers will steer her course.

It is difficult for a layman to advise the clergy; but it seems to me that what is wanted is more work outside the walls of the church, more street preaching, more field preaching, more preaching from house to house, more direct personal work. Truly Christ and His apostles taught and preached in the synagogues, but they made many more converts to Christianity in the wilderness and on the seashore.

The clergy cannot do it all, the laity must help, and the clergy must seek help from all ranks. The educated and godly laymen of the upper classes are few, but there are many others who have the love of God in their hearts, and would have much weight with their fellows if the clergy would utilize the services of all they could find, and not be afraid of even a little vulgarity.

Lord Shaftesbury once said that the lowest classes of England would never be Christianized until they were preached to by men of nearly their own rank; and I would recommend that too many obstacles be not put in the way. Bishops' licenses, a sort of quasi-ordination, and

a long preparation are not absolutely necessary for preaching the Gospel. Employ women, too, wherever it is possible, and do not fence the lay helpers round with a number of regulations; give them as much freedom as possible.

Do not be afraid of a little enthusiasm. Of course a highly-civilized Englishman is seldom enthusiastic; it is considered hardly respectable; but a conventional respectability will never upset the kingdom of Satan: he has got hold of people who don't know what it is, and naturally it makes no impression upon them.

Above all, let congregations who profess to have found Christ set a better example; let us individually give more thought to the lives we lead, and let us try to set our own house in order; let us endeavour to mitigate as soon as may be the hindrances in the constitution of our Church.

Can we expect to gain great victories as a Church while there is anarchy within, while the bishops have so little power to rule, and while there are clergy who will not obey; while the cure of souls is bought and sold as freehold property, while the poor are often practically shut out of their own churches, while clergy who do nothing more than they are obliged are irremovable from their posts; while immortal souls are consequently dying in ignorance and unrepented sin; while our services are stereotyped and inelastic; and while instead of trying to rectify these wrongs we wrangle among ourselves about points of mediæval ritual, how can we expect poor ignorant men and women to appreciate the religion which we have buried under such a mass of shameful abuses.

[Mr. Hubbard here referred to his resolutions.]

One thing we can all do, and that is to pray God that whatever is wrong in this movement may be mercifully over-ruled, and that what is right may be blessed and multiplied exceedingly to the glory of His name and to the salvation of many souls whom His Son died to redeem!

The reports of several Diocesan Conferences have been read with interest. The Diocesan Conference movement, we note with pleasure, is still growing and gaining strength. Such conferences of laity and clergy can hardly fail to exert great influence for good.

At York, the Archbishop made some remarks upon Church Courts. His Grace said:—

A commission has been sitting for some time on the subject, but it will be some time before it is in a position to report. What I have urged on other occasions I wish to repeat now in presence of the clergy of the diocese. A demand that the future courts shall one and all have the formal approval of the synods of the Church may transform itself, almost before we know how, into a demand for disestablishment. The Church has never before founded her own courts. The Court of Final

Appeal is the body of advisers of the Crown in the last appeal which all subjects who think they suffer wrong have the right to bring to the foot of the throne. The Court of First Instance may be expected to be a purely ecclesiastical court, and the Church may expect to make her voice heard as to its constitution. But the Crown would have a voice in the appointment of the court which was to be its final adviser in matters connected with the rights of the subject.

At Chichester a very interesting paper was read by Mr. S. Hannington on "How to Popularize the Services of the Church." A committee was appointed. In supporting Mr. Hannington, Mr. Purton, Rector of Kingston-by-Sea, dwelt on three points; the need of elasticity in our services; the Lay Diaconate; and Diocesan Organization of Missions. Some resolutions were proposed by Mr. W. E. Hubbard, jun., referring to the Salvation Army; but an amendment, proposed by the Dean of Chichester, was carried by a large majority.

At Liverpool, after a strong speech by the Bishop against it, a proposal to send six representatives to the Central Council was negatived; 70 were in favour of, and 90 against it.

At Norwich there was an interesting discussion on the Lay Diaconate. On the motion of Canon Garratt, the Committee was reappointed.

On the 4th, an application having been made by his Bishop, Mr. Green was released.

We deeply regret the loss of Archdeacon Prest. From the first a warm friend of THE CHURCHMAN, he recently wrote to us expressing his regret that he had been unable oftener to contribute to our columns. An admirable *In Memoriam*, with the well-known initials, "H. B. T.," appeared in the *Record* of the 3rd, and we gladly quote its opening sentences, as follows:—

The Church of England has lost, in the removal of Archdeacon Prest, of Durham, one who has been for years foremost in every good work in his own diocese, and whose influence and labours extended far beyond the counties of Durham and Northumberland. Quiet, gentle, and unassuming in manner; patient, calm, and unruffled in discussion; clear and temperate in judgment; firm and definite in his convictions; unflinching in his decisions, never hastily formed; with a legal and methodical mind, which led him cautiously to weigh every argument on either side; thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the Protestant Reformation; with his inner life continually fed by close communion and intercourse with his Saviour—for he was markedly a man of prayer—no wonder that he exercised an influence second to none over the whole of the Evangelical portion of our Church in the North of England.