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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

NOVEMBER, 1883.

ART. I.—THE REPORT OF THE ROYAL COMMISSION, AND THE EPISCOPAL VETO.

THE Commissioners for inquiring into the constitution and working of the Ecclesiastical Courts were appointed on the 16th May, 1881, and only made their report in August last. They held seventy-five meetings, they heard fifty-six witnesses orally; and though the actual Reports do not occupy more than sixty-three pages of blue-book, they have presented to her Majesty and the public two blue volumes, containing altogether more than 1,000 pages of closely printed quarto. To give within the limits of a paper in THE CHURCHMAN an adequate review of the results of the Commissioners' labours is obviously impossible. At the same time, it may be desirable to give some account of the more salient features of the actual signed Reports, in order that our readers may be the better able to appreciate the general tendency of their important parts. The writer of this paper would be the first to disclaim any idea that the short period which has elapsed since the publication of the Reports can possibly be enough to enable him to understand their full bearing; all he can pretend to do is to offer a few remarks, of the most obvious kind. It is to be hoped that every reader of THE CHURCHMAN will take the pains to investigate each point for himself, and not be content to take, at secondhand, impressions which at this early date must be considered as provisional.

The Reports are as follows: First, a long and (shall we say?) somewhat tedious general Report, signed by all the Commissioners except Lord Penzance—but as to many of the signatures, accompanied by reservations; this general Report is then followed by the reservations and dissents as to particular portions of it which the dissentients have found themselves on different grounds unable to agree with; and lastly comes Lord Penzance's separate Report.

I have spoken, perhaps, rather too disrespectfully of the general Report; but the fact is, that a very large portion of it is taken up with an historical disquisition on the Pre-Reformational Courts. Indeed, Pre-Reformational is an inadequate expression; the Commissioners go back to the times before the Conquest. Considering that their instructions were to deal with the Ecclesiastical Courts, "as created, or modified, under the Reformation Statutes of the 24th and 25th years of King Henry VIII., and any subsequent Acts," this antiquarian zeal shows that the Commissioners, at all events, took no narrow view of their duties. It cannot be said, however, that its result is completely satisfactory even to the historian. This part of the Report is confessedly and obviously based upon, and it may almost be said reproduced from, a draft Report by the illustrious Canon Stubbs. The Commissioners have printed Canon Stubbs's draft as an appendix to their own Report, so that the two may be compared with one another. The reader is strongly recommended to peruse the Canon's production first, and not to read the historical part of the Commissioners' Report till afterwards, if he wishes to obtain a correct view of the relation between the two. Now Canon Stubbs is a very eminent man; but there is no reason why, if the Commissioners thought proper to write a new history, they should have handed over their historical consciences to him, especially in matters of law and legal history. Canon Stubbs is no lawyer; if he had been, he would never have allowed himself to enumerate the Archbishop's Courts of Peculiars among his *Provincial* Courts. Yet this woful slip is adopted as it stands from Canon Stubbs's appendix into the Commissioners' Report.

To anyone who looks a little beyond the immediate future, there is really much satisfaction to be obtained from a perusal of this Report with its voluminous accompaniments. The Nonconforming party have had their fling, and a real good fling it has been. There stands their case, printed at length in the evidence, as extracted from the lips of their most representative men, the utmost they can do, the whole of their grievances and their demands. This fact alone ought to outweigh much that might otherwise appear unsatisfactory in the mere Report itself.

But even if we confine our attention to the Reports themselves, although we find, no doubt, that the necessity for making concessions to agitation has had great influence, there is not much (likely to pass through Parliament) that will do permanent harm. If, for instance, the Bishops are made to sit in their own Courts, whatever absurdities may be perpetrated at the outset will be more than counterbalanced in the future

by the leaven of common-sense and plain, sturdy, commercial morality which the study of law must inevitably produce in the clergy, especially if clergymen take to practising as advocates in the Ecclesiastical Courts. We are not of those who think that Bishops are at present sadly over-taxed; and consequently we see no objection to this proposal on the ground of the additional labour it will cast upon them. We trust it may be supplemented by a regular Clerical Bar. The benefit to the clergy will be incalculable. No doubt we shall get some curiosities at first starting in the judgments of our present revered prelates; but they must not mind being laughed at: and by-and-by, when they are succeeded by men who have received a legal training in courts of law, we shall hear no more of vetoes, or things of that kind, even if such things shall still continue a theoretical existence. On the other hand, there is much in the Report which is statesmanlike and thoroughly sound. The recommendation of suspension and deprivation instead of imprisonment, and other recommendations, will probably meet with general approval.

It appears to have been over and over again pressed upon the Commissioners that they should treat ecclesiastical suits as civil, and not as criminal, proceedings. No doubt it is for the advantage of clergy that these suits should remain criminal in character, so that the reverend defendants may have the benefit of all those technicalities which the principles of English Temporal Courts allow a prisoner to take advantage of. The Commissioners recommend that the pleading and procedure in all the Courts in contentious cases shall follow as near as may be the practice and procedure of the Supreme Court of Judicature in civil cases. If this recommendation is carried out, the effect will be that the element of fiction and unreality which has pervaded these ecclesiastical prosecutions —and is principally due to the circumstance of their being criminal in form—will be, to a great extent, eliminated. It was Mr. Valpy's suggestion; and the change will be as advantageous as the proposal itself is modest.

The most unsatisfactory part of the Report is that which relates to the Bishop's veto, by which the Bishop claims to protect clergymen from liability to the law. It is only dealt with in one short clause, which appears on the very same page as a magnificently sounding sentence, concerning the indefeasible right (of every subject of the Crown) "to approach the throne itself with a representation that justice has not been done him, and with a claim for the full investigation of his cause." No doubt this sentence was only meant to apply to appeals to the Crown against an adverse decision. But why every subject of the Crown should have an indefeasible

right to appeal against an adverse decision, but no right to appeal against a blank refusal of any decision—why he should have a right to appeal against a decision where he has been fully heard, but no right to complain where he has not been heard at all, it would not be easy to say. But as Romola says: "The human soul is hospitable, and will entertain conflicting sentiments and contradictory opinions with much impartiality." So will a blue-book, apparently. It is satisfactory to find that the Archbishop of York, Lord Chichester, the Dean of Peterborough, Mr. Jeune, Lord Coleridge, the Vicar-General of the Province of Canterbury, Chancellor Espin, and, lastly, Lord Penzance, have recorded their absolute dissent from this portion of the general Report; and that the late Archbishop, as we have learned from the Bishop of Winchester, would have been found joining in this dissent.

It could hardly be expected, when the constitution of the Commission is considered, that an explicit condemnation of this "Privilege of Clergy" should be found in the Report of the majority. The clerical element (by which we do not mean clergymen only) was far too strongly represented for that.

The fact is that while we should all like to see the Bishops taking the lead in matters of morality and true religion, and standing forth before the world as living proofs that the keenest intellect, the soundest common-sense, and the highest development of nineteenth-century morality are not only not inconsistent with, but, on the contrary, essential to the highest Christianity, and thereby wielding an authority and influence for good over the spirit of man which no secular enactments could either destroy or bestow; yet nobody can shut his eyes to the circumstance, that as things stand at present, the ideal is not universally realized. There can be no doubt that the Commissioners were perfectly aware that if the "spiritual authority" of the Bishops is to be preserved, it must be by dint of very careful nursing and swaddling. No one knows it better than the Bishops themselves. The Bishop of Oxford, for instance, must know full well that he can never wield any "spiritual" authority which is not given him by Act of Parliament. And the worst of it is that you cannot prevent the public from imputing the sins of individuals to the whole class. A profound consciousness of this would naturally induce many members of the Commission to cling to this veto as a drowning man clutches at a straw. But a voting majority is obtained by counting, not by weighing. The legal element among the Commissioners, including Chancellor Espin, and also the only episcopal member who has had much experience in the ecclesiastical appeals to the Privy Council (we allude to the Archbishop of York), is strongly against the veto.

So that the somewhat feminine character of the treatment of the subject by the numerical majority becomes less surprising.

The first thing that strikes one is the oddness of the phraseology. "Nothing has been brought to the notice of the Commission to lead them to recommend any alteration in the law which leaves it to the Bishop to give permission to the complainant to proceed." This disinclination to call a spade a spade is curiously characteristic. When the whole Church is eagerly discussing the power of veto, when several witnesses have raised the question distinctly and expressed the strongest opinions on the point, this numerical majority dares not even to call the thing in question by any other name than "the power of the Bishop to give permission to the complainant to proceed." Why, if you take the words by themselves, they are harmless enough. No one would object to the Bishop (provided he was not to be judge in the case) prejudging the case before hearing it, and using such spiritual influence, if any, as a person so acting may think he possesses, to conciliate popular favour and subscriptions for his candidate, and to dissuade and deter his rival. The lay justice of the Law Courts is, we will not say of a higher, but at all events of a very different character to episcopal justice, in some of its present developments, and would not be affected by the leave of the Bishop being granted or refused to the complainant. The substantial question is therefore not whether the Bishop shall or shall not have power to sanction the complainant's proceeding, but whether that sanction shall be made by statute a *sine quâ non* to the complainant's proceeding with his complaint in the legal method. It is a matter for serious complaint that the Report does not deal with this definite and most important point in more definite language. Such as it is, however, this phraseology finds such favour that it occurs twice in the body of the Report.[1] It cannot, therefore, be due to inadvertence. It might, indeed, be plausibly urged that the Report really means to leave open the question of principle, viz., whether justice should be free or fettered. If so, why in the world does it not say so? The sentence we have quoted does not end with a full stop. It is, in fact, in its entirety, as follows: "Nothing has been brought to the notice of the Commission to lead them to recommend any alteration in the law which leaves it to the Bishop to give permission to the complainant to proceed, and therefore they see no reason for restraining the general power of making a complaint in the first instance as provided in the Church Discipline Act." The ostensible point of the whole sentence is, of course, that there is no reason for limiting com-

[1] At pp. lii. and lvii.

plaints to three parishioners, or to residents for a certain period, or to officials, such as churchwardens, archdeacons, or the like. It is not stated, but only assumed, that there is a necessity for putting a padlock on the doors of the Temple of Justice. And yet, without knowing of this assumption, how is it possible to understand the *sequitur* implied in the word "therefore"? Nay, without knowing of the existence of this assumption, it would be impossible to guess that the words "power to give permission" mean "power to veto." The assumption, therefore, is of vital importance for the purpose of making intelligible not only the reasoning of the Commissioners, but also their very language; and this quite independently of the truth of the assumption. On the self-evident importance of its truth or falsity we need not enlarge. Under these circumstances the public had a right to expect a statement that it had been proved before the Commissioners that some limitation of the ordinary rights of her Majesty's subjects is necessary in ecclesiastical cases; or, at all events, a statement that the Commissioners have taken it for granted that some such limitation is necessary. But we look in vain for either the one or the other. And the reason is not far to seek. The objections to either course were too potent and crushing. A statement that the necessity for some limitation had been proved would have been in too glaring contradiction to the facts that no suit has been shown to have been instituted frivolously or vexatiously, while many suits which have been vetoed have been shown to have been neither frivolous nor vexatious. On the other hand, if the Commissioners had stated in so many words that they were proceeding on the assumption that some limitation was necessary, the public would have immediately cried, "Why, that is one of the most important things which you were told to inquire into!" And so, in order to steer between Scylla and Charybdis, they affect to consider that the only question is between the Bishops' veto and some other limitation, and that the *onus* of proof lies on those who would substitute some other limitation for the Bishops' veto.

It may be perfectly true, and we are not disposed to dispute, that *if* some limitation is necessary, the *onus* of proof is upon those who would substitute some different limitation for that which is now in existence. But on the prior and much more important question, whether there is any reason for making the Ecclesiastical Courts an exception to the rule of free justice which has prevailed in this country since Magna Charta[1]

[1] "Nulli negabimus justitiam vel rectum" (Magna Charta). "Neither the end, which is justice, nor the meane whereby we may attaine to the end, and that is the law" (Commentary of Lord Coke thereon).

downwards, the burden of proof is on those who support so gross an anomaly, so great a novelty.

Before saying a word further, it must be at once stated that this important question is not one which can be decided by discussing on which side the burden of proof lies. If, and so far as that portion of the Report which deals with this question is founded solely on any assumption as to the burden of proof, it is merely frivolous. In whichever way the burden of proof lies, the Commissioners ought to have fully considered the question, and to have given us the benefit of their reasoning. If they had done so, and had come to the conclusion that free justice was not desirable in the Ecclesiastical Courts, then, when they came to the second question, viz., what fetter should be imposed, there would not be much to complain of if they had decided it simply on the burden of proof; if, in fact, they had said there was no reason for change because no reason had been shown. It might be a matter of opinion whether any reason had or had not been shown; but, at any rate, the form of the Report on this point would not have been matter for censure. There were two separate questions with which the Commissioners had to deal, perfectly distinct from one another, differing widely in importance, and also in the treatment which they respectively demanded. Yet, in satisfaction of that demand, all we are offered in this voluminous and voluble Report of sixty pages of blue-book is an unreasoned and barely intelligible sentence in which both points are lumped together: "Nothing has been brought to the notice of the Commission to lead them to recommend any alteration in the law which leaves it to the Bishop to give permission to the complainant to proceed, and therefore they see no reason for restraining the general power of making a complaint in the first instance as provided in the Church Discipline Act." However you look at it, this is wholly inadequate; and, we must say, a clear shirking of the Commission's duty. We have pointed out considerations which must have weighed with many of the majority in favour of endeavouring by any decent means to support "spiritual" authority by the secular arm; we have shown that on this particular question they were without the assistance of the most experienced portion of their body; and we have indicated the dilemma which was staring them in the face. The stress of the logical situation is so evident, and the necessity for finding some way out of the dilemma is so palpable, as almost to lead to a presumption that the way which has been adopted will be found a little difficult to square with the facts.

In the first place it is a little startling, in contrast with th statement as to the utter absence of evidence, to read Lo

Coleridge's view of what was "brought to the notice of the Commission." He says (Report, p. lxii.), "The active interference of the Bishops to prevent the law of the land being enforced against those who have deliberately broken it seems to me to be fast becoming intolerable in practice;" that the right (of veto) "is one which, desiring to speak with true respect, I must think, in fact, has been abused." Either the Lord Chief Justice is reporting on what has not been brought to the notice of the Commission, or the majority of the Commissioners have been surprisingly blind and deaf. We cannot help thinking of an incident in the trial scene in "Pickwick," which suggests a possible explanation of the extraordinary contradiction.[1] "Do you see any evidence?" asks Lord Coleridge. "No," say the majority, gazing intently on their dilemma.

Even if, on the evidence taken before the Commission and printed with their Reports, there should be found no evidence against the veto, still, except on the principle that all is fair in love or war, it is rather unfair to ignore the published opinions of the Judges in the Bishop of Oxford's case merely because the presence of his lordship as a member of the Commission prevented the apparent discourtesy of reading these opinions to the Commissioners. When that Bishop interfered to veto the suit against Mr. Carter of Clewer, his technical right to do so was upheld by the Common Law Courts, but on purely technical grounds; while the opinion of the Judges on the merits of the case were clearly given. Lord Justice Bramwell said:

It is admitted that Mr. Carter has committed, and is wilfully and knowingly persisting in committing, six several breaches of the law of the land, acts for which he might be indicted and punished. By what means he has persuaded himself that he can receive the wages of the State to do a certain duty, and not do it, but do that which is opposed to it, I cannot conceive; and, with all submission, I feel a nearly equal difficulty in understanding how it can seem right to the Right Reverend Bishop not to bring him to justice. . . . . It does seem to me (I speak with sincere respect) that the discretion here has been most erroneously exercised.

Lord Justice Thesiger said:

I would guard myself against being supposed to differ in any way from the expressions upon this point which have fallen from Lord Justice Bramwell, and which were made use of in the Court below.

Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, after giving his reasons why the *mandamus* should be granted, said that it would have

---

[1] "'Do you see him here now?' said the judge.
"'No, I don't, my lord,' replied Sam, staring right up into the lantern in the roof of the court."

been a very different thing if the Bishop had declined to grant a commission "on the ground *that the complaint was frivolous or vexatious,* or that it had been prompted by sinister or unworthy motives . . . . but nothing of the kind exists here." Mr. Justice Field and Mr. Justice Manisty concurred in this language.

However, as these opinions were not formally read before the Commission, their existence, however well-known, would not *per se* affect the literal truth of the statement that nothing *had been brought to the notice* of the Commission (against the veto). It is not said that there is no reason to recommend any alteration; but an affectation of judicial impartiality, and of deciding only on the evidence before them, is introduced, probably for the same reasons which caused the veto to be called a "permission to proceed." It should be noted also that the language is calculated at first sight to lead the reader to conclude that no evidence whatever has been adduced against the veto. Whether intended or not, that will undoubtedly be the effect of it. But when we turn to the evidence itself, what do we find? Mr. Valpy quoted to the Commissioners eight cases where the Bishop, exercising his veto, had stated his reasons for so doing. These so-called "reasons" are of the most ridiculous character; but the point of our present argument is that in *not a single one* is the frivolousness or vexatiousness of the suit given as the ground of the veto. Under these circumstances can anything be more frivolous and vexatious than to allege that the veto is required to stop frivolous and vexatious suits? Then look at the result of the veto in these eight cases. Mr. Valpy's evidence shows that in only one case have the illegalities been discontinued by the incriminated clergymen. This was the case of Mr. Chapman at Donhead St. Andrews. In one other case, the clergyman resigned, and the illegalities were discontinued by his successor. But in the other six it is in uncontradicted evidence that undoubtedly illegal practices, established by actual decisions to be illegal, are continued, and protected by the veto.

Or, to take a particular case, one of these eight, let anyone read the really touching story told by Mr. Howard, the railway clerk (7701-7703), of the building of the church for the railway men, of the three law-breakers appointed in succession by the Bishop, of the petition of 800 inhabitants for the appointment of a law-abiding clergyman replied to by that Bishop's appointment of Mr. Glover, of the various failures culminating only at the last in the veto, and then ask himself whether the somewhat unadorned language of this railway clerk is not intelligible, excusable, almost justifiable?

Now in the face of all this, is it possible to contend that there

is absolutely *no* evidence against the veto? We do not say no *sufficient* evidence, but no evidence at all. It is impossible to suppose that these sixteen Commissioners can have intended to commit themselves to the statement that there was no evidence at all, especially when to say that there was not sufficient evidence would equally well answer their purpose. Accordingly, when we examine the language with still more minuteness, we find that a loophole is carefully left to enable it to be said, if necessary, that the sentence does not really mean that no evidence against the veto was adduced, but only that no evidence was adduced sufficient to lead them to recommend alteration.

But if this is what is intended, the statement must be based not solely upon what was "brought to the notice of" the Commission *against* the veto, but on a consideration of the whole of the evidence taken together; on the evidence for the veto as well as the evidence against it. Now, how is the evidence against the veto met? What is the counter-evidence in its favour? Surely we expect to find the witnesses giving numerous instances of the necessity and beneficial working of the veto; of parishes pacified by its exercise, parishioners coming back to their parish churches, harmony regained, confidence restored. And, on the other hand, we should expect to hear of suits which ought to have been, but have not been, vetoed, dragging their weary length along to the ultimate consummation, which ought to have been their fate from their very beginning, of being dismissed with costs to be paid by the complainant.

How ludicrously the actual evidence offered meets such expectations, can only be appreciated by those who have read it. Suffice it here to say that no attempt whatever is made on the part of the ritualists either to show any instance of a "frivolous and vexatious" suit (indeed they could hardly do so in the face of the fact that in no instance has a veto been actually exercised on that ground), or to quote a single parish pacified by means of an exercise of the veto. In the case of Mr. Barrett of St. George, Barrow in Furness, the illegal practices are said to have been discontinued by his successor, Mr. Barrett himself having resigned; it is therefore clear that the immediate cause of the discontinuance was Mr. Barrett's resignation; and though his resignation may conceivably be in some way or other caused wholly by the veto, and not at all by the suit, it is reasonable to ask for some evidence of this before the case can be quoted as supporting the veto. But it is not in fact quoted by any of the ritualists as supporting the veto, nor is any other case. There is positively nothing but this question (in different forms, of course,) asked, "Are you

in favour of the veto?" And if the answer is affirmative, no grounds for such an answer are given or even asked for. No one asks why the witness thinks so, whether he is answering from his experience or his imagination; no one thinks it necessary (or perhaps safe?) to ask for instances. At one of the earlier sittings, an inexperienced Commissioner ventured to go a little further with Dr. Tristram, who had answered "Yes" to the question (3218), "Should you leave it in the discretion of anyone as to whether the case was to be heard or not?" But he had much better have left it alone; for it quickly appeared that Dr. Tristram's idea was that the power of vetoing should only exist where a man, *solely* influenced by spite and malignity, brings a *false* charge against a clergyman, and should be exercised by the *Chancellor*, with an appeal to the *Dean of Arches!* After this unfortunate result of indulging in an undue curiosity, the questions are regularly limited to mere approval or disapproval. Thus Mr. Shelly, Mr. Hubbard, Lord Alwyne Compton, and Mr. Bouverie, merely approve of the veto without giving any facts or instances derived from experience in support of their opinion. While the Rev. J. Oakley (since Dean of Carlisle), the Rev. Berdmore Compton, Mr. Wilbraham Egerton, the Rev. G. Body, the Dean of Manchester, the Rev. W. E. Heygate, Dr. Littledale, Canon Bright, Mr. Mackonochie, Mr. Beresford Hope, the Rev. Malcolm Maccoll, the Dean of St. Paul's, the Chancellor of Manchester, Canon Liddon, and Canon Trevor, are not asked, nor does any of them volunteer a word about it.

But now let us suppose that when this question comes before Parliament, timidity and partiality are found after all too strong for reason and justice, and that this bogey of frivolous and vexatious litigation has not been laid. Let us, in view of such a contingency, consider what may be conceded to clamour without the flagrant injustice of this secret veto. And here let it be observed, that there is nothing in the reports of the Commissioners to show that they have in any way whatever considered this point.

In the first place, there could be nothing objectionable in allowing clergymen who have been the defendants in frivolous and vexatious actions, to have the remedy provided for the ordinary layman who has been the object of a malicious prosecution. This was suggested to the Commission by Mr. Girdlestone. Let them have their remedy in an action for damages for a malicious suit in the Ecclesiastical Court. And if this is not enough, let it be extended, if necessary, to a case where the suit, though not malicious, has been frivolous and vexatious; or, if you will, where it has been either frivolous or vexatious. Care of course must be taken so to define the

vexatiousness as not to allow it to include that amount of vexatiousness which is a necessary incident to every suit. Every suit must be in one sense vexatious to the defendant. But the distinction between inevitable vexatiousness and the vexatiousness which goes beyond this necessary point, is not unknown to the law courts. The writer of this paper well remembers hearing a barrister make an application to the Court of Appeal for an order that a certain appellant should give security for costs, on the ground that the appeal in that case was vexatious. The late Sir George Jessel, who was presiding, at once said, "Why, every appeal is vexatious!" Of course it was necessary, and in all such cases is necessary, to show that the vexatiousness which gives a right to the other side to ask for security for costs is something beyond this ordinary vexatiousness.

Another alternative would be to allow the defendant to raise the frivolity and vexatiousness as a preliminary defence. It is the defendant's business alone. If the defendant does not object to the suit on the ground of its being frivolous and vexatious, why in the world should anyone else interfere? This is another objection to the proposed episcopal veto, that it may be wholly uncalled for. No doubt it may be presumed with a high degree of probability that these nonconforming clergy would desire to raise every possible defence; the probability is in marvellous proportion to the justice of the complaints against them; but then it may be also presumed that they are capable of expressing their wishes. They are clearly the proper persons, and if they do not wish to do so, no one else has any business to meddle. It is not a matter of course that every defendant should wish to raise the objection. Everybody knows that where there are *bonâ-fide* disputants, it continually happens that one says to the other: "You say I am wrong; I say I am right. Don't go on nagging, but if you think you have a complaint, the law courts are open: go and take your remedy. Either withdraw your accusations, or have it out in the proper way." Everybody can see the reasonableness of this, and every lawyer knows that it is the very best foundation for conducting litigation without acrimony. But this can only happen where the defendant *bonâ fide* believes he is right; and the case for the veto rests on the tacit assumption (which might just as well be confessed at once) that this happens so rarely as to be altogether unworthy of notice.

We may sum up our criticisms on the action of the majority of the Commission with regard to this question of the veto, by saying that their treatment of it appears grossly inadequate, and plainly contrary to the evidence.

A Layman.

ART. II.—SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE.

IT was a saying of Wordsworth that "many men in this age had done wonderful *things*, as Davy, Scott, Cuvier, etc., but that Coleridge was the only wonderful *man* he knew." This seems to have been the judgment of all who had the privilege of knowing the poet, the moralist, the psychologist, and the philosopher. The man was more than his works, the author greater than his books. Great as his reputation was while he lived, it has increased since his death; and he exercises still a powerful influence over the thinkers of this generation. Those who knew him in his more vigorous days, bore witness to the power of his regal mind, and to the brilliancy of his conversational eloquence, which was peculiar and unique of its kind. De Quincey,[1] speaking of a visit that he made to the poet, refers to his conversation on that occasion in the following words:

> That point being settled, Coleridge, like some great river, the Orellana, or the St. Lawrence, that, having been checked and fretted by rocks, or thwarting islands, suddenly recovers its volume of waters, and its mighty music, swept at once, as if returning to his natural business, into a continuous strain of eloquent dissertation, certainly the most novel, the most finely illustrated, and traversing the most spacious fields of thought, by transitions the most just and logical that it was possible to conceive.

A Quarterly Reviewer in an article on "Coleridge's Poetical Works," written in the year 1834, thus sums up the difference between the conversation of Coleridge and Sir James Mackintosh, also a brilliant and elegant talker:

> To listen to Mackintosh was to inhale perfume; it pleased but it did not satisfy. The effects of an hour with Coleridge is to set you thinking; his words haunt you for a week afterwards; they are spells, brightenings, revelations. In short it is, if we may venture to draw so bold a line, the whole difference between talent and genius.

It were impossible, in the space allowed us in these pages, to enter upon the labours of Coleridge as a moralist, or as a metaphysical philosopher, or to speak of such literary works as the "Friend," the "Lay Sermons," the "Aids to Reflection," and "The Church and State." His "Table Talk" is a delightful volume, full of beauties; and his "Notes" on English Divines present many examples of acute theological criticism. To attempt anything like a review of these volumes would be beyond our limits; but we may say in passing that there is

---

[1] De Quincey's "Recollections of the Lake Poets;" Gillman's "Life of Coleridge;" "The English Poets," edited by T. H. Ward.

not one of them which does not supply to the patient reader topics suggestive of the deepest thought and the greatest interest.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge was the youngest son of a Devonshire clergyman, vicar of Ottery St. Mary, and master of its Grammar School. He was born in the year 1772. His father was a man of guileless simplicity, described by his son as a sort of Parson Adams, distinguished alike by his learning and his inexperience of the world. It is strange to say that he was an object of dislike and persecution to his mother, and being a child of delicate condition, he was excluded from the sports of his brothers, and was left to find his amusement in books. He was early attracted to works of imagination, and before he was six years old he had thrice read through the stories of the "Arabian Nights;" and when alone he pursued his dreams of fancy, and realized them in his solitary games. When the death of his father broke up his quiet home, the delicate and sensitive boy was removed to the heart of London, and placed on the foundation of Christ's Hospital. He went there in the summer of 1782, and carried to the din and dust of London images of the country, its green lanes and grassy meadows, its old church with its grey tower; and these refreshed the heart of the dreaming boy, as he roamed fancy free through the crowded streets of the great city. Here he found himself associated with several boys who won distinction in after-life; and he formed a lasting friendship with the brilliant Leigh Hunt, and the inimitable Charles Lamb. Coleridge early displayed his genius, outstripped all competition, and rose to be the captain of the school. Before completing his fifteenth year he had translated the Greek Hymns of Synesius into English Anacreontic verse. This was no school-task undertaken by compulsion, but was a work of choice and a labour of love. An interesting anecdote is told of him at this time. Strolling one day down the Strand, absorbed in a reverie, and fancying himself Leander swimming across the Hellespont, he thrust out his hands before him like a swimmer; and as one of his hands touched a gentleman's pocket, the stranger laid hold of him as a pickpocket. The frightened boy explained the circumstance, and the gentleman was so much touched that he procured him admission to a Library in King Street, where he devoured catalogues, folios, and books of all kinds, borrowing daily the two volumes allowed him, and then curling himself up in some sunny corner where he read unconscious of everything but the pages, and the fancies which they conjured up.

All were attracted to the dreamy Bluecoat Boy. His masters looked upon him as a genius, and his schoolfellows regarded

him with admiration. He had made friends, and all were astonished as he poured forth in conversation, inconceivable in a lad of his years, stores of philosophy, metaphysical speculations, and quotations from the classics. In the spring of 1791 he went to Jesus College, Cambridge, at the age of nineteen, where he won some distinction as a scholar, having obtained the prize for a Greek Ode in Sapphic metre, of which the sentiments (as he observes himself) were better than the Greek. He soon began to betray that infirmity of purpose and that want of perseverance which proved to be his bane. Instead of following out the studies of the University, his reading was desultory. He read whatever pleased his fancy, or was agreeable to his tastes—it might be philosophy, or poetry, or politics; and his rooms became a rendezvous for all who loved conversation better than work, and who preferred debates on the pamphlets of Burke and the speculations of Voltaire, to the dramas of Æschylus or the dialogues of Plato.

It was an age of excitement both in religion and politics. Unitarianism was the popular creed. The French Revolution in its early stages had a fascination for minds enthusiastic in what was hoped to be the cause of liberty, and many ardent youths of the University allowed themselves to be borne away on the strong current of popular thought. Coleridge embraced Unitarian opinions, and ranged himself on what he believed to be the side of freedom.

All this interrupted his quiet habits of study, and weary of restraint, in a frenzy of unhappy feeling at the rejection he met with from a lady whom he loved, he left Cambridge, and enlisted as a private in a Dragoon regiment. He fell off his horse on several occasions, and being ill framed for a good rider, and finding a peculiar difficulty in grooming his steed, he only spent a few months in the army.[1]

He returned to Cambridge, unsettled and dejected, and despairing of success, gave up the hope of attaining a fellowship. Forming an acquaintance at this critical time with the two Wedgwoods, the celebrated manufacturers of Etruria, they became his friends, and admiring his genius, they subscribed to send him to Germany, where, at the University of Göttingen,

[1] De Quincey—who, however, will vouch for no part of the story—mentions a romantic incident which, it is said, led to his discharge from a profession which under no circumstances would have been congenial to his tastes. "Coleridge, as a private; was on one occasion mounted on guard at the door of a room in which his officers were giving a ball. Two of them had a dispute upon some Greek word or passage when close to Coleridge's station. He interposed his authentic decision of the case. The officers stared as though one of their horses had sung 'Rule Britannia,' questioned him, heard his story, pitied his misfortunes, and finally subscribed to purchase his discharge."

he completed his education according to his own scheme. On his return to England he attended Mr. Thomas Wedgwood throughout the long anomalous illness which brought him to the grave. By the death of Mr. Wedgwood, Coleridge succeeded to an annuity of £75, which that gentleman bequeathed to him. Mr. Wedgwood's brother granted him a similar allowance, and from this time he could reckon on a small but certain income.

Still in profound sympathy with the French Revolution, he, with two or three friends, who were worshippers of liberty, and had theories of superhuman virtue, resolved to seek in America happier fortunes than the Old World contained; and at the close of 1794, these enthusiastic students from Oxford and Cambridge met in Bristol, and resolved to emigrate to the banks of the Susquehanna. Now came plans for raising the wind, and struggles to escape the pangs of hunger; and lectures were announced in Bristol—six shillings for the course—on subjects wide in their range, and magnificent in their scope. Southey proposed to deal with history, and his syllabus embraced a period extending from the first origin of society to the legislation of Solon, and thence on to the American war. Coleridge took as his themes Milton and Sidney, Mirabeau and Tom Paine, Oliver Cromwell and Robespierre, Mazarin and Pitt; and into his plan entered the extent and origin of evil, the evidences and corruptions of Christianity; and he hoped to evolve a grand social scheme which would convert all men to Unitarianism, and make them wise, and pure, and perfect.

As might be expected, nothing came of so grandiloquent a prospectus. Already absence of mind, and disregard of order, began to be marked features in Coleridge's daily life; no appointments were kept; the lecture-room was often crowded, but the lecturer was not to be found; and as to letters, he opened none and answered none. Amidst daylight realities, he spent his time in a deep reverie or waking dream. It is not surprising under the circumstances that he often found himself in want of money, and that he formed various plans for raising what is as needful in this practical world for the philosopher and the poet as for the dullest and most prosaic of men. To his kind bookseller—the most liberal of friends—he offered to write poems, songs, and epics in blank verse, all of which prospects were pleasantly conceived, faithfully promised, and never carried into execution. Upon the faith of these "airy nothings," Coleridge married. His wife was a Miss Fricker, one of four or five sisters in humble circumstances, who lived at Bristol, and who maintained an irreproachable character, though exposed by their personal attractions to some peril, and to the detractions of envy.

Another of the sisters became the wife of Southey. Unfortunately Mrs. Coleridge was not a woman who could comprehend her husband's intellectual powers, or had any sympathy with his ruling pursuits; and though she was in all circumstances of her married life a virtuous wife and conscientious mother, yet their home was not a happy one, and its domestic peace was often disturbed. To embarrassments of a pecuniary nature was added an incompatibility of temper and disposition which in a great measure robbed life of its sunshine and added to its gloom. Another circumstance which marred the harmony of the young married couple was the friendship which Coleridge formed with a young lady who became their neighbour, who was intellectually very superior to Mrs. Coleridge, and had a true sympathy with the husband's pursuits. Although no shadow of suspicion rested upon the moral conduct of either party, yet Mrs. Coleridge felt that she held but a divided sway over her husband's heart, which could not but be deeply mortifying to a young wife; and the arrow was even more sharply barbed when others—her own female servant amongst the number—began to drop expressions which alternately implied pity for her as an injured woman, or contempt for her as a tame one.

Their first home was in a cottage near the Severn, very picturesque in its external aspect, with roses clambering over the wall and round the windows, but very comfortless in its internal arrangements, with no paper on the walls, and no supplies in the kitchen. In order to meet his daily wants he writes to his friend the bookseller, now offering him a sonnet, and now a ballad; now proposing to print a pamphlet for the instruction of the public; and now to publish eighteen different works in quarto; and as a *per contra* he begs his friend to send him "a tea-kettle, a tin dust-pan, teaspoons, a cheese-toaster, a keg of porter, allspice, ginger, and rice." Thus passed two years away in futile plans and projects never to be fulfilled.

In 1796 he attempts to raise money in another way, and he resolves to publish a periodical, *The Watchman*, every eighth day, for the small sum of fourpence, which is to treat of all kinds of subjects, to teach all truth, that all may know the truth and that the truth may make them free. He hurries to the manufacturing districts to find subscribers; teaches philosophy with more or less success to tallow-chandlers and cotton-spinners; argues with infidels; reasons with Dr. Darwin; preaches Socinianism at Birmingham and Sheffield; wears a blue coat in the pulpit, and is greatly disturbed when forced in the former town to present himself to his audience in a gown. Nor is he altogether regardless of enjoyment on his

tour. He often finds himself in pleasant company; sees interesting sights; eats good dinners at a late hour, and is solaced and entertained by the music of the concert-room. He also starts a grand scheme of education, and proposes to set up a school at Derby. He thinks of becoming a regular Unitarian preacher; tries his hand at two sermons at Bath, and gives instead two lectures on the Corn Laws and the Hair Powder Tax, which were unfortunately considered to be dull. Are not these, and other incidents of a similar nature, told us in his letters? *The Watchman* lived through nine numbers, and then died suddenly of inanition.

But though *The Watchman* died, Coleridge lived, and his genius attracted to him many friends. At one time a young man, the son of a banker, Mr. Lloyd, enters his family as a boarder, in order to enjoy his society; at another, an acquaintance who admires his powers of conversation, settles in his neighbourhood.

It was now that he formed with Southey a scheme for emigrating to America under the learned name of "Pantisocracy." "It differed little," as De Quincey says, "except in its Grecian name, from any other scheme for mitigating the privations of a wilderness, by settling in a cluster of families bound together by congenial tastes and uniform principles, rather than in self-depending, insulated households." The plan was never carried out. A fierce quarrel parted the friends, and England, not America, was to be the home of Coleridge.

About this time he wrote a tragedy, which Sheridan accepted, and brought out on the stage of Drury Lane.[1].

In 1798 was published Wordsworth's famous volume of "Lyrical Ballads," to which Coleridge contributed "The Ancient Mariner," together with some other pieces. In the autumn of this year he visited North Germany in company with Mr. and Miss Wordsworth. Their tour was chiefly confined to the Hartz Mountains and the neighbourhood; and after fourteen

---

[1] The success of the play was marred by Sheridan's inability to sacrifice what he thought a good jest. One scene presented a cave with streams of water creeping down the sides, and the first words were in a sort of mimicry of the sound: "Drip, drip, drip!" upon which Sheridan repeated aloud to the assembled green-room, especially convoked for the purpose of hearing the play read: "'Drip, drip, drip!' in short, it is all dripping." The theatre falling afterwards into the hands of Lord Byron and Mr. Whitbread, his lordship sent for Coleridge, was very kind to his brother poet, and requested that the play might be represented; this desire was complied with, and it received his support. Although Mr. Whitbread did not give it the advantage of a single new scene, yet the popularity of the play was such that the principal actor who had performed in it with great success, made choice of it for his benefit night, and it brought an overflowing house.

months the little party returned to England. He now became the editor of the literary department of the *Morning Post*, and on its staff were also Wordsworth and Southey. In 1801 he settled at Keswick, no doubt attracted to the Lake country by Wordsworth. Here his health began to be affected, and he suffered from severe attacks of rheumatism, accompanied by difficulty in breathing, which, with a constant sensation of weight, made him think that his heart was affected. In the spring of 1804 he was induced to seek change of air, and to try the climate of Malta; and here his powers of conversation had such an effect on the Governor, Sir Alexander Ball, that he appointed him to the office of Secretary then vacant. Unhappily in Malta he formed, if he did not confirm and cherish, the habit of taking opium in large quantities. He began the habit as a relief from bodily pain and nervous irritation, and he continued it as a source of luxurious sensations. When he had once tasted the enchanted cup he returned to its charms again and again in order to excite his animal spirits by artificial stimulants; and the habit became the curse of his later life. For years he struggled against it, and struggled in vain. Under these circumstances it was not likely that he could discharge efficiently the post of Secretary, or bear with patience the restraints of duty; and so he left Malta in the autumn of 1805, and on his return homewards he visited Rome and Naples.

In 1806 he returned to England, and passed his time between his own house at Keswick, and Wordsworth's house at Grasmere. His eccentric habits were now rapidly gaining ground, and making a fixed impression on his character. His life, under these conditions, was far from being a happy or satisfactory one, and his conscience was but ill at ease. It is thus he writes to the friend who had more than once come to his help in his early struggles. "Alas! you will find me the wretched wreck of what you knew me, rolling rudderless! My health is exceedingly bad; pain I have enough of; but that is indeed to me a mere trifle; but the almost unceasing, overpowering sensations of wretchedness, achings in my limbs, with an indescribable restlesness that makes action to any available purpose almost impossible; and, worst of all, the sense of blighted utility, regrets not remorseless." This was written in the year 1807. We have an account of him in the same year from the pen of De Quincey. He says: "In the summer season of 1807 I first saw this illustrious man, the largest and most spacious intellect, in my judgment, that has ever yet existed amongst men. My knowledge of his works as a most original genius began about the year 1799." Coleridge was at this time staying at Nether Stowey with Mr. Poole; and thither

De Quincey, who had conceived a profound admiration for the poet and philosopher, bent his steps.

I had received direction for finding out the house where Coleridge was visiting, and in riding down a main street of Bridgwater I noticed a gateway corresponding to the description given me. Under this was standing, and gazing about him, a man whom I will describe. In height he might seem to be about five feet eight (he was, in reality, about an inch and a half taller, but his figure was of an order which drowns the height); his person was broad and full, and tended even to corpulence; his complexion was fair, though not what painters technically style fair, because it was associated with black hair; his eyes were large, and soft in their expression, and it was from the peculiar appearance of haze or dreaminess which mixed with their light that I recognised my object. This was Coleridge. I examined him steadfastly for a minute or more, and it struck me that he saw neither myself nor any other object in the street. He was in a deep reverie, for I had dismounted, made two or three trifling arrangements at an inn door, and advanced close to him before he seemed apparently conscious of my presence. The sound of my voice, announcing my own name, first awoke him; he started for a moment, seemed at a loss to understand my purpose or his own situation, for he repeated rapidly a number of words which had no relation to either of us. There was no *mauvaise honte* in his manner, but simply perplexity, and an apparent difficulty in recovering his position among daylight realities. This little scene over, he received me with a kindness of manner so marked that it might be called gracious. The hospitable family with whom he was domesticated were distinguished for their amiable manners and enlightened understandings; they were descendants from Chubb, the philosophic writer, and bore the same name. For Coleridge they all testified deep affection and esteem—sentiments in which the whole town of Bridgwater seemed to share; for in the evening, when the heat of the day had declined, I walked out with him, and rarely, perhaps never, have I seen a person so much interrupted in one hour's space as Coleridge on this occasion by the courteous attentions of young and old.

The extreme courtesy of Coleridge, his devotion to those he loved, or who might require his sympathy, won the regard of all whom he met; and Lord Egmont and others, who felt for him an excessive admiration, were anxious that he should undertake some great work that might furnish a sufficient arena for the display of his various and rare accomplishments. "At any rate, let him do something," said Lord Egmont, "for at present he talks very much like an angel, and does nothing at all. And what a pity," he added, "if this man were after all to vanish like an apparition, and you and I, and a few others who have witnessed his grand *bravuras* of display were to have the usual fortune of ghost-seers, in meeting no credit for any statements that we might vouch on his behalf." In speaking of his conversation, Professor Wilson said he talks with a melodious richness of words, which he heaps around his

images—images that are not glaring, but which are always affecting to the very verge of tears.

The restless activity of Coleridge's mind, his intellectual efforts in the paths of speculation, and the chase after abstract truths, seemed to his friends to be attempts to escape out of his own personal wretchedness. The consciousness of marvellous gifts weakened or wasted by the direful effects of opium, and his slavery to the habit, stimulated his mind to a restless activity, which found a vent in conversation. It is pitiable to read in "The History of my own Mind for my own Improvement," of his self-reproaches; of his struggles to get rid of this thorn in the flesh; of his endeavours to free himself from the "Maëlstrom, the fatal whirlpool, to which I am drawing," he says, "just when the current was already beyond my strength to stem." Wordsworth refers to the change wrought in his friend by "the flattering poison" in those beautiful "Lines written in my Pocket Copy of the 'Castle of Indolence.'" After the description of Coleridge's countenance, there follow the lines:

> Ah! piteous sight it was to see this man
> When he came back to us, a wither'd flow'r,
> Or, like a sinful creature, pale and wan!
> Down would he sit, and without strength or power
> Look at the common grass from hour to hour.
> And oftentimes, how long I fear to say,
> Where apple-trees in blossom made a bower,
> Retired in that sunshiny shade he lay,
> And, like a naked Indian, slept himself away.

It was during his residence at the Lakes, and in the year 1809, that Coleridge published some essays, composed in 1807, in a periodical called the *Friend*, which he continued for some time. The *Friend*, dealing too exclusively with metaphysics, in which Coleridge delighted, came to a sudden and abrupt end through the bankruptcy of the printer. Coleridge was living as a visitor at this time at Allan Bank, Grasmere, the residence of Wordsworth. Here, surrounded by the most exquisite scenery, and turn where he would seeing nothing but beauty—beauty of hill, and stream, and lake, and dale—and living in a family endeared to him by long friendship, and by the closest sympathy with all his predilections and tastes, Coleridge might surely have been happy. What more could he want? The outward world was "as a field which the Lord hath blessed"—a well-watered garden of the Lord; the world within was made pleasant by congenial companionships—the voices of friends, the graciousness of woman, the innocent laughter of children. But he was far from knowing what happiness was; all natural pleasure was poisoned at its

source; and the gloom which marked his countenance was but the shadow projected there from a conscience ill at ease. His habits were peculiar. He lived chiefly by candle-light, and sat up a great part of the night reading German books. At two or four o'clock in the afternoon he would make his first appearance downstairs. When all other lights had been put out in the quiet village of Grasmere, his lamp burnt on still; and when man was going forth to his labour in the morning, he was about to retire to bed.

In the autumn of 1810 Coleridge left the Lakes, and never returned to them again as a resident. The causes which led him to leave these scenes of natural beauty in which he had found strength and restoration are matters of conjecture. The reason is unknown. It may be that, suffering as he was in mind and body, the sad passion exercised over him a mastery so terrible that Nature, however beautiful, had not the charm for him that she once possessed. He has himself insisted on the truth that all which we find in nature must be created by ourselves; and this power may have now become extinct in him; he can give nothing to nature, and therefore he can receive nothing in return. Everyone is familiar with the beautiful lines in his "Ode to Dejection:"

> Oh Lady! we receive but what we give,
> And in our life alone does nature live.
> Ours is her wedding-garment, ours her shroud!
> And would we aught behold of higher worth,
> Than that inanimate cold world allowed
> To the poor loveless ever anxious crowd,
> Ah! from the soul itself must issue forth
> A light, a glory, a fair luminous cloud
> Enveloping the earth—
> And from the soul itself must there be sent
> A sweet and potent voice, of its own birth,
> Of all sweet sounds the life and element!

As a personal comment on this thought we may give the lines of the preceding stanza:

> My genial spirits fail;
> And what can these avail
> To lift the smothering weight from off my breast?
> It were a vain endeavour,
> Though I should gaze for ever
> On that green light that lingers in the west.
> I may not hope from outward forms to win
> The passion and the life, whose fountains are within!

Coleridge left the Lakes in company with Mr. Basil Montagu, who with Mrs. Montagu was returning to London from a visit

to Wordsworth, and who offered his friend a seat in his travelling-carriage. For some time he remained as a guest under Mr. Montagu's friendly roof. He afterwards resided at Hammersmith with a common friend of his and Southey's, a Mr. Morgan, with whom they had formed an intimacy in Bristol. He was suffering at this time from pecuniary difficulties, which affected his health and spirits; and such reliance had he on the kindness of friends that he threw out the suggestion that they might purchase an annuity for him to set him free from anxiety, and enable him to pursue his literary labours. Though this was not done, efforts for his relief were not wanting; and De Quincey made him a gift of £300. It was arranged that he should deliver a course of lectures at the Royal Institution on Poetry and the Fine Arts during the ensuing winter, and for this he received a sum of one hundred guineas. The course was to extend to fifteen lectures, which were to be given on Monday and Thursday evenings successively during the winter. He was at this time living uncomfortably at the *Courier* office, in the Strand, and was a constant contributor to that journal. In such a situation, disturbed by the noise of feet passing his chamber-door continually to the printing-room of this great establishment, and with no soothing ministrations of female hands to sustain his cheerfulness (for his wife and he had separated, and she with her children resided with Southey), naturally enough his spirits flagged, and he sank more than ever under the dominion of opium. So that it often happened, when at two o'clock he should have been in the Lecture Hall of the Royal Institution, he was unable to rise from his bed. Audience after audience were dismissed with pleas of illness; and on many of the days when Albemarle Street was blocked up with carriages, intelligence was brought by the attendants to the carriage-doors that Mr. Coleridge had been suddenly taken ill. This plea repeated too often, and at first received with expressions of concern, began to awaken feelings of annoyance and disgust, so that many, from the uncertainty of the lecturer's appearance, ceased to attend. "Even when he did appear, his looks betrayed his condition. His lips were baked with feverish heat, and often black in colour; and in spite of the water which he continued drinking through the whole course of his lecture, he often seemed to labour under an almost paralytic inability to raise the upper jaw from the lower." Yet such was his rare intellectual power, and marvellous brilliancy of expression, that when he was himself he held his audience spell-bound by the eloquent periods that flowed in melodious cadence from his tongue. Dr. Dibdin, in his "Reminiscences of a Literary Life," says that it might be said of Coleridge, as Cowper has so happily said of Sir Philip Sidney,

that he was "the warbler of poetic prose." "There was always *this* characteristic in his multifarious conversation — it was delicate, reverend, and courteous. The chastest ear could drink in no startling sound; the most serious believer never had his bosom ruffled by one sceptical or reckless assertion. Coleridge was eminently simple in his manner. Thinking and speaking were his delight; and he would sometimes seem, during the more fervid movements of discourse, to be abstracted from all and everything around and about him, and to be basking in the sunny warmth of his own radiant imagination." "In his lectures Coleridge was brilliant, fluent, and rapid; his words seemed to flow as from a person repeating with grace and energy some delightful poem;" and though he lectured from notes carefully prepared, yet his audience was more delighted when, putting his notes aside, he spoke extempore, for words never failed him; he always found the most appropriate, and they followed one another in the most logical arrangement. The attempt to take down his lectures in shorthand was a failure.[1]

It was during this sad period of suffering, energies depressed, and a mind ill at ease, because of his bondage to a terrible drug—his regular allowance of opium being a pint a day, though on one occasion he actually swallowed a quart—that he threw aside the cheerless doctrines of Socinianism for a truer and Scriptural creed. He had once endeavoured to reconcile the Socinian theory with an orthodox belief, but he now regarded Socinianism as a heresy subversive of Christianity; and receiving the Bible as the Word of God, and accepting the fall and corruption of man as doctrines of revelation, he looked at Christ's atonement as the only hope of the sinner, and proclaimed without hesitation that Christ was God as well as man. He acknowledged in all humility, and with the frankness of true wisdom, that "there are truths revealed to us, of which the Trinity was one, lost in darkness to us, because our eyes cannot penetrate the depths of the skies; we receive them, not because they can be made clear to our apprehension, but because the Scriptures expressly state them. It is impos-

[1] The manuscript was almost entirely unintelligible. An accomplished and experienced shorthand-writer thus accounts for the difficulty: "With regard to every other speaker whom he had ever heard, however rapid or involved, he could always, by long experience in his art, guess the form of the latter part, or apodosis of the sentence, by the form of the beginning; but that the conclusion of every one of Coleridge's sentences was a surprise upon him. He was obliged to listen to the last word. Yet this unexpectedness was not the effect of quaintness or confusion of construction: it was the uncommonness of the thoughts, or the image, which prevented you from anticipating the end."

sible for any man to read the New Testament with the uncommon exercise of an unbiassed understanding, without being convinced of the divinity of Christ from the testimony of almost every page." "Socinianism," he says, "is not a religion, but a theory: pernicious, because it excludes all our deep and awful ideas of the perfect holiness of God, His justice and His mercy, etc.; unsatisfactory, for it promises forgiveness, without any solution of the difficulty of the compatibility of this with the justice of God."[1]

We find Coleridge in the midst of all his literary and social successes struggling still against his besetting sin; now entreating his friends to place him in the asylum of Dr. Fox, that, treated as a madman, he might be cured; and now resolving to place himself where he could "remain a month or two, wholly in the power of others;" "for my case is a species of

---

[1] When referring to the religious opinions of Coleridge, we must not omit to say that he was one of the first in this country to put forth a theory of inspiration as unsatisfactory as it was bold. In his "Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit," published after his death, he spoke of the Bible as a library of infinite value, as that which must have a Divine Spirit in it, from its appeal to all the hidden springs of feeling in our hearts. But then he protests against what he calls "Bibliolatry," "the doctrine which requires me to believe that not only what finds me, but all that exists in the same volume, and which I am bound to find therein, was not only inspired by, that is, composed by men under the actuating influence of the Holy Spirit, but likewise dictated by an Infallible Intelligence; that the writers, each and all, were divinely informed, as well as inspired." Such a doctrine, he conceives, must imply infallibility in physical science and in everything else as much as in faith, in things natural no less than in spiritual. He expresses a full belief "that the word of the Lord came to Samuel, to Isaiah, to others, and that the words which gave utterance to the same are faithfully recorded." But for the recording he does not think there was need of any supernatural working, except in such cases as those in which God not only utters certain express words to a prophet, but also enjoins him to record them. In the latter case he accepts them "as supernaturally communicated, and their recording as executed under special guidance." We need not say that the views of Coleridge are far from satisfactory to those who believe, as we do, that the Scriptures are the revelations through human media of the infinite mind of God to the finite mind of man, and who recognising, as we do, both a human and a Divine element in the written Word, are convinced that the Holy Ghost was so breathed into the mind of the writer, so illumined his spirit, and pervaded his thoughts, that while nothing that individualized him as a man was taken away, everything that was necessary to enable him to declare Divine Truth in all its fulness was bestowed and superadded. Not only did the writers, under the influence of the Spirit, reveal the rule and counsel of God, declare facts, and make statements, but they also made choice of such expressions, and words of speech, as were most calculated to convey and commend the Truth. This, it will be seen, is very different from the theory of Coleridge, who apparently draws no distinction between the inspiration of holy men of old, and the inspiration of the poet and the teacher in every age and nation.

madness, only that it is a derangement, an utter impotence of the volition, and not of the intellectual faculties." "I have prayed," he says in a letter to a friend, alluding to the fierceness of his conflict with his sin—"I have prayed with drops of agony on my brow." He draws the following picture of himself: "Conceive a poor, miserable wretch, who for many years has been attempting to beat off pain by a constant recurrence to a vice which reproduces it; conceive a spirit in hell, employed in tracing out for others the road to that heaven from which his crimes exclude him; in short, conceive whatever is most wretched, helpless, and hopeless, and you will form as tolerable a notion of my state as it is possible for a good man to have."

In the spring of 1816, he placed himself in the home of Mr. Gillman, a physician, and here he passed the last eighteen years of his life, during which years he wrote but little. Though he was gradually set free from the bondage of an ensnaring vice, and his conscience, no longer clouded by vicious indulgence, was at rest through the faith which he had sought with many tears; yet his health was permanently injured by the tremendous effects of taking opium. Though his intellect was clear, his mind never recovered its vigour or energy; and while pursuing his philosophical and literary labours, yet he never regained the capacity or strength necessary to undertake a continuous work. "Christabel," after lying long in manuscript, was printed in 1816, three editions of it appearing in one year; and in the next year, Coleridge published a collection of his chief poems, under the title of "Sibylline Leaves;" in allusion, as he says, "to the fragmentary and wildly-scattered state in which they had been long suffered to remain." His "Lay-Sermons" were written in 1816-17; and in 1818 he delivered the Lectures on Poetry which have been already referred to; but the first really collective edition of his "Poetical and Dramatic Works" was published in the year 1828, in three volumes arranged by himself. A third and more complete issue of his works, arranged by another hand, appeared in 1834, the year of his death. He to the last retained his marvellous powers of conversation.[1]

[1] It is thus that a Quarterly Reviewer speaks of him in the later period of his life: "Mr. Coleridge's conversation, it is true, has not now all the brilliant versatility of his former years; yet we know not whether the contrast between his bodily weakness and his mental power does not leave a deeper and a more solemnly affecting impression than his most triumphant displays in youth could ever have done. To see the pain-stricken countenance relax, and the contracted frame dilate under the kindling of intellectual fire alone; to watch the infirmities of the flesh shrinking out of sight, or glorified and transfigured in the brightness of the awakening spirit, is an awful object of contemplation; and in no

In July, 1834, in his sixty-second year, Coleridge entered into rest. He had been long separated by distance from the companions of his early days. The friends with whom he had at one time been closely connected and who had many things in common, who were bound together, in the bonds of a common sympathy with nature as well as literature, continued to cherish for him an affectionate regard. This was shown by the manner in which Wordsworth received, in the Westmoreland which they both loved, the news that Coleridge had fallen asleep in peace at Highgate. The Rev. Robert Perceval Graves, in writing to a friend, says:

The death of Coleridge was announced to us by his friend Wordsworth. He then continued to speak of him; called him the most *wonderful* man that he had ever known, wonderful for the originality of his mind, and the power he possessed of throwing out in profusion grand central truths from which might be evolved the most comprehensive systems. Wordsworth, as a poet, regretted that German metaphysics had so much captivated the taste of Coleridge, for he was frequently not intelligible on this subject; whereas, if his energy and his originality had been more exerted in the channel of poetry—an instrument of which he had so perfect a mastery—Wordsworth thought he might have done more permanently to enrich the literature, and to influence the thought of the nation, than any man of the age.

The letter of Henry Nelson Coleridge, which conveyed the tidings of his great relation's death, and the manner of it, adds Mr. Graves, was read to us:

It appeared that his death was a relief from intense pain, which, however, subsided at the interval of a few days before the event; and that shortly after this cessation of agony, he fell into a comatose state. The most interesting part of the letter was the statement that the last use he made of his faculties was to call his children, and other relatives and friends, around him to give them his blessing, and to express his hope to them that the manner of his end might manifest the depth of his trust in his Saviour, Christ. As I heard this, I was at once deeply glad at the substance, and deeply affected by Wordsworth's emotion in reading it. When he came to this part his voice at first faltered, and then broke; but soon divine faith that the change was a blest one overcame aught of human grief, and he concluded in an equable though subdued tone.

So Coleridge, Poet, Psychologist, Moralist, Philosopher, and Christian, passed to his rest, thankful for the deep, calm peace

---

other person did we ever witness such a distinction—nay, aberration of mind from body—such a mastery of the purely intellectual over the purely corporeal, as in the instance of this remarkable man. Even now his conversation is characterized by all the essentials of its former excellence, there is the same individuality, the same *unexpectedness*, the same universal grasp; nothing is too high, nothing too low for it; it glances from earth to heaven, from heaven to earth, with a speed and a splendour, an ease and a power, which almost seems inspired."—*Quarterly Review*, vol. lii. p. 3.

of mind which he enjoyed ; a peace such as he had never before experienced, or scarcely hoped for ; this, he said, seemed now settled upon him ; and all things were thus looked at by him through an atmosphere by which all were reconciled and harmonized. We may appropriately conclude this sketch of his life with the lines called my "Baptismal Birthday:"

> God's child in Christ adopted,—Christ my all,—
> What that earth boasts were not lost cheaply, rather
> Than forfeit that blest name, by which I call
> The Holy One, the Almighty God, my Father ?—
> Father ! in Christ we live, and Christ in Thee—
> Eternal Thou, and everlasting we.
>
> The heir of heaven, henceforth I fear not death :
> In Christ I live ! in Christ I draw the breath
> Of the true life !—Let then earth, sea, and sky
> Make war against me ! On my front I show
> Their mighty master's seal. In vain they try
> To end my life, that can but end its woe.—
> Is that a death-bed where a Christian lies ?—
> Yes ! but not his—'tis Death itself there dies.

In turning to speak of his poems in what space is yet allowed to us, we may notice the sweetness of his versification, and the natural melody of the words he employs to express his thoughts. Mrs. Barrett Browning in her "Vision of Poets" thus speaks of him :

> And visionary Coleridge, who
> Did sweep his thoughts as angels do
> Their wings, with cadence up the blue.

He seems to have had an inborn sense of music which never can be acquired by any effort of art, and which made him by natural right a singer, so that he attempted every kind of lyric measure, whether rhymed or not, with the most perfect success. He has also written poems in the heroic couplet, and in blank verse which satisfies the ear of all who delight in harmony which is the result of rhythmical construction. The best poems of Coleridge are distinguished in a remarkable degree by that consummate harmony which is a natural gift, as well as by that metrical arrangement which is the fruit of uncommon labour and skill. It is evident that he must have studied the laws and properties of metre with the utmost attention and care. His poetry is what Milton said poetry ought to be, "simple, sensuous, impassioned ;" and his imagery, ever distinct and clear, is fitted to carry out the poet's intention of awaking in the reader's mind the same mood which coloured the spirit of his own thoughts. In the wild and romantic poem of "Christabel"—that magnificent fragment—with what

singular skill the reader is made to see and to hear the various sights and sounds which the poet narrates with such power and distinction! The reader is under a spell as he hears at midnight the striking of the castle clock, and the "Tu-whit! Tu-who!" of the owl, and the short, low howl of the sleeping mastiff; and as he sees the dim forest in the chilly night, and the lonely Lady Christabel, as she steals through the wood to pray "for the weal of her lover so far away," and suddenly, at the other side of the oak, observes a lady richly clad, and "beautiful exceedingly." What pictures pass before the eye—the sudden flash of the dying brands, as Christabel and Geraldine pass through the echoing hall, the carved chamber:

> Carved with figures strange and sweet,
> All made out of the carver's brain
> For a lady's chamber meet:
> The lamp with twofold silver chain
> Is fastened to an angel's feet.

And then the struggle between Geraldine and the spirit of Christabel's sainted mother; the weaving of the spell, and the discovery of her hideous form as Geraldine drops her silken robe and inner vest:

> A sight to dream of, not to tell,
> O shield her, shield sweet Christabel!
> Yet Geraldine nor speaks, nor stirs:
> Ah! what a stricken look was hers!

And what a relief at the ceasing of the spell, and as the joyousness of the birds is described, and the awaking of Christabel as from a trance—all this and more powerfully affects the imagination, and if he had written nothing else would have placed him in the ranks of our greatest poets.

The description of the change which takes place in Geraldine from her assumed to her natural form, when read in a party at Lord Byron's, is said to have caused Shelley to faint.

> A snake's small eye blinks dull and shy.
> And the lady's eyes they shrunk in her head,
> Each shrunk up to a serpent's eye,
> And with somewhat of malice and more of dread
> At Christabel she look'd askance!
> One moment—and the sight was fled!
> But Christabel, in dizzy trance
> Stumbling on the unsteady ground,
> Shuddered aloud with a hissing sound;
> And Geraldine again turn'd round,
> And like a thing that sought relief,
> Full of wonder, and full of grief,

She rolled her large bright eyes divine
Wildly on Sir Leoline.
The maid, alas! her thoughts are gone,
She nothing sees—no sight but one!

With regard to the sweetness of the versification of the poem there can be but one opinion. The first part was composed in 1797—the *annus mirabilis* of this great man—when he was in his best and strongest health, and when the works on which his poetic fame will rest were composed or planned.

The weird poem of "The Ancient Mariner" also displays the poet's mastery of the wild and preternatural, and is one of the most perfect pieces of imaginative poetry in our own or any other language. It is a poem in which sublimity is allied to terror. And how full of the sweetest music are many of its stanzas! For example:

Sometimes a-dropping from the sky
I heard the skylark sing,
Sometimes all little birds that are
How they seemed to fill the sea and air
With their sweet jargoning!

And now 'twas like all instruments,
Now like a lonely flute,
And now it is an angel's song,
That makes the heavens be mute.

It ceased; yet still the sails made on
A pleasant noise till noon,
A noise like of a hidden brook
In the leafy month of June,
That to the sleeping woods all night
Singeth a quiet tune.

It is by these two poems, "The Ancient Mariner" and "Christabel," that Coleridge is most widely known; and many of his most exquisite pieces are but little read. They who confine themselves to these two poems of pure imagination are great losers, for there are other poems of his distinguished, some by philosophical reflection, some by deep pathos, and others, like the grand "Hymn in the Vale of Chamouni," inspired not only by the glory of external nature, but by the hidden fire of strong devotional feelings which lifted the soul to God. This poem, which has excited much discussion, is an expansion of a poem of twenty lines by Frederica Brun. It is to all intents and purposes a new poem; a new creation; a glorification of the original. It has been said that it was a sentiment of propriety and not of inspiration that led Coleridge to give a religious turn to his lines, and that propriety is a bad guide in poetry; but with this criticism we cannot agree.

There is no feigned enthusiasm in this magnificent hymn; its inspiration is not simply derived from the beauty of flowers and waters, stars and sunsets, the mountain and the glacier; not simply from the majesty of Nature, but from the majesty of Nature's God. No! He describes the glories of external nature, "the silent sea of pines;" the bald and awful head of Sovran Blanc, "visited all night by troops of stars;" the "wild torrents fiercely glad;" the dark and icy caverns; the ice-falls; the enormous ravines; the sky-pointing peaks—for the sake of lifting up the soul to God. The invocation summoning all creation to praise its Author is the crown and climax of the poem.

> Into the depth of clouds, that veil thy breast,
> Thou too again, stupendous Mountain! thou
> That as I raise my head, awhile bowed low
> In adoration, upward from thy base
> Slow travelling with dim eyes suffused with tears,
> Solemnly seemest, like a vapoury cloud,
> To rise before me—Rise, O ever rise,
> Rise like a cloud of incense, from the Earth:
> Thou kingly Spirit throned among the hills,
> Thou dread ambassador from Earth to Heaven
> Great hierarch! tell thou the silent sky,
> And tell the stars, and tell yon rising sun,
> Earth, with her thousand voices, praises God.

"Genevieve" is one of Coleridge's best-known and most beautiful pieces. It is a song of triumphant "Love"—love as pure as it is ardent, as gentle as it is impassioned, and full of a chivalrous tenderness and courtesy. It is musical throughout.

> All thoughts, all passions, all delights,
> Whatever stirs this mortal frame,
> All are but ministers of love,
> And feed his sacred flame.

Some of its stanzas linger almost unconsciously on the memory.

Many of Coleridge's poems are marked by a strain of impassioned contemplation, combined with philosophical expression, such as we find in the "Ode to Dejection," from which some lines have been quoted in an earlier part of this paper. It is a poem less known than it ought to be; and in it we find not only philosophical reflection, but also a deep and tender pathos. "France: an Ode," a political poem, inspired by an indignant reaction against his own earlier sympathies with the French Republic, and full of strong national feeling, has some fine stanzas. The first is especially worthy of remembrance.

Ye clouds! that far above me float and pause,
Whose pathless march no mortal may control!
Ye ocean-waves! that wheresoe'er ye roll,
Yield homage only to eternal laws!
Ye woods, that listen to the night-birds singing
Midway the smooth and perilous slope reclined
Save when your own imperious branches swinging
Have made a solemn music of the wind!
Where like a man beloved of God,
Through glooms which never woodman trod,
How oft pursuing fancies holy,
My moonlight way o'er flowering weeds I wound,
Inspired beyond the guess of folly
By each rude shape and wild unconquerable sound!
O ye loud waves, and O ye forests high!
And O ye clouds that far above me soared!
Thou rising sun! thou blue rejoicing sky!
Yea, everything that is and will be free!
Bear witness for me, wheresoe'er ye be,
With what deep worship I have still adored
The spirit of divinest liberty.

Another political poem in which his love for England is eloquently expressed, and in which we have some beautiful and living descriptions of natural objects, is one called "Fears in Solitude." It was "written in 1798, during the alarm of an invasion." We have as a background to the poet's fears:

A green and silent spot, amid the hills,
A small and silent dell! O'er stiller place
No singing skylark ever poised himself.

He contrasts the national agitation and alarm with the quiet and peace of nature.

The dell,
Bathed by the mist, is fresh and delicate
As vernal cornfield, or the unripe flax
When, through its half-transparent stalks, at eve,
The level sunshine glimmers with green light,
Oh! 'tis a quiet, spirit-healing nook!

Coleridge was associated with what has been called "The Lake School," not only in political sentiment, but in its reaction from the formal and mechanical poetry of Pope, and the old French School of Poetry; in its love of Nature, in its discernment of the spiritual in the material, and in its sympathy with the animal world.

But we must not linger on a poet who has been called "the most imaginative poet since Milton;" a poet distinguished by sympathetic vision, and whose verses overflow with harmony. We cannot speak of his tragedies, "Remorse" and "Zapolya,"

the latter not found in every edition of the poet's works, but each embracing the pastoral and romantic, and containing situations of grand dramatic interest.

His translation of Schiller's magnificent drama of "Wallenstein," which has always been considered as one of the most remarkable productions of Coleridge's pen, is an unique performance, and has all the charm of an original work. It is as closely connected with the translator's poetic fame as the "Iliad" with Pope, and the "Æneid" with Dryden, and is superior to both in its faithfulness to the original. Indeed, many parts of the translation are exclusively the property of the English poet, who used a manuscript copy of the German text before its publication by the author; and it is a curious anecdote in literature, that Schiller in more instances than one afterwards adopted the hints, and translated in turn the interpolations of his own translator.[1]

But we must send the reader to the works of Coleridge for poems which cannot but charm the fancy, please the ear, and delight the taste; such as "An Ode to the Departing Year;" "This Lime-tree Bower my Prison;" "To William Wordsworth;" "Time: Real and Imaginary;" and "The Nightingale: a Conversation Poem." In this latter poem he contests the idea that the nightingale is a bird

> Most musical, most melancholy,

and saying that "in nature there is nothing melancholy" (a sentiment which, however, we dispute), has the following beautiful lines:

> 'Tis the merry nightingale
> That crowds, and hurries, and precipitates
> With fast thick warble his delicious notes,
> As he were fearful that an April night
> Would be too short for him to utter forth
> His love-chant, and disburthen his full soul
> Of all its music!

This paper may be fittingly brought to a close by some lines from "A Tombless Epitaph," which form a portrait of the poet himself:

> Sickness, 'tis true,
> Whole years of weary days besieged him close,
> Even to the gates and inlets of his life!
> But it is true, no less, that strenuous, firm,
> And with a natural gladness, he maintained
> The citadel unconquered, and in joy
> Was strong to follow the delightful muse.

[1] *Quarterly Review*, vol. lii. p. 18.

For not a hidden path, that to the shades
Of the Parnassian forest leads,
Lurked undiscovered by him; not a rill
There issues from the fount of Hippocrene,
But he traced it upwards to its source.
Through open glade, dark glen, and secret dell,
Knew the gay wild flowers on its banks, and cull'd
Its med'cinable herbs. Yea, oft alone,
Piercing the long-neglected holy cave,
The haunt obscure of old Philosophy.
He bade with lifted torch its starry walls
Sparkle, as erst they sparkled to the flame
Of odorous lamps tended by Saint and Sage.
O framed for calmer times and nobler hearts!
O studious Poet, eloquent for truth!
Philosopher! contemning wealth and death,
Yet docile, childlike, full of Life and Love!

CHARLES D. BELL, D.D.

ART. III.—MR. RICHARD, M.P., AND THE NATIONAL CHURCH.

MR. RICHARD, M.P. for Merthyr, has given the following notice of motion for the next session:

That the establishment of the Church of England by law
(1) Imposes upon Parliament duties which it cannot effectually discharge;
(2) Deprives the Church of the power of managing her own affairs;
(3) Inflicts injustice on a large number of the community, and
(4) Is injurious to the political and religious interest of the nation; and that
Therefore it ought no longer to be maintained.

In the second charge of this indictment Mr. Richard admits that there are affairs which belong to the Church. This is satisfactory, because Mr. Richard is, we believe, a prominent member of the Liberation Society, and that Society has put forth a scheme which, if carried out, would leave the Church no affairs at all. The scheme observes that Mr. Gladstone's method of dealing with the Irish Church left the Church many affairs. To guard against so calamitous a result in England, precautions are taken, in the Society's scheme, for leaving the Church in this country neither minister, endowment, nor fabric. The cathedrals and other "monumental buildings" are to be seized by the State, and maintained for such pur-

poses as Parliament may determine. Parish churches, if built before 1818, are to be given to the ratepayers; if built after that date, and by individuals still living, they may be claimed by these individuals; but if built by persons since deceased, or by more than one person, they are to be handed over, not to the Church of England, but to the congregations for the time being. The Bishops and clergy are to be relieved at once of all obligation to continue their ministry—as, indeed, is reasonable when they are no longer to have churches to minister in, or houses to live in—and are to be pensioned off on a sliding scale according to their age.

This scheme is so obviously absurd and fanatical that it would need only to be stated in order to be tossed aside, if we did not know that evil passions are not to be reckoned upon by the principles of ordinary experience, but, like an ice-storm or a volcanic eruption, may be expected to baffle all expectations. However, we will suppose that the gentlemen who drew up this monstrous scheme hardly expect to carry it out. Indeed we have sometimes thought, that with all their assumption of seriousness, they are only treating us to an elaborate joke. Like Cheap Jack at the fair, they ask a guinea, but may be prepared to take sixpence. Mr. Richard's notice certainly looks that way. He has carefully avoided the word Disendowment, which everybody understands, and deals only with Disestablishment, which may mean anything, from the removal of the incumbent from the vestry chair, to the sort of Disestablishment which Henry VIII. applied to the monasteries, and the Liberationists talk of applying to the churches.

We should like to ask Mr. Richard how he intends the Church to manage her own affairs if she ceases to be established by law? How would the Wesleyans manage their affairs if Mr. Wesley's famous Deed Poll were declared invalid, and the State declined to afford them legal establishment by any other means? How could the minister and members of an Independent Chapel manage their own affairs, if the chapel were taken from them, and any other which they might try to buy or build were refused legal protection? How can I be established in the possession of the pen I write with, except by law? Must I be prepared to fight any neighbour who takes a fancy to it, or how? To say that the establishment of the Church of England by law ought no longer to be maintained, can mean only one of two things:

(1) That the Church of England ought not to be established by law at all, or

(2) That the Church of England ought not to be established by law in the same manner as it is at present.

If Mr. Richard adopts the first of these alternatives, he

adopts the plan of the Liberation Society, and while talking of Disestablishment, means Destruction. If he adopts the second alternative, we adopt it also. What he wants is, in that case, what we want—not Destruction, but Reform. A thousand questions might arise as to the details of the reforms desired. But if the principle kept in view by Mr. Richard and Churchmen alike, is to make the Church more efficient, and not less, surely the problem should not be an insoluble one. Mr. Bright, in his famous speech at Mr. Spurgeon's Tabernacle, said, "Our purpose, I can undertake to say with a clear conscience—and you will confirm it—our purpose is not in any way the enslavement or destruction of the Church of England. What we want rather is its liberation, its freedom, its purity, and its greater power as a religious institution." Churchmen must hold Mr. Bright to these words. When Mr. Richard reads his indictment against us next session, Mr. Bright will probably be the most important counsel for the prosecution. But he has pledged himself, his conscience, and his enthusiastic audience, to precisely the same objects as those which are dear to the Church's own children. He was challenged afterwards to show how the scheme proposed by the Society, in whose name he spoke, could produce the results he professed to aim at. And he shirked the challenge. He wrote a letter in reply. But all he could say was this:

> The questions you put to me will be answered by Parliament when the day of Disestablishment arrives. They have been answered in the case of Ireland; they will be answered in due time in the case of Scotland; and whatever difficulty may exist in England will be solved by the same authority and with equal certainty. You may be quite certain that the English people, and especially that portion of them who are Nonconformists, will not be unjust to your Church, or to Churchmen, when the great act of justice to the nation and to Christianity shall be undertaken and completed. Bishops and clergy in Ireland wrote to me, as you write, some fifteen years ago; now not few of them rejoice in their freedom.

The questions asked were, first, In what particulars Mr. Bright believed Parliament would use a cathedral more for the benefit of the Church of England as a religious institution, when it was taken away from the Church and maintained as a monumental building, than it is used now by the Bishop and the cathedral clergy. And, secondly, How the Church of England would be made freer, purer, and more powerful by taking a parish church away from the incumbent who now holds it as trustee for the purposes of the Church, and giving it to the ratepayers, a body consisting of several different sorts of religionists, to do what they liked with. It is obvious that these questions have *not* been answered by Parliament in the case of Ireland, for the very good reason that they were never

asked. In Ireland every cathedral and parish church was left for divine service just as before. It is equally obvious that the questions will not be answered by Parliament either in Scotland or in England. Whether they will be asked in Parliament is another thing. But they will not be answered, because there is no answer to them. When Mr. Bright said "*Our* purpose is not the destruction of the Church of England," he ought not to have included, with himself and the majority of his great audience, the small but busy faction which got the meeting together, and got him to address it.

Let us now examine Mr. Richard's charges a little more in detail. First, he says the establishment of the Church of England by law—by which we must now understand the establishment of the Church of England by the *present* laws—*imposes upon Parliament duties which it cannot effectually discharge;* and secondly (which, however, is much the same as the converse of No. 1), deprives the Church of managing her own affairs. Nothing can be truer. Before the Act of Submission, in the reign of Henry VIII., the faith, ritual, and discipline of the Church were not placed under the direct control of the Crown in the way they are now. And in the Tudor days, the Crown did not mean, as in the last resort it does now, the House of Commons. Henry no doubt intended that canons should still be enacted by Convocation, with consent of the Crown. But, practically, canons have fallen out of use. Their binding power, even over the clergy, is a little obscure; and for the laity they have no force at all. If there is one department of Church legislation more open to new canons than another, one would think it would be the reform of the Ecclesiastical Courts. But those Courts have been so affected by Acts of Parliament that it would be exceedingly difficult to draw up a canon for their reform without clashing in many points with statute law. Then as to ritual: The two Convocations of Canterbury and York agreed upon a Bill, and sent it up to the Crown, along with their final reports on the rubrics; and if this Bill were passed, the Convocations could make any alterations in the Prayer Book, or additions to it, except alterations of doctrine, and these changes would become law if approved by the Crown in Council and not objected to by either House of Parliament. In any case, the great majority of the clergy of England agree, in effect, with Mr. Richard when he says that the present state of things imposes upon Parliament duties which it cannot effectually discharge. But then, Mr. Richard proposes to burn down the cottage to roast the pig.

That Parliament should be relieved of the most difficult of its present ecclesiastical duties most Churchmen heartily desire. We contrast the House of Commons after the Restoration,

when it represented England only, and was a strong Church body, with the present House of Commons, representing Roman Catholic Ireland, and Presbyterian Scotland, besides the manifold Dissent of England; and we shrink from the prospect of such a House of Commons teaching us Churchmen to pray. Yet Sir William Harcourt, himself an Archbishop's grandson, said, if we remember rightly, during the discussions on the Burial Bill, that in an established church no form of prayer could be allowed which had not been sanctioned by Parliament, forgetting that across the Border all the prayers are made afresh by the parish ministers every Sunday in a church which is far more truly "established by law" than the Church of England. And when a man like Sir William is possessed by the exceedingly "unhistorical" notion that there is no alternative between an Act of Uniformity and "Disestablishment," no wonder that persons such as Mr. Richard and the Liberationists should see in the Church's parliamentary difficulties a splendid pretext for crying "Down with her, down with her, even to the ground!" Churchmen, on the other hand, have been far too slow in perceiving that some method of Church legislation adapted to the times is urgently required. Perhaps Mr. Richard may hasten their perception. If Scotland has its General Assembly, why may not England? Is not every municipality established by law, and yet permitted to manage its own affairs? So far as we know, Parliament does not prescribe the weight, pattern, or material of a mayor's chain, the height of the aldermen's cocked hats, or the shape and colour of their gowns. Certainly it does not interfere with their numerous local ordinances, so long as they are consistent with the terms of their charter or the laws of the land. If at any time they need new powers they must go to Parliament for them. They have no power but what rests ultimately on Crown and Parliament, but they have, within their prescribed limits, a very substantial amount of self-government.[1]

The Church of England originated in voluntary action; it has been continued to this day by voluntary support; and though it now possesses both land and other investments, it owes to the State not its possessions, but merely the power of holding

[1] It is the same with every incorporated society and institution. There is the S. P. G. Its old charter was becoming unworkable. But nobody proposed therefore to "disestablish" the S. P. G., and—for that, let us remember, is what the "disestablishers" really mean—pension off its missionaries, and apply the balance of its possessions, if any, to endowing Roman Catholic and Presbyterian colleges, paying arrears of farmers' rents, or making tramways. The society simply applied for a new charter, got it, and proceeded without more ado to use its new powers for managing its own affairs.

them. Every cathedral and parish church is a separate institution, having relations, no doubt, to the others, but to a very large extent distinct and independent. The Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's are a corporation, and have as much right to their possessions as the Lord Mayor and Corporation of London have to theirs, and so with every cathedral. In parish churches where there is but one endowed minister, he is, in the eye of the law, a corporation, a corporation sole; and no reason can be given for robbing him which would not apply to every other holder of other than private property. Most modern societies, whether for religious or other purposes—the Church Missionary Society, for instance—have been provided by the law with other means of keeping what belongs to them. But for the purpose of this discussion, there is no difference whatever between the incumbent of a parish as a corporation sole, and the trustees of a Dissenting chapel, who, without the name, are for practical purposes a corporation aggregate. Chapel trustees may have powers of dissolving their trusts which Church trustees have not; but that is merely a detail and of no account. If it pleased Parliament to ordain that a Dissenting chapel should in future, on the application of the founders or members, be held by a single trustee, and that one the minister, without power of alienation, or that a parish church should be held in trust by five or more trustees chosen in a certain manner, and with some powers not now possessed by the incumbent, both the churches and the chapels would remain established by law as completely as they are at present; and unless it could be proved that the nation at large would be the better for their forcible impoverishment or dissolution, both alike ought to remain, as they are now, in possession and enjoyment of their several acquisitions. Parliament has interfered repeatedly with Dissenting endowments, as it has with those of the Church; and ought to do the like again when good can be done by the interference, but not otherwise.

We come now to Mr. Richard's third charge: That the establishment—that is, we must repeat, the actually existing establishment in its various details—*inflicts injustice on a large number of the community.* Mr. Richard does not say who the people are who suffer the injustice. When the oracle told Crœsus that if he crossed the river Halys he would destroy a mighty kingdom, he does not seem to have thought that possibly that kingdom was his own. Certainly the largest number of the community on whom injustice is inflicted by the existing establishment of the Church of England consists of the members of that Church. Thus charge No. 3 may be held to be identical with No. 2. The injustice consists in depriving the Church of managing its own affairs. But this is

not to be cured, as Mr. Richard means, though he does not say so, by leaving the Church no affairs to manage. It is not establishment in the abstract that is in fault, but *the* establishment which we now have. And the injustice is a growing one. So long as we have a Prime Minister who is a sincere Christian and Churchman, though his churchmanship widely differs from that advocated in this magazine, there is some security that high offices in the Church will not be filled by men who do not care for the Church. But when Mr. Gladstone is gone, Churchmen of every kind, who believe that there is one only Name whereby men may be saved, cannot look forward with much satisfaction to the management of the Church by some of his probable successors. Why should there be all these opportunities for friction? The Tudor Monarchs laid their heavy hands on the Church to keep the Pope away. That danger is one which we can safely ignore now; and, with a fairly representative government of lay as well as clerical Churchmen, there would be less and less of that playing at Popery within our gates, which the present anomalous position of the clergy makes possible. The first clause of Magna Charta runs thus:

In primis concessisse Deo et hac præsente carta confirmasse, pro nobis et heredibus nostris in perpetuum, *quod Anglicana Ecclesia libera sit*, et habeat jura sua integra, et libertates suas illæsas; et ita volumus observari; quod apparet ex eo quod libertatem electionum quæ maxima et magis necessaria reputatur ecclesiæ Anglicanæ mera et spontanea voluntate, ante discordiam intra nos et barones nostros motam, concessimus, et carta nostra confirmavimus, et eam obtinuimus a domino papa Innocentio tertio confirmari, quam et nos observabimus et ab hæredibus nostris in perpetuum *bonâ fide* volumus observari.

This would be real Liberationism if it were carried out, with due regard to the altered circumstances of the times. Strike out the Pope, and in his place put the lay members of the Church, as the third party besides the State and the clergy, and then the Church of England might be set free without danger to any man. It is not proposed that the Church of England should keep a Swiss guard or even a policeman. The State need not be afraid of us. We should still be Englishmen, and Englishmen given on principle to loyalty and order. We are not firebrands nor fanatics. To make us so, the best way would be to liberate us, as the Liberators propose, of every stone and every shilling we now possess, and turn us out into the streets after twelve centuries of housekeeping to begin life afresh as begging friars.

Thus it is quite true, though hardly as Mr. Richard intended it, that the existing establishment of the Church of England inflicts injustice on a large number of the community. As to

that number which Mr. Richard means, we really cannot see that they have much reason to complain. They are treated in almost every way on a perfect equality with Churchmen. They can be members of either House of Parliament, Judges, and Ministers of the Crown. They are not required to contribute towards the maintenance or extension of the Church,[1] and yet they have, whenever they please, exactly the same free right to a place in the parish church, and to the public and private ministrations of the clergy, as the most devoted and most liberal of Churchmen. They are authorized by law to thrust their ministrations into the Church's consecrated grave-yards, where, however, they contrive to make a grievance of having to pay the fees; their notion being that Churchmen should provide the ground, and maintain it in order, but allow Dissenters to use it for nothing. What Mr. Richard will try to make out is, of course, that the churches, the churchyards, and the endowments are "national property," and may therefore be transferred from one national use to another at the mere will and pleasure of Parliament, without any consideration of right or wrong in the matter. But if Churchmen are not very fast asleep indeed, they will put up somebody to put this "unhistorical" rubbish down. National is not a synonym for confiscationable. The letter H is national. In schools and otherwise it is under State patronage and control. There are also large numbers who do not conform to it. But there is no Society yet for compelling us to drop it and cut it up into I's and 'yphens. The Church is national because it is the Church which has grown with the nation's growth, and aimed at supplying, and except in some huge populations of recent date has actually succeeded in supplying, a place of worship and a pastor for every man, woman, and child on English ground. It is the fashion of Mr. Richard's friends to call the Church of England the Episcopal Church, and Churchmen Episcopalians. They might as well call our churches, as the Quakers used to call them, steeple-houses, and ourselves steeplemen. No doubt the Church fabrics are distinguished in most cases from other houses by their steeples, though herein, as in so many other instances, Dissenters are copying us. But to see no difference between a parish church and any other house in a parish, besides its having a steeple, is precisely the same sort of wilful blindness as to distinguish the Church of England from the other religious bodies in England by its having retained the ancient order of Bishops. The Church does not exist either for steeple or for Bishop. If

[1] Paying tithes is not supporting the Church any more than paying rent to Chapel Trustees is supporting Dissent.

every meeting-house had a steeple, as many now have, and if in these days of Cumminsites, Reformed Church-of-Englands, O. C. R.'s, etc., etc., every Dissenting minister had received episcopal consecration, the Church of England would remain just what it is, not the Church of Steeples, nor the Church of Bishops, but the Church of England.

The churches founded by our Lord's Apostles were all local and territorial, in no manner nor degree optional or congregational. Every baptized person in any one town or place belonged to the church of that place. If he travelled abroad, and came to another town where there was a Christian community, he at once became a member of it. There was no Church of Rome at Corinth, and no Church of Corinth at Rome, still less were there altogether in any place a Church of Paul, a Church of Apollos, a Church of Peter, and a church calling itself, because it stood apart from its fellow-Christians, a Church of Christ. In our Lord's last messages to the churches in the Revelation this comes out beyond the possibility of mistake, when once the facts are fairly studied. Christ addressed in each of his seven epistles, the local and territorial church, the church that was distinguished from all other churches, not by peculiarities of government, opinion, or ritual, but by its being the church of the place in which it was. No man may withdraw from the communion of such a church without sin, unless, like the historical churches of France, Italy, and Spain, it imposes sinful terms of communion.

If everything is to be abolished which some people do not like, we have a good deal more "injustice" on our hands than Mr. Richard is perhaps quite ready to deal with. We suppose a soldier inflicts injustice on a Quaker. Yet the Quaker not only has to tolerate the soldier, as he has to tolerate the Church, but to supply part of the money for his pay, his rifle, his powder and his shot. A man in a broadcloth coat very possibly is held to be "inflicting injustice" upon some who only wear fustian. We can quite understand that Dissenters of Mr. Richard's type do not like the Church. And Churchmen, while they acknowledge most gladly the many good qualities possessed by Dissenters, and the many good works done by them, have strong feelings in regard to the "dissidence of Dissent." Yet we never hear Churchmen complaining that the existence of a Dissenting chapel inflicts injustice upon them, in such a sense that they have a right to call upon Parliament to disestablish it.

The cathedral and parish churches of England have been founded and endowed, enlarged, re-built, and restored, one by one, from time to time, by those who wished to have them.

Two or three still survive in England from the Roman occupation of Britain, notably St. Martin's Church, Canterbury. A large number are older in their original foundation, if not in parts of their remaining fabrics, than the Norman Conquest. Four thousand have been built in our own days. Every one of these, from the most ancient to the most recent, has as much title to exist as the Crown itself, or either House of Parliament. The idea which they represent is not Mr. Richard's idea; but that is no reason why the law should come in to Mr. Richard's help, and do by force what he cannot do by persuasion. Let him empty the churches by convincing churchgoers that divisions are fruits of the Spirit, and that Christian ministers are merely the hired servants of those they minister to, removable at pleasure like the directors of a railway company, and the Disestablishment so dear to Mr. Richard will be accomplished forthwith.

Take a public library. Does that inflict injustice upon those who do not care for books, or are blind, or cannot read, or prefer to buy their own books? If it is built and maintained out of the rates, perhaps it does—as much as a poor-rate inflicts injustice upon those who are not paupers, a highway-rate upon those who use neither horse, ass, nor carriage, or a police-rate upon those who never go to gaol. But if the fabric of the library was a free gift, and if the funds for its repair and maintenance, including the wages of the librarians, come from voluntary gifts of persons living, or deceased, or both, where is the injustice? Must a public hospital be disestablished—that is to say, its nurses and doctors pensioned, its patients turned out, and the fabric handed over to the mayor and corporation —because there are homœopathists, herb-doctors, anti-vaccinationists, and other medical sectaries who disapprove of the treatment pursued in it? Is the sentimental "injustice" inflicted upon these gentlemen to be removed by inflicting upon those who use the hospital, whether patients, students or others, the gross and palpable injustice of destroying the hospital or seriously crippling its means of doing good? If every man is unjustly treated when anything that he dislikes is protected by law, we see no end to disestablishment as long as anything remains established.

Was not Mr. Richard once a Dissenting minister? Is he not carrying his class prejudices into the arena of national politics? The present Bishop of Winchester, in a memorable paper read by him at the Oxford Church Congress in 1862, said of members of the middle or lower classes who are educated for the ministry in the Church of England: "As soon as they are ordained, they struggle into the position of gentlemen; and *hard and painful and disappointing* as the struggle

generally is, they can scarcely do otherwise." How much harder, more painful, and more disappointing must be the struggle of the ordinary Dissenting minister! He dresses himself in clerical attire; his natural ability is probably equal, perhaps superior, to that of the rector or vicar. As a preacher he may be reckoned, at least by his own congregation, as much the better man of the two. Yet the rector dines at the squire's. *He* does not. The rector drives his pony-carriage, gives tennis-parties, has the squire and even the squiress to dinner occasionally at the rectory. He may be even a Magistrate, or at least a Commissioner of Taxes, a Poor Law Guardian, a Governor of an Endowed School, and a member of half a dozen public trusts. From all these glories the other good man is clean shut out. Is it in human nature for him to see that he is shut out because he is not fit to be let in? Will he not ascribe the whole of the grievance to the establishment of the Church of England by law? And there is thus much truth in his ascription. If the parish church were to be secularized, and the endowments taken away, the race of gentlemen clergy would probably be much reduced in numbers; so much, perhaps, that the clergy of the future, drawn so much more frequently from the same class as the present Dissenting preachers, would no longer have to "struggle into the position of gentlemen," but might find satisfaction in the social amenities of the local Pigeons and Tozers. This, however, is a process of levelling down. The clergy would be lowered; but the clients of Mr. Richard would not be elevated. Some may say that if gentlemen would not become clergymen without the endowments, those we now have are mercenaries, and we should be better without them. Not so, however. If we could trace the history of Dissenting ministers, we should find that in many cases, probably in most, their present position, however unsatisfactory in itself, is to them an actual rise in social standing. Salem Chapel and £100 a year may call forth quite as much worldly ambition as the parish church with its £500. And there is another consideration. In Scotland, where the Episcopal clergy are paid—many of them—less than the "established" Presbyterians, it does not always follow that the presbyter stands higher than the priest. This is so, strange to say, even in America, where, if anywhere, the "injustice" which galls Mr. Richard might be the last thing to expect. There is in America the same drift of Dissenting ministers into the ministry of the Church as there is in England, and on a much larger scale. Knowing what we do of human nature, even of Christian nature in these days, we may be pretty sure that the struggle which precedes the change does not tend downwards in the social scale. An Independent minister at Ipswich, not

long ago, chairman for the time of the Suffolk Congregational Union, pointed out to his brethren that, year by year, there are ministers leaving the Congregationalists, and others joining them. He also pointed out that those who left almost always went to the Church or to the Presbyterians, seldom or never to the Methodists, their inferiors in social standing, and very rarely to the Baptists, their equals. Those who joined them followed the same rule. They did not come from the Church, nor from the Presbyterians, nor even from the Baptists, but chiefly from the minor sects of Methodists.

But away with a grievance thus trumpery and unchristian! "Who shall be the greatest" is certainly a question of apostolic precedent, but not one which the Master desires His disciples to follow. Shall the means of grace, provided for the people of our English parishes by the piety of twelve centuries, be swept off the face of the land for such reasons as these?

The only items of injustice which we can think of in the case are: (1) The Bishops have seats and votes in the House of Lords. This, however, is considerably neutralized by the exclusion of the clergy from the House of Commons. (2) The minister of the parish is *ex-officio* chairman of the ordinary parish meeting. This, however, is a privilege of no great value. It is curtailed by various Acts of Parliament, and presiding in a vestry meeting is not always one of the pleasantest occupations. And (3) churchwardens are for some few purposes overseers. As a set-off against this offensive pre-eminence, and a set-off which puts the balance the other way, is the election of one of the churchwardens, in some cases both, by the whole body of the rate-payers, Dissenters and Infidels as well as Churchmen. In these three particulars the Church appears to be privileged by the State above the rest of the nation. If these are the particulars in which the existing establishment of the Church inflicts injustice upon those who repudiate her jurisdiction, we do not know that they are much worth contending for.

We are quite aware that when Mr. Richard comes to draw up his charge of injustice he will clothe it in very different attire from the ridiculous garments in which—because they alone belong to it and fit it—we have here exhibited it. Nor do we expect to make any impression upon him and his friends, who have been manufacturing their idol at a vast expense these many years past, and will follow the conservative instincts of human nature in keeping it high on its pedestal these many years to come. But they are, in numbers, a quite insignificant fraction of English people. Among the four millions of London, more than eighty-four per cent. of the marriages take place in church, and not four per cent. in the chapels of all

Protestant Nonconformists. In the parish where this is written, during the three years and a few weeks since the Burials Act came into operation, there have been 113 Protestant burials—of which the Church has taken 108, and the Nonconformists 5, although they have three chapels, one of them seated for as many as the parish church. Many people prefer the Chapel services to those of the Church; but they are not Dissenters in any substantial meaning of the term. Many of them have their children baptized at Church; they go to Church to be married; when they are ill they like the clergyman to visit them, and when they die they wish the clergyman to bury them. All this may be very illogical; but there is no need to legislate for the pleasure of logicians. This mass of Chapel-goers should be within reach of good influence. They and Church-folk together form an enormous majority in the nation, and only sheer mismanagement can allow a small minority of fanatics to override their united wishes.

Mr. Richard's last charge is, that the establishment of the Church of England by law is injurious to the political and religious interests of the nation. This is no argument, unless Mr. Richard can prove that disestablishment would not be more injurious. We can quite imagine the honourable member coming forward with a vast array of newspaper paragraphs, diligently collected by the agents of his society, in which Churchmen, clerical and lay, are shown to have hindered the progress of what Mr. Richard believes—and, in many cases, what we ourselves believe—to be the right sort of politics and religion. But, unless Churchmen have a monopoly of wickedness and folly, it would be equally possible to collect similar evidence against Dissenters. There might not be so much of it, partly because Dissenters are fewer than Churchmen—partly because a Dissenting delinquent is not half so profitable a subject for the penny-a-liner as the Churchman is.

The government of a great, civilized, Christian country, by the antagonism of political parties, is a prolongation into the present age of what ought to have become extinct when we ceased to be barbarians. Take up a political newspaper of either side: you know perfectly well what to expect—abuse of the side opposite, and laudation or excuses for the side taken. And, as with the obscurest of scribes, so with the greatest leaders. They stand up and make speeches in and out of Parliament, such that, if they were all to be taken as true, the only possible conclusion would be that England is always governed by knaves and fools. The Church in her charity assumes that both parties are led by worthy men, praying for Parliament, and the Lords of the Council, always in the same identical words, whoever may be out or whoever

may be in. Hitherto the nation has recognised in the Church the chief remaining element of national unity.

Mr. Richard appears to think that religion ought to be vulgarized to the same level as government by party has vulgarized the State. He would have it declared by Crown and Parliament that there is no ascertainable, or even probable truth in religion; and that whether a man is a Mussulman or a Christian is a question of the same order as whether he is a Whig or a Tory. Not quite, though; for he will not allow an English Mussulman to marry more than one wife, thereby showing that his boasted religious equality does not mean the equality of religions, but the degradation of the Church. That the nations and their kings should bring their glory and honour into the Holy City was the last revelation of our Saviour Christ to the beloved disciple. That the English nation and its sovereign bring their glory and honour into the Holy City is, in Mr. Richard's opinion, injurious to the national politics and religion. That the glory and honour of England are not brought into the Church as wisely as they might be we have admitted most fully in this paper; but that they should not be brought in at all is contrary, not only to the Scriptures of both Testaments, but to the conclusions of philosophers, who try to philosophize independently of Scripture. What says the author of "Ecce Homo" in that strange book which he has lately published under the title of "Natural Religion"? Speaking of England and its influence on its foreign dependencies, he says (page 206):

> Our want of any high ideal, the commonness of our aims and of our lives, the decay of that strong individuality which used to be our boast, our want of moral greatness which may at all correspond to the wide extension and prosperity of the English race, all this which we fondly misname our common sense, our honest plainness and practicality, may well frighten us when we view it thus, and may almost fill us with the foreboding of an ignominious national fall.

Does this differ altogether from the prophecies of Isaiah and St. John?

> The nation and kingdom that will not serve Thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted.
>
> If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part from the tree of life and out of the holy city, which are written in this book.

Is it not taking away from the words of divine prophecy to proclaim that a nation, as a nation, has no right to recognise the Church of God, no right to draw a distinction between that which Christ said he would build, and the inventions of men, be they Christian, Agnostic, or Heathen? Surely "our want of a high ideal" would no longer be so manifest amongst us if

the majesty of England were gathered up in the National Church, and our missions at home and abroad could speak with the whole weight of our national authority, and invite Great Britain and Greater Britain to national unity and universal brotherhood. Instead of disestablishing the Church by force, let Mr. Richard disestablish Dissent by persuasion; instead of crumbling to pieces what yet remains to us—and it is not much—of national Christianity, let him purify and strengthen it; instead of abandoning the great ideal of our forefathers in despair, and even indicting it as a nuisance, let him help us Churchmen to uplift it, and display it, till our people of all ranks and conditions, from the lowest to the highest, see in the Church of England God's witness for truth and righteousness in this land, and a means of saying with hitherto undreamt of success, "O be joyful in the Lord, *all ye lands;* serve the Lord with gladness, and come before His presence with a song."

JOSEPH FOXLEY.

ART. IV.—MARTIN LUTHER.

NEARLY four hundred years have elapsed since the birth of Martin Luther, and their history is his noblest monument. Through all these centuries the influence of the Wittenberg Professor can readily be discerned, and must endure for all time. It is, however, not a little remarkable that the world should have so long been content to know so little of the private life of this marvellous man. Yet it would be difficult to point to a single biography which gives us a faithful portrait of him. In our own language there is certainly none in which his personality is not completely obscured by adventitious matters, and it has hitherto justly been the reproach of German literature that it had so little to tell us of the man who made German a language and Germany a nation. It has been suggested that most ordinary readers would have no difficulty in writing down what they know of Luther upon a sheet of note-paper, and this is probably not a greatly exaggerated estimate of the popular ignorance. Sundry of his acts and words, it is true, are familiar to all of us. Many fables and calumnies respecting him can, too readily, be recollected. But of the man's life from boyhood to old age most of us must confess that we know very little. Nor is this wholly inexplicable. The magnitude of the events in which he was the principal actor have dwarfed his individuality. Probably no

single figure of his own or any other era ever made so much noise in the world as Luther:

> Who so stood out against the Holy Church,
> The great metropolis and see of Rome.

The consequences were inevitable. He has become little more than a creature of criticism. The industrious student may well be bewildered by the mass of contradictory testimony. On the one hand, a crowd of critics have addressed themselves to the task of lowering the prestige of the great German Reformer with such goodwill, that were we to follow these blind guides, we could only arrive at the conclusion that he was an ignorant and depraved monk, while the Reformation itself was merely a revolution against authority of a political as much as of a religious character. Others, again, actuated doubtless by a fancied necessity for explaining things, treat the Reformation as the mature outcome of the downfall of mediævalism, and tell us that there would have been no lack of Luthers if Luther had never been born. But all his motives, words, and deeds have been interpreted in an infinite variety of ways. It is, too, such a wholly superfluous task to speculate what the Reformation would have been without Martin Luther, and his indispensable coadjutor, Philip Melancthon. History, at any rate, would have had a very different reading.

It was from a very humble origin that Luther was called to such great and exceptional honour. He was the son of a peasant. The date of his birth is unknown, or at any rate doubtful, thanks to the Roman Catholic writers who could find no star evil enough to have been that of his destiny; while, curiously enough, according to Melancthon, Martin's mother remembered the day and the month but not the year of his birth. By the common consent of his biographers, however, it has come to be fixed as the 10th of November, 1483.

Of his parents, John and Margaret Luther, we know very little. John, however, seems to have been in some ways a remarkable man. Upright, straightforward, and hardworking, he was at the same time austere, and obstinate to a fault. He was, too, a man of some education, and read such books as he could obtain, although we can well believe that at the latter end of the fifteenth century these would be few indeed, notwithstanding that the revival of letters had then already set in in Germany. Margaret was a pattern wife. "Other honest wives," says Melancthon, "looked to her as a model of virtue." Martin was indebted to his parents for his early lessons in a piety which was strongly tinged with terrorism. They seem, indeed, to have erred on the side of strictness, for, as Martin himself tells us, they used the rod with such

frequency that he became timid. His mother, for instance, whipped him until the blood came one day for stealing a hazel-nut; and his father was so fervent a believer in the same method of correction that the child was in the habit of hiding in the chimney-corner to avoid his anger. There seems, however, to be little doubt that Martin was naturally headstrong and wilful; and although he himself blames his parents for their severity, the spirit of independence which chiefly enabled him to achieve his life-work was probably due in no small measure to his early training. At the school at Eisenach the same rough and ready code of discipline was practised. Once, he tells us, he was beaten fifteen times in a single morning. Nor could this have been for stupidity, for when six years old little Martin could read and write with ease. It is impossible to dwell with pleasure upon a childhood which was little more than a succession of ordeals. Of his little playmates we know nothing. He was one of a family of some six or seven, but not even the names of his brothers and sisters have been preserved.[1]

In 1497 Martin and a comrade, Hans Reinicke, went to a school of the Franciscans at Magdeburg. Here they scraped together a very precarious livelihood from alms and such sums as they could earn as choristers. Martin's father could do little for him at this time, so that when he had been in Magdeburg for a twelvemonth he again returned to Eisenach. Too much has been made of Martin's singing in the streets of Eisenach for alms. Such was the rule rather than the exception in Germany, and not the least touching of the customs of the country was that of bestowing bread or pence upon the scholars of the schools who sang from door to door asking "*Panem propter Deum.*" Of course their livelihood was precarious, but the practice was then almost universal, and survived down to very recent times. One name at any rate will ever be remembered in this connection. Ursula von Cotta, the wife or widow of a rich citizen of Eisenach, has earned an immortal memorial for her charity to the boy Martin, and it must have been in no small measure due to her kindness to him that he afterwards, "looking back through years that gilded the distance and wiped out the hungry hours," spoke of "Eisenach, my own dear Eisenach." Here he studied grammar, rhetoric, poetry, and Latin, under Trebonius, Rector of the Convent of the barefooted Carmelites, and a man of some learning, and, more than that, rare sympathy. Martin

[1] Luther tells us that two of them died of the plague which swept over Europe in the beginning of the sixteenth century, and one of his sisters married Ruhel de Mansfeldt, a scribe whose name is mentioned in Luther's letters.

was indebted to him for his first lessons in self-respect, and was one of his pupils, thanks to his patroness, for four years.

When he was eighteen Luther entered at the University of Erfurt, then the capital of Thuringia, and a famous seat of learning, with the intention of embracing the legal profession, in compliance with his father's wishes. The name of "Martinus Ludher ex Mansfeld" is recorded on the register of the University in the year 1501, the entry having been made by the rector Jodocus Truttvetter, who was one of his tutors in philosophy, and was afterwards to be one of his great opponents, and whose death Martin accuses himself of having hastened by his rebellion against the theology of the schools. Martin could already write and converse in Latin fluently. He was, too, remarkable for quickness of apprehension, and his rare natural eloquence made him a leading figure in the disputations which were then an important feature of German university life. His studies were now chiefly in law, logic, and dialectic philosophy. The writings of Occam, Scotus, Bonaventura, and Thomas Aquinas were at this time his chief mental *pabulum*. Although he attained to a remarkable pitch of proficiency in both mediæval and ancient philosophy, such studies had little charm for him, and he gladly embraced the opportunity of studying classics afforded by the invaluable collection in the University library. Amongst his companions were some destined to be remembered. Of these, George Spalatin, afterwards the confidant of Frederick III., Elector of Saxony, and one of Luther's staunchest friends, is the best known. Lucas Cranach, too, who was ten years his senior, and was afterwards court painter to three Electoral princes, was one of his associates, and is perhaps best known to fame as the painter of Luther's portrait. Crotus Rubianus, again, the friend of Ulrich von Hütten, was one of the leaders of the Humanists, of whom there was already a little coterie at Erfurt, and who were destined to play no unimportant part in the coming Reformation. With these Luther was on terms of intimate friendship.

In 1502 he was admitted to the degree of Bachelor of Philosophy, the entry on the University roll being "Martinus Luder, Baccalaureus Philosophiæ." (Luther himself spelt his name in four ways, viz.: Ludher, Lutter, Lother, and Luther.) His chief relaxation was music. All through his life the song and the lute never failed to charm him. "Music," said he, "is a fair gift of God, and near akin to Divinity. I would not for a great matter be destitute of the small skill in music which I have." He played both the guitar and flute, and he taught the art to all his children. He had, too, great taste for mechanics, and could use a lathe skilfully, a fact which was afterwards of some importance to him. We have no trustworthy record of

his personal appearance at this time, but the vigorous vitality of his middle age was unknown to his youth. Luther's life at Erfurt was full of anxieties, and he suffered both mentally and bodily from the constant strain he placed upon his intellectual powers. He was a voracious student. Fired with the fever of knowledge, the peasant's son might well be bewildered in the midst of so many almost priceless volumes, now for the first time within his reach. He studied at once logic and law, philosophy and theology, poetry and *belles lettres*. He read everything. It was when he was twenty years old and in the University library that Luther first saw the Vulgate. Hitherto he had only met with the fragments of Scripture which had been appointed to be read in the churches. There can be no question that this was the turning-point of his life. There is nothing to show that up to this period he had been peculiarly influenced by religious feeling. He was a scrupulous Catholic, but nothing more than that. From this period, however, a great change is noticeable in his career. He passed through an agony of doubt, and although not even his bitterest enemies accuse him of having led a wicked life, he became at once conscious of its shortcomings. Yet he could only read the Latin Bible in the college library at odd moments, and when his studies permitted. He was still a law student, but by degrees his inclinations towards making theology the business of his life steadily grew. Other influences, too, were at work tending to this end. In 1505 Alexis, one of his boon comrades, was killed in a duel, then even a more common event in the German universities than now, and about the same time, when walking to Mansfeldt in order to visit his parents, a thunderbolt struck the ground in front of him. In his terror he vowed himself to a monastic life. The promise was kept. In spite of his father's prayers and his mother's tears he took the cowl, and at midnight on the 7th of July, 1505, he entered the cloister as a novice, taking with him a Plautus and a Virgil as the sole memorials of his past life.

He was fortunate in his choice of a brotherhood. John Staupitz, the Vicar-General of the monastery of St. Augustine at Erfurt, was then far in advance of the time, and was a man of vast learning and wide sympathy. He speedily discerned Luther's promise. Luther himself has partly lifted the veil which would otherwise have shrouded his monastic life. It was during his novitiate that he first studied the Bible systematically. "When I entered into the cloister," he says, "I called for a Bible, and the brethren gave me one. It was bound in red morocco. I made myself so familiar with it, that I knew on what page and in what place every passage stood." His studious habits, however, provoked the jealousy of some of

the monks, so that he was set to perform menial duties, and had again to beg in the streets with a bread-bag on his shoulders. In his monk's cell he fought a hard fight. But for Staupitz, who cheered him, while he could not wholly satisfy his cravings after a higher life, he might not have survived the combined results of his mortifications and doubts.

The University of Wittenberg was now in its infancy, and in 1508 Luther, through the kindly instrumentality of Staupitz, exchanged his cell at Erfurt for the chair of philosophy and theology at the favourite foundation of Frederick the Wise, where there was a branch of the Augustinian monastery. Here Luther lived, lecturing and alternately preaching in the monastery chapel and college church. There were at the time some four hundred students, but in a few years, thanks chiefly to the fame of the new Professor, the number increased to two thousand. It was owing to the fact that the University which was destined to be the birth-place of the Reformation was not like those of Louvain, Cologne, and Leipzig, protected by Pope and Bishop, but by the Elector, that the Reformation was possible; and it was, too, because Luther was there that the craving after freedom, which was already making itself felt throughout the Fatherland, took that definite form and shape which prepared the nation by steady gradations for the time when it should possess an "open Bible and a preached Gospel." In March, 1509, Luther applied for and obtained the degree of Bachelor in Divinity, and in return for this distinction he had every day to lecture on the Bible, and we may well believe that it was a congenial theme. The fame of his lectures soon spread far and wide. The eloquence and the vehemence with which he expounded a new theology to that of the schoolmen attracted students from all parts of the country. Frederick the Wise came to Wittenberg to hear his young Professor.

It was at this juncture that Luther was destined to visit Rome. He was selected as one of two emissaries of his order, who were charged with the duty of procuring the Papal decision upon certain disputed questions. This journey was most pregnant in its results. Never did pilgrim since the earliest days of the Christian era more reverently drag his weary feet to the Holy Sepulchre than did Luther to the city still in his eyes the holiest on earth, since there God's vicegerent sat enthroned. As he neared the land of promise, however, doubts gradually grew. The splendour of the Italian convents, their gorgeousness, their ostentatious luxury, came upon the foot-worn Augustine friar as a terrible surprise. The German monk who had begged for food from door to door could not but contrast the poverty and rigid austerity of his own brotherhood with the magnificence of the Benedictines, who knew little of mortifi-

cation and less of prayers. At Bologna he had a dangerous illness, but recovered; and at length, six weeks after he had left Wittenberg, he entered Rome.

Julius II. was now on the Papal throne. Occupied in the intervals of intemperance and debauchery with schemes of political aggrandisement which should make him "lord and master of the game of this world,"[1] he had neither leisure nor inclination to make even a pretence to the Christian life. Ecclesiastical duties, too, had small weight in the Pontifical councils; and Luther, full of zeal and reverence for authority, received from authority but scanty favour. Julius could not trouble himself about the quarrels of a few German monks. But although Rome knew it not, a prophet was in their midst. Luther paid visits to the churches. On all sides were irreverence and venality, but nowhere could the shadow of spiritual religion be found. Of the grand truth "*The just shall live by faith*," not an echo was heard. Luther was even chided by the Roman priests for not reading mass more speedily. The honest monk was astounded at what he saw and heard. He, however, was not idle, and from Elias Levita, a celebrated rabbi, he learned the rudiments of Hebrew, which was necessary to fit him for the work he had to do. Probably never in the world's history was conviction fraught with such momentous results brought home to a man's mind more speedily. Luther only stayed a fortnight in Rome. He entered it a Papist: he left it a Protestant for all time.

Luther re-entered Wittenberg a sadder man than he left it. His doubts were now overwhelming, and speedily made themselves apparent in his teaching, both in the lecture-room and the pulpit. Meanwhile, the fame of him spread far and wide. Scarcely a city of the then civilized world but had already heard of the philosophy of the Wittenberg Professor.

Now, for the first time, he began to publicly question the wisdom and the piety of the Papacy. His words furnished his hearers with plenty of food for thought. For a time, too, he took upon him the duties of Vicar-General of his Order. Staupitz was glad of a respite from the constant complaints and dissensions of his flock; and, perhaps discerning the signs of the times, he wished Luther to take a prominent part in the coming renaissance of religion. "It is now necessary, my friend," said he to Luther, "that you become a Doctor of the Holy Scriptures." Luther was overwhelmed at the prospect of such an honour being conferred upon him; but all his scruples were overcome, and the Elector took all the attendant

[1] Ranke's "History of the Popes," vol. i., p. 50, 1846.

expenses upon himself.[1] He now applied himself diligently to the study of Greek and Hebrew, thus fitting himself for the work that was to be given him to do. He was already a notable scholar. In an age when philosophy was one of the sciences most abstrusely studied, he was distinguished for his profound erudition. In common with his Order he followed the principles of the Nominalists. He was a diligent student of the Fathers, especially of St. Augustine. Of the schoolmen, Occam and Gerson still attracted him; while his indebtedness to Reuchlin and John Tauler, the mystic, can hardly be exaggerated. Hé was, too, certainly better read than any other divine of the Romish Church in the Bible. He had now, to some extent, overcome the constitutional weakness of his youth. Of medium height, sturdy square build, with a small head, and features typical of a sensitively vigorous mind, and with eyes like a "falcon"—his was the type of a perfect manhood.

Near Wittenberg lived a monk, John Tetzel, a man of notoriously immoral and evil life. In spite of this, however, he was employed by Albert, Archbishop of Mentz—and, although only a young man of about twenty-four years of age, already a Cardinal and Prince of the Empire—as the German agent for the sale of indulgences. It would be superfluous to specify here the nature of this traffic; but if it was bad in itself, it was made a thousand times worse by the infamous manner in which Tetzel practised it. He selected the annual fairs for its prosecution; and with all the pomp and circumstance of an accredited Papal agent he cried his wares, inventing a catalogue of most heinous crimes, merely as a proof of the efficacy of the indulgences which he offered for sale. History relates not how Luther was first brought in contact with Tetzel; but the story runs, that some of those who had purchased these bits of parchment confessed themselves to be guilty of very gross sins to Luther, who thereupon imposed severe penances, whereupon they triumphantly produced Tetzel's indulgence and demanded absolution. Luther's indignation got the better of his prudence. In ignorance that Albert was pecuniarily interested in the traffic in indulgences, he wrote a letter to him remonstrating against it. To this he received no reply. Turning to Staupitz, he said: "I will declaim against this gross and profane error—write against it—do all in my power to destroy it." "What!" said Staupitz, "would you write against the Pope? They will not permit you to do it; your head will go for it! I pray you

[1] It was on October the 19th, 1512, that he was invested with the insignia of Doctor of Divinity, by Andrew Bodenstein of Carlstadt, Dean of the Faculty of Theology at Wittenberg, and Canon and Archdeacon of the Church of All Saints in that town.

desist!" "Suppose they must needs permit it!" replied Luther. He was as good as his word. On the eve of All Saints' Day, 1517, Luther nailed his ninety-five theses on the door of the church in Wittenberg, and thereby struck the key-note of the Reformation.

In the act itself there was nothing remarkable. In these days the martial spirit had made its way into the schools; and challenges on points of doctrine or scholarship were as usual among the learned as duels among the warlike. Nor in themselves did the theses go any great length in protesting against Papal authority. It was indulgences and their abuse that were attacked. He did not wholly discard all use of indulgences, but only maintained "that they were merely a release by the Pope from the canonical penances for sin, as established by ecclesiastical law, and did not extend to the punishments which God inflicts; that forgiveness of sins was to be had only from God, through real repentance and sorrow, and that God requires no penance or satisfaction therefor."[1]

Luther's theses raised a whirlwind throughout Germany. They gave a shape to the popular feeling. Tetzel, put on his defence, pleaded the infallibility of the Pope, and issued a set of counter-theses which were not logically worth the paper on which they were written. John Mair of Eck—better known as John Eck—whom Luther had counted upon for support, assailed him with great fury; and so, too, did Sylvester Prierius of Rome, and James Hochstraten of Cologne, two learned Dominicans. Luther was bewildered by the storm of abuse, but stood his ground with combined modesty and firmness. A general convention of the Augustinians met at Heidelberg early in the following year, and here Luther maintained his opinions so earnestly as to convince many of his brethren. While still at Heidelberg he addressed firm but respectful letters to the Pope and the Archbishop of Mentz and Magdeburg. Although Leo X. is said to have made light of this controversy,[2] he must have speedily changed his mind; for on the 7th of August Luther received a citation to appear at Rome within sixty days and take his trial. The Elector Frederick, however, demanded that Luther should be tried in Germany, according to the ecclesiastical laws of that country; and ultimately in October Luther left Wittenberg, amid the shouts of the students, to meet the Papal Legate, Cardinal Thomas Cajetan (Thomas de Vio, of Gaeta), a Dominican (and hence obviously unfitted to sit as judge in a controversy

[1] Mosheim's "Eccles. History," vol. iii. p. 101. London, 1841.

[2] Luther tells us in his "Tischreden" that the Papal comment on reading them was: "A drunken Dutchman wrote them; when he hath slept out his sleep and is sober again, he will then be of another mind."

between a Dominican and an Augustinian monk) learned in the theology of the schools, but profoundly ignorant of Scripture. Such an interview could only have one result. Luther was not so constituted that he would obey an imperious mandate to say "*Revoco*," unless convinced by argument; and the Legate could not argue from the Scriptures for lack of knowledge. Luther, who had been furnished with a safe-conduct from Maximilian, and provided with legal advisers, terminated the discussion by appealing *a Pontifice male informato ad melius informandum*—a familiar legal artifice, which while it recognised the jurisdiction of the Pope, superseded that of Cajetan. To this Leo X. imprudently replied by publishing a special edict requiring all his subjects to believe that he had the power to forgive sins. Thereupon Luther appealed from the Pontiff to a general council of the whole Church. The efforts of Charles von Miltitz, the Pope's private Chancellor, in the following year to bring about Luther's submission were more craftily conducted, and but for the firmness of Frederick would probably have succeeded in luring Luther to Rome. Many events, however, combined to keep the breach open. The death of the Emperor Maximilian had complicated matters, and the Elector Frederick was appointed Regent of the Empire. The Pope was too fully occupied in intriguing to secure the succession to the imperial throne of a candidate favourable to the Papacy to attend to the case of a single monk.

The famous disputation of Eck with Luther at the Castle of Pleissenburg, at Leipzig, respecting the Papal supremacy and authority, also certainly had the result of confirming Luther in his convictions. He was now in his thirty-sixth year. The anxieties and intense labour and study of the past few years had told terribly upon his constitution. His physical prostration was such that his bones showed through the skin. He had not, however, lost his old vigour and fire in debate. Possessing a naturally strong moving eloquence and melodious voice, his earnestness carried with it the conviction that this was a man who was asserting the truth, and at once gave him an immeasurable superiority over merely scholastic disputants. He was, however, not free from fault. He answered his opponents with too great acrimony, and indulged too frequently in personalities. We must not, however, forget that much of his passion was fully justified, and that in the age in which he lived it was far from being singular. Controversialists were then accustomed to abuse one another. Those who prefer to dwell upon the mild and peaceful disposition of Melancthon as standing out in pleasing contrast to the rugged obstinacy of Luther may well ask themselves whether without Luther the Reformation would ever have been achieved. The time for compromise had

not yet come. Among the results of the debate at Leipzig were proofs that the authorities were on the side of authority. The faculties of Louvain and Cologne condemned Luther's propositions. At this time, too, Luther did not know how far he could rely upon support outside his own University. Upon his return to Wittenberg, however, he assumed the offensive. The die was now cast, and all the world felt assured that the contest in which all the power of Rome was arrayed against that of the Professor of a mushroom University could have but one issue. Eck, burning with rage, had hastened to Rome to ensure Luther's destruction. There Luther was burnt in effigy and his writings in reality. It was high time. They had already spread all over Europe. The press at Bâle was busily engaged. Luther now published, amongst other things, his "De Captivitate Babylonia Ecclesiæ," "wherein he maintained that the Church was captive, that Jesus Christ, constantly profaned in the idolatry of the mass, set aside in the dogma of transubstantiation, was the Pope's prisoner." It is scarcely to be wondered at that works of this kind were in demand. In France, Spain, Italy, and the Netherlands, as well as throughout the whole of Germany and Switzerland, they were already eagerly read. At the time that the Pope thought it desirable to suppress the spread of schism in Germany, it had already begun to make way in nearly all the other countries of Europe. On the 15th June, 1520, Leo X. finally closed the door to reconciliation by issuing the first Bull against Luther, in which forty-one of his propositions were denounced as heretical, scandalous, and damnable, and everyone was prohibited, under pain of excommunication, from in any way propagating or sanctioning them. It further condemned all Luther's writings to the flames, while Luther and his followers were commanded to confess their faults within sixty days or be cast out of the Church. Luther responded by renewing his appeal from the Pontiff to the supreme tribunal of a future council, and by reasserting all the condemned propositions. Having now decided upon secession, he further emphasized this act by committing the Bull, together with a copy of the Pontifical Canon Law, to the flames on the 10th of December, 1520, in the presence of a vast number of spectators, just outside the walls of Wittenberg. The act was an earnest of the dawn of that "Christian liberty" which he had already preached. The second Bull, in which Luther was expelled from the bosom of the Romish Church, followed promptly upon this act of defiance. But all Germany rallied round the young Professor. The climax was at hand.

Charles V. had succeeded to the Imperial throne when yet only twenty years of age. An Imperial Reichstag was

summoned to meet at Worms to inaugurate his accession, and the Emperor was charged by the Pontiff with the duty of punishing the recalcitrant monk. Fortunately Charles was willing to be guided by the Elector, who advised him not to proceed summarily and condemn Luther without a hearing, as he was disposed to do. The case was such as, according to the ancient Canon Law, could properly be heard before the Provincial Council of the German nation, in which the Archbishops and Bishops and some of the Abbots had seats among the Princes. Already, too, had Luther gained a following which was strong enough to render it desirable that the matter should be conducted with seeming fairness. That the worst results were anticipated when Luther was summoned to Worms may well be believed. There were those who shook their heads even though Luther held the Imperial safe-conduct. His journey from Wittenberg to Worms was one perpetual ovation such as Germany had never accorded to any one man, and can never accord to any other. Money was provided sufficient for his needs, and the Doctor was furnished by the Council of Wittenberg with the unwonted luxury of an open waggon, the state of his health wholly preventing him from journeying as usual on foot. At Erfurt he received an enthusiastic reception, and there he preached on Easter Sunday. During his sermon, as the record runs, part of the church fell in, probably owing to the unusual crowd, and the audience fled in terror. Luther, however, continued preaching, and such was his magnetism that, even in that superstitious age, he induced them to return to the dilapidated building. At Leipzig the magistrates gave him the cup of honour, the customary reception accorded to distinguished visitors. At Weimar, John, Duke of Saxony, replenished his scantily filled purse. At Eisenach he paid a visit as a pious pilgrim to the house of Ursula von Cotta, and was nearly detained by a fresh attack of pain; but wishing to avoid even the appearance of reluctance to obey the Imperial mandate, he pushed on. He was cheered shortly before he reached Frankfort on the Maine by a priest who sent him a portrait of Savonarola, bidding him "persevere for the glory of God."

It is a pity that there is no proof that he composed that famous hymn—"Ein' feste Burg ist unser Gott"—which is not only the national psalm of Germany, but has sunk so deeply into the national heart, upon his way to Worms; but the better opinion seems certainly to point to its having been written later. However this may be, the spirit of that psalm must certainly have been running in the Reformer's mind at this time. He entered the city, henceforth destined to be famous, about noon on the 16th of April. He was escorted to

his lodgings by an immense crowd, and already even at Worms the populace were with him. Among the Princes, however, few had as yet declared for him. Of these, Philip, the young Landgrave of Hesse, Duke William of Brunswick, and the Elector Frederick, countenanced him most openly.

Luther's prayer, when summoned before the Reichstag, which has been preserved, is pregnant with proofs that the Reformer feared the worst, and had already faced the bitterness of death. Haggard but resolute, Luther entered the assembly. It was a terrible ordeal. The Emperor, six Electors, an Archduke, twenty-seven Dukes, two Landgraves, five Margraves, and numerous Counts, Archbishops, and Bishops, formed a tribunal before which the bravest might tremble. The galleries, too, were crowded with nobles. Luther had few friends here. Outside the populace cried "Bundschuh! Bundschuh!" the old rallying-cry of the insurgent peasantry, but within there was little to reassure the Reformer. He acknowledged that he was the author of his books when their titles had been read over to him, and asked for and obtained time to consider his defence. It is unnecessary to recapitulate minutely the events of this, perhaps the most memorable scene of history. They have been reiterated over and over again, and there is no more familiar figure than that of Luther at Worms. Every device that sophistry could suggest was adopted to induce him to retract. Cajolery and flattery were exhausted. Cochlæus, for instance, tempted him to increase his fame as an orator by offering to dispute with him if he would forfeit his safe-conduct, or in other words, sacrifice his life. But all were of no avail. Luther refused to renounce his opinions unless first convinced of error by proofs from Scripture or from sound reason. His intrepid attitude roused the manhood of the German Princes. In the face of the feeling evolved among nobles and people, it would have needed greater influence than even Charles possessed to have then safely sacrificed Luther to the Papal vengeance. Even the sentence condemning his books to destruction was carried out with difficulty. The people passed summary judgment upon those daring enough to attempt to destroy them publicly. The edict which placed Luther under the ban of the Empire was, too, cunningly ante-dated, so that although it was really drawn up when nearly all the Electoral Princes had departed, it purported to be the sentence of the whole Reichstag. Although of doubtful legality, it was none the less efficacious. Luther left Worms on the 26th of April, and for twenty-one days was protected by the Imperial safe-conduct; but after that period no man might harbour him on pain of treason, but whosoever might find him was charged to deliver him up to the Emperor.

Fortunately, however, Frederick discerned how real was the danger, and that Rome clamoured for Luther's blood. He was equal to the emergency. The Reformer had reached Eisenach in safety, and after visiting his parents set out for Waltershausen, through the solitudes of the Thüringerwald. Here he was set upon by armed horsemen, and his companions having been allowed to escape, was taken prisoner to a neighbouring castle—the Wartburg. He was now dubbed "Junker Georg," and passed as a captive knight.

This holiday, for such it must be called, was of the greatest importance to him. Rural amusements and better fare than that to which he was accustomed were doubtless of great service in restoring some of his lost vigour. He filled up his tedious hours by commencing the most glorious labour of his life—the translation of the New Testament into High German, a work which first assumed definite shape while he was in the Wartburg. In the meantime both friends and foes were aghast at his disappearance. For some months he had vanished as completely as though the earth had swallowed him up. Soon, however, he began to write letters and tracts, graphically dated "From amidst the birds which sing sweetly on the branches of the tall trees, and praise God night and day with all their might;" or, again, "From the mountain; from the Isle of Patmos." It is impossible that the Emperor could have really been very anxious to apprehend him, for he might doubtless have discovered his retreat. His friends certainly frequently visited him, and more than once he visited Gotha, Erfurt, and other towns and villages in disguise, and he went to Wittenberg openly towards the end of the year. Sorely against the will of the Elector, he finally left the Wartburg in March, 1522. He was constrained to take this rash step by the progress which the Reformation had made. A fanatical spirit was making headway. Carlstadt, who had been excommunicated in conjunction with Luther's followers, had begun to break the images in the churches, and gathering round him the common people, had established a sect which threatened to destroy the firstfruits of the Reformation. The young church at Wittenberg stood sorely in need of a strong hand to guide it; and heedless of the risk he ran, and almost discourteous in his replies to the remonstrances of the Elector, Luther once more took the lead.

This was the busiest time of his life. Henceforth he knew no leisure. Volumes poured from his pen; the translation of the Bible was continued in the midst of great difficulties, and the New Testament was completed and published. Henry VIII.,[1]

[1] See "Assertio septem Sacramentorum." Pynson: London, 1521. This was the work for which Pope Leo X. conferred upon Henry VIII. the title "Defender of the Faith."

through his chaplain Edward Lee, had entered the lists against him as defender of the Seven Sacraments, and great as was his provocation, it is impossible wholly to justify the unbounded license which Luther allowed himself in his reply.[1] Such questions, too, as the mass, the *elevation of the Host*, confession and monastic vows, demanded speedy settlement. The emancipation of the Reformers themselves could not but be gradual, and was the work of years.

The death of Leo X., and the accession of Adrian VI. of Utrecht to the Papal throne, were perhaps instrumental in securing for Luther a period of comparative peace. It is true that Adrian, at the Diet of Nuremberg in 1522, demanded that the decree against Luther should be executed; but the German Princes calling for a council, the Pope, who was conscious of the abuses existing in the Romish Church, was loth to bring the matter to the test of the sword, and consented to a truce. A terrible civil war was now threatening Germany. Goetz von Berlichingen, with thousands of the peasants, was preparing to fall upon the nobles. Thomas Münzer, who was now the leader of the Zwickau fanatics, whom Luther, in a letter to Spalatin, describes as "instruments of Satan, full of a proud and vehement spirit, and deaf to the voice of reason," had exchanged the *rôle* of an advocate of visionary spiritualism and a pretender to supernatural gifts for the leadership of the insurgents in Thuringia. Luther was charged by the nobles with being the author of this outbreak, but he was certainly greatly instrumental in suppressing it. He was indefatigable in his efforts to put a stop to these terrible scenes. He tramped all over the country preaching and exhorting the people to peace. All through the years 1523, 1524, and 1525 he did his utmost to stem the tide of rebellion. He was called upon to protect the Romish monks from the fury of the religious fanatics, and in turns the nobles from the peasantry and the peasantry from the nobles. All through this terrible time the man's integrity was inflexible. "Those who take the sword," said he, "shall perish by the sword;" and he, a peasant's son, showed no false sympathy with the peasants who had overstepped the bounds of reason, nor servility to the nobles, who were by no means blameless.

Great changes had now occurred. During the insurrection the Elector Frederick had died, but John, who succeeded him, was even more friendly to the Reformation. Adrian VI., who only lived long enough to reign a little more than two years, had been succeeded by Clement VII. The first Diet of Spire had secured religious liberty to the German Princes, and the

[1] "Contra Henricum regem Angliæ," Wittembergæ, 1522.

war between Charles V. and the Pope had further fostered the Reformation. On the other hand, Erasmus and Luther, who had long been on friendly terms, had become bitter antagonists, and a war of words was waging. The Swiss reformers too were coming to the front. As yet, the principles of the faith which Luther inculcated had not assumed a definite shape. Much had been accomplished, but much still remained to be done. It was at this juncture that Luther, at the wish of his father, married. It was a very bold step. His bride, Catherine von Bora, was one of those nuns who owed their emancipation to the Reformation, and had taken refuge at Wittenberg. She was only twenty-four years of age, and was of noble birth; but, despite the disparity in age and station, she made Luther an excellent helpmate at a time when he sorely needed womanly solace and sympathy. Those contemporary portraits of her which are still extant are little better than caricatures, but the better opinion seems to be that she possessed considerable personal attractions. Luther certainly never repented his marriage, but to the end of his life frequently gave expression to his love for her. "I would not," says he, in a letter to Stiefel, "exchange my poverty with her for all the riches of Crœsus without her." So great was his poverty, indeed, that after his marriage he endeavoured to fill his leisure by occupations which would serve to eke out his narrow income. Doubting his ability to teach music, he became a turner. He also applied himself to gardening and building. He seems to have received little or nothing for his books, and his annual salary never exceeded "two hundred Misnian florins." He was, too, generous to a fault, so that it is not surprising that he was burdened with debt. Fortunately he had five or six rooms in the old Augustinian convent for a home. His early married life was full of light and shade. The terrible plague which swept over Germany in 1527 spared him and his family, although his favourite son John sickened. The following year he deeply felt the loss of his little daughter Elizabeth. "I could never have dreamed," said he, "that a man's soul could be filled with such tenderness even towards his child." He was, too, himself in wretched health.

But another ordeal awaited him. The Turks had been defeated, and Germany was saved, but Lutheranism was again in danger. The hostility between the Catholic and Protestant Princes fostered by Clement VII. was reaching a head in the absence of a common foe. The Pope and the Emperor were again friends. In 1529, at the second Diet of Spire, a decree was passed revoking that of the first Diet of Spire, and again bringing Germany under the yoke of the Church as a system of spiritual slavery. The Lutheran Princes, however, protested

against the decree, and in token thereof assumed the name of "Protestants." With a view to greater strength, attempts were now made to reconcile the different sects of the Reformation in Germany, Switzerland, and the Netherlands. Luther and Melancthon maintained an argument with Œcolampadius and Zwingle; but it came to nothing. In 1530 the Protestant Princes were summoned to meet the Emperor at Augsburg. Melancthon and Luther in council drew up the Articles of the Protestant Faith, founded on those previously agreed to in a convention at Schwabach, and known as the Articles of Torgau. This, henceforth to be known as "the Augsburg Confession," signed by five Electors, thirty-five ecclesiastical Princes, twenty-three secular Princes, twenty-two Abbots, thirty-two Counts and Barons, and thirty-nine free imperial cities, was presented and publicly read before the Emperor and the members of the Diet at Augsburg on the 20th June, 1530. It was the charter of Evangelical Christianity. The Papal advisers of the Emperor, however, soon afterwards presented their Refutation of this Confession; and on the 19th of November a decree was passed requiring the Princes and the cities which had become alienated from the Pontiff "to return to their duty or to incur the vengeance of the Emperor." The result of this was the formation of the Protestant Princes into a defensive league at Schmalkald, a proceeding which Luther viewed with only qualified approval, since it seemed to inevitably bring matters to the arbitrament of the sword. There can, however, be no question that the bold front assumed by the offending Princes had the greatest effect upon the mind of the Emperor; of this the truce made at Nuremberg in the following year was the natural expression.

In the meanwhile the translation of the Old Testament had been progressing. Already various portions of it had been published. In 1534 the whole Bible appeared in German, and Luther's noblest work was accomplished. His translation was a masterpiece. "Idiomatic, vital in every part, clothed in the racy language of common life; it created, apart from its religious influence, an epoch in the literary development of the German nation." Luther's life-work was now nearly finished; but he was not yet destined to enjoy much peace. The terrible scandal to religion occasioned by the Anabaptists of Münster, and the constant prospect of the assembling of the Council, occupied his attention. In this respect Paul III. seemed to be more tractable than any of his predecessors; but the Protestant Princes, finding that Italy was fixed upon as the meeting-place, declined to consent, and reunited themselves in the Schmalkalden League; and in 1537, at a time of terrible suffering, Luther drew up the memorable Articles of Schmalkald to serve

as a declaration of the Protestant faith, and they spoke in trumpet tones. Luther came near to dying at this time, but recovering in spite of the doctors, was taken home by easy stages, there to spend perhaps the most peaceful period of his life. During the absence of Bugenhagen in Denmark he officiated as pastor of the Stadt Kirche at Wittenberg, but he never held any pastoral charge. He, however, fulfilled his University duties almost to the last. In May, 1539, one of his wishes was realized. Duke George, of Saxony, had been succeeded by his brother Henry, a Protestant, whose first act was to invite Luther to inaugurate the establishment of Protestantism in his dominions. He preached on Whitsunday in St. Nicholas Church to an immense congregation, thus fulfilling his own prophecy: "I shall one day preach God's Word in Leipzig." In 1542 death again visited his family, and Magdalene, his favourite daughter, died at the age of fourteen. There can be no question that this loss overshadowed the rest of his life.[1] But it is touching to know that the heart-broken father, in the next year, published his "Geistliche Lieder," containing many of those sweet hymns which have now passed into household words in Germany.

But Luther was now weary of life. His health was thoroughly broken down, and he was threatened with blindness, and subject to frequent attacks of vertigo. His University would not, however, hear of his retirement. He had for the past few years been in better circumstances. The new Elector Frederick had given him substantial presents, and he had received gifts from others. He had purchased a farm, and had looked forward to retiring to it for the evening of his life. His home at Wittenberg was still in the old convent (now "The Luther Hall"). Here he held a little court. From all parts of Europe people made pilgrimages to see him. Round him, too, were gathered a little circle of adherents. Melancthon and his family were, of course, constant visitors; so, too, were Cruciger, Justus Jonas, Eberus, Bugenhagen, Dietrich, John Forster, and others: and these recorded many of his sayings, which were published in 1566 as his "Tischreden." The volume contains much that is curious and interesting. It cannot, however, be regarded as an unimpeachable authority, since it bears evident signs of emendation. Still it reveals to us much of that lighter side of Luther's character, of which we should otherwise have no record. That Luther could be humorous at times we can well

[1] Luther wrote the following touching epitaph for her tombstone:

"Dormio cum sanctis hic Magdalena Lutheri,
Filia et hoc strato tecta quiesco meo.
Filia mortis eram peccati femine nata,
Sanguine sed vivo Christe redemta tuo."

believe; and there is a rare example of his pathos in the way in which he tells us: "I, who am aged, and have gained my title of *Emeritus*, should prefer now to enjoy the pleasures of an old man in the garden, contemplating the wonders of God's creation in the trees, the flowers, the grass, and the birds." But it was not to be. He felt that his end was near. Still he was constrained to visit Eisleben in the beginning of 1546. Disputes had arisen between the Counts of Mansfeldt as to the ecclesiastical regulations of their territory. These Luther examined and settled. He also preached repeatedly. But on the 14th of February he entered the pulpit for the last time; on the 18th he was taken worse, and died in the same town in which he first drew breath.

It may be contended that Luther came in the fulness of time; but none the less did he stamp the hallmark of his individual genius upon the grand framework of Christian liberty, of which he laid the foundation and which he lived to see complete. In Germany and the world, as he found them and as he left them, there is a contrast so great that it cannot be claimed as the work of one man; but without Luther the emancipation of Germany and Christendom from Rome must have taken generations. To those who prefer to dwell on his faults we commend the words of Robert Montgomery:

> "If Soul majestic and a dauntless mien;
> If Faith colossal o'er all fiends and frowns
> Erect; if Energy that never slack'd,
> With all that galaxy of graces bright
> Which stud the firmament of Christian mind;
> If these be noble—with a zeal conjoin'd
> That made his life one liturgy of love—
> Then may the Saxon from his death-couch send
> A dreadless answer, that refutes all foes
> Who dwarf his merit, or his creed revile
> With falsehood!"

W. Morris Colles.

Review.

The Gospel and its Witnesses. Some of the chief facts in the Life of our Lord, and the authority of the Evangelical Narratives considered, in lectures chiefly preached at St. James's, Westminster, by Henry Wace, B.D., D.D., Prebendary of St. Paul's, Preacher of Lincoln's Inn, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in King's College, London, and Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Pp. 210. John Murray. 1883.

This is a book of singular interest and value, and we hope that it will be widely read by thoughtful laymen as well as by the clergy. The

design of the eminent author, it seems, was, in the first place, to exhibit the real character and results of modern criticism in respect to the authenticity of the Gospels, and in the second place to illustrate the credibility and spiritual significance of the main facts which are recorded in them, the truths, *i.e.*, concerning our Lord which are recited in the Creed and in that summary of the Gospel which St. Peter proclaimed to Cornelius. The Professor shows, accordingly, first of all, that the critical inquiries of the last fifty years have failed to establish any objections against the traditional authorship of the four Gospels; and his arguments here, and in other leading portions of the work, will probably be accepted by all his readers, unless there be unreasonable prejudice,[1] as clear and cogent.

Dr. Wace has rare gifts. His erudition is immense; on the judgment, accuracy, and fairness of his writings one may safely rely; but not the smallest charm of his able arguments is their pure and lucid style. He gives the results of laborious investigations in so small a compass, in such simple English, that any layman of average culture, as we have remarked, may peruse them with profit and unflagging interest. Strauss, Baur, Renan, and the author of that pretentious and much-puffed book "Supernatural Religion," are in turn quoted and utilized. But the author does not burden his text with disquisitions, or weary the reader with critical foot-notes; not a page of the book, indeed, is dry or dull.

In the first lecture—"The Christian Creed"—Professor Wace touches upon the woeful failure of the writer of "Supernatural Religion" in regard to Marcion. In his first edition[2] fifty pages were occupied in arguing against the tradition that Marcion compiled a Gospel from our Gospel of St. Luke; but in his complete edition, published in 1879, though he left those fifty pages nearly in their former shape, he was obliged to confess, with Dr. Sanday's recent work before him, that his conclusions upon this point were mistaken. Dr. Wace refers to another example of this rash sceptical criticism. A recent discovery[3] establishes the fact that the "Diatessaron" of Tatian is a welding togther of the four Canonical Gospels. Tatian is now admitted, even by Rationalist critics abroad, as witnessing to the acceptance of our Four Gospels in the time of Justin Martyr. "In other words," says Dr. Wace, "our Four Gospels, and only our four, are allowed to have been the recognised authorities respecting the life and ministry of our Lord, at a time when their very existence is denied by the author of 'Supernatural Religion.'" In corroboration, an impartial witness, Dr. Weiss ("Das Leben Jesu," 1882), is quoted with effect; and our author, in summing up, lays down the truth "that no alternative theory to the traditions of the Christian Church respecting the authorship of the Gospels has ever held its ground, and that no definite fact in opposition to these traditions has ever been established, even to the general satisfaction of negative critics themselves."

Before we pass from the first lecture, one passage, as to the temper of believing controversialists, may well be quoted. Dr. Wace says:

> It is a common reproach against us that we enter on the discussion with a special interest in favour of the old faith. Of course we do; and it would be a shame to us if we did not. We have the same interest in believing the truth of the Christian Creed that all men have for believing in the truth of any cause with

[1] Strauss said: "That which cannot happen did not happen."

[2] Published in 1874, and praised at the time by some timid reviewers, who ought to have known better.

[3] The discovery of St. Ephraem's Commentary on the "Diatessaron." See THE CHURCHMAN, vol. iv. p. 463.

which the civilization they inherit is indissolubly bound up . . . and with which the deepest, and purest, and most elevated of their feelings are united. It would be a bitter thing, no doubt, and bitter to others than Christians—it would be a shock to human nature, and would shake our faith in the trustworthiness of our faculties—to have to recognise that the self-sacrifice of Christian martyrs and the devoted lives of Christian saints, inseparably united as they are in a manner presented by no other religion, with all that is noblest and most progressive in history, with the highest hopes of the human race even for this world—to have to recognise, I say, that all this was founded upon a series of illusions. But, nevertheless, none have the right to say of us, any more than they have a right to presume respecting any other men, that we are disqualified by our prejudices from recognising plain facts. It is facts that we want, and nothing else. Our creed, as has already been stated is a creed of facts, and every light that can be thrown upon the evidence for them is welcome to us.

On the other hand, we are justified in saying of the principal writers among our antagonists—for they say it of themselves—that they are so far from entering on the consideration of the subject impartially that they actually prejudge the very question in dispute.

The second lecture concludes with a striking passage on the internal evidence of the Gospels. The Evangelists, says Dr. Wace, are their own best witnesses. There is not a word for which they are responsible which does not harmonize with the highest conceivable ideals of all that is good and true. To suppose that such writers should have been visionaries, capable of hallucinations about occurrences which were indissolubly bound up with the truths which they proclaimed, and on which they staked their lives, "would be worse than miraculous; it would be monstrous." Dr. Wace concludes as follows:

Such evidence may not, indeed, be formally demonstrative. In that respect it shares the character of almost all historical and literary evidence. But it will ever be convincing to those who recognise the supreme moral and spiritual force inherent in our Lord's words, and in the records of the Evangelists. As we have seen, the objections raised against the authenticity of a Gospel like that of St. John depend, in the ultimate resort, on the question whether the discourses of our Lord in that Gospel are pregnant with moral and spiritual truth, or are arid and metaphysical. A man whose moral sense is closed to their force cannot be convinced by any amount of evidence that the Gospel, as a whole, is the work of an Apostle. But in proportion as those words enter your hearts and pierce them like a two-edged sword, in proportion as the moral force of the Gospels overpowers your whole nature, will you be prepared to give due weight to the other elements in their testimony, and will you be disposed to think that the most incredible of all things would be that they should not be literally true.

In the third lecture—"The Birth of our Lord"—are fine thoughts forcibly expressed. Thus, it is well said that in the whole character of Christ[1] there is something absolutely unique; and what more natural than that there should be something unique in His *origin*? This is the primary truth of the Christian Creed; but it is "directly at issue with the ideas which have been acquiring increasing influence throughout this century;" men's minds "have become penetrated with the conception of development or of evolution." They shrink from accepting, therefore, the notion of a break or a new commencement in human life. Hegel's

[1] Rousseau's remark has always seemed to us very pointed. Did the Apostles *invent* Christ? "The inventor would be more wonderful than the hero." And Parker's—Supposing that Newton never lived: who did his works and thought his thoughts? "It takes a Newton to forge a Newton."

philosophy has widely spread; the doctrine of physical evolution, nowadays so fashionable, is but one application of this idea. Miracles had, of course, to be explained away, and especially the primary miracle, that of the Incarnation. The origin of Christianity, according to this development philosophy, could not be supernatural; the Gospel history must be explained on natural grounds and by natural causes. This, it must be borne in mind, says Dr. Wace, is the key to the whole critical assault of this century on the authority and credibility of the Scripture history, whether of the Old or the New Testament:

It has not, in any instance, been prompted by an impartial and independent study of the facts for themselves. The critical difficulties did not make the philosophy. Men have allowed their minds, in the Apostles' language, to be made spoil of by a vain philosophy, which assumed that no influence had ever operated on human nature above human nature itself; and then, when they were confronted with the momentous facts of the Christian Creed and the Christian Scriptures, they set themselves with desperate efforts to explain away their credibility, to transform their records, and to find excuses of whatever kind for evading their evidence. After being applied to the Gospel history and the Apostolical records, an attempt is now being made to apply this philosophy to the Old Testament, and to represent the faith of the Jews, not as the result of a supernatural education by the miraculous interposition of God, but as the mere natural development of Semitic tendencies. The attempt has failed with respect to the New Testament, and has resulted in the critical defeat of each successive school in Germany; and a similar defeat may safely be predicted for this new application of the philosophy of the century.

The lecture on "The Witness to our Lord's Resurrection" is excellent. It contains some of the best bits of a masterly work. For instance (p. 156) we read of the Evangelists:

The mere fact of our Saviour having left the grave was but a part, and comparatively a small part, in their view of the Resurrection. The essential part of the Resurrection was our Lord's reappearance to His disciples in a glorious form, and the fact that He was still living as a Prince and a Saviour to them.

Again, on p. 162 we read:

As an historic event, the deliverance of our Lord from the grave would have been, no doubt, of profound and momentous significance; but it would not have been the reality upon which Christians lived. It was not merely, in a word, belief in the resurrection, but belief in a risen and living Christ, which was, and is, the corner-stone of the Christian edifice.

Other sentences on the same subject (and from other lectures) we should gladly quote; but we must refer our readers to the book. It is a worthy companion to the "Foundations of Faith" (Bampton Lectures for 1879), a book which was strongly recommended in THE CHURCHMAN.

Short Notices.

IN the *Church Quarterly* for October—an average number, to say the least—appears an interesting article on Professor Palmer. "The Suppression of Convocation" in 1707 is well worth reading. "The Prospects of Religion and Society in France" is ably written, and has several striking quotations. M. Jules Simon's remarkable book, entitled *Dieu*,

Patrie, Liberté, is, of course, reviewed. To what a pass Religion has been brought in France the reviewer pretty fairly shows; the state of things is frightful. But he does not, apparently, perceive the real lesson which the facts should teach us; the warning against high-flown Sacerdotalism, against, in short, the Mass and the Confessional. He does not seem to be aware of the good work now being done among the working classes of Paris by the teaching of the simple Gospel. All his sympathies, in fact, seem to be with the ritualistic types of devotion. As a specimen of the style of this "Catholic" writer we quote one of his concluding paragraphs. Practically, he writes, France has to choose between atheism and the Syllabus:

If she chooses the latter she has to accept, not only God, but Papal infallibility; not only Christ, but Mariolatry and the Immaculate Conception; not only the Bible, but the legends of the saints; not only the priest and the sister of charity, but the scapulary and the consecrated medal, the wonder-working image, Lourdes and La Salette.

Protestantism is practically of little account in France, as we find to be the case in Ireland, and for the same reasons: its ugly, dreary, negative side predominates. A recent novel of M. Daudet, entitled "L'Evangéliste," gives a picture of it in its most uncongenial aspect, and shows us how improbable it is, to say the least of it, that an excitable, emotional, spectacle-loving nation can ever be won by any form of religion that has not light, warmth, picturesqueness and many-sided sympathy—that is not in the best sense of the word "Catholic." On the other hand, it is impossible to see how intelligent men and women can accept the Roman system as it stands. The very work of fiction just referred to gives us side by side with its pictures of religious revivals with all their hysterical accompaniments, and of ungainly female "evangelists" in waterproofs (the ugly word, like the ugly thing, is imported straight from England), a no less characteristic sketch of a sceptical artisan who manufactures images of Madonnas and saints for Church consumption, and while he is touching up his aureoles, and imparting a brighter tint of blue or scarlet to his draperies, gives utterance to the boldest expressions of freethought, and of contempt for the religion to which he is playing the part of a less consistent and faithful Demetrius.

As regards France the problem is, we confess, all but insoluble. But it surely ought not to be so with regard to ourselves.

The clergy of the Church of England, adds the *Church Quarterly* writer "are under no allegiance to the Papacy." That is a fact.

A Charge delivered at his Visitation, in June, 1883. By HENRY, Lord Bishop of Worcester. Rivington.

In this Charge appear some striking and suggestive comments upon matters of moment. Points of interest as regards the Diocese of Worcester naturally come first; and then the Bishop proceeds to touch upon such questions as the Revised Version, Diocesan Conferences, the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., Church Courts, Holy Communion, and "the Church of the Future." Of Diocesan Conferences, as at present constituted, he does not approve. "I cannot think that the lay-members of the Church of England in any diocese," he says, "will accept the resolutions of a conference as the true expression of their opinions until means are found to give them collectively by competent authority a voice in selecting the persons by whom resolutions should be passed." And the difficulties "which prevent our giving to the proposed conference a truly representative character," he continues, "apply with no less force to the Central Council of Diocesan Conferences," from which, moreover, "the order of Bishops is altogether excluded." His lordship continues:

I joined not long since with others in a petition to the Queen, that her Majesty would be graciously pleased to issue a royal Commission to inquire and report upon the best method of creating a lay body of members of the Church of

England, which may, in conjunction with the Convocations of Canterbury and York (duly reformed and combined for that purpose) prepare and submit to Parliament from time to time such measures as they may deem best calculated to promote the well-being and increase the efficiency of the Church of England.

If such a Church body could be satisfactorily formed and entrusted with the proposed authority and functions, it might be hoped that the Legislature would be content to commit to it the absolute determination of many matters of detail, the settlement of which, as questions arise from time to time, is of much importance to the well-being of the Church, but for which it can hardly be said to be desirable to seek the action of Parliament. Let me mention, for instance, such matters as the selection of lessons from Holy Writ to be read in churches, or amendment of the Lectionary, which, notwithstanding recent legislation on the subject, many of us perhaps think is still urgently needed; together with other measures, for which Bills are now pending in Parliament, and to the full discussion and satisfactory settlement of which it is hopeless to expect that Parliament can give attention.

For ourselves, we confess we should have preferred a "lay body," to act with a reformed Convocation; but are the difficulties in front of such a proposal easy to overcome? If Diocesan Conferences do not represent the laity of the dioceses, how shall a really representative "lay body" be secured? And is the House of Commons likely to view with favour an ecclesiastical Parliament, lay and clerical, with such powers?

The venerable Bishop's remarks upon the E. C. U. proposal with regard to the first Prayer Book of Edward VI., are well worthy of a careful perusal. The article in THE CHURCHMAN by Canon Hoare (whose Church Congress speech, in reply to the president of the E. C. U., is admitted to be one of the best debating speeches a Church Congress has ever heard), has done, we have reason to believe, much good service. The criticism of Bishop Philpott may convince many who as yet are waverers. One point in it, that which relates to the Ordinal, is too often overlooked. The Ordinal of 1549,[1] says the Bishop,

> Retained "the tradition of the instruments;" that is, the delivery of the cup and paten for the candidates to touch. Subsequent revision has abolished this ceremony, and retained the delivery of the Bible only. And every one who is conversant with the teaching of the Church of Rome in the present day, and still more with the opinions of Roman Catholic writers of the sixteenth century, is well aware that the ceremony was not abolished without reason. The "tradition of the instruments" was held to be an essential process in "The Form of Ordaining Priests." No ordination of a priest was valid without it. It was then considered, and I believe that in the Church of Rome it is still considered, the ordinary means of conveying the grace which shall empower the newly-ordained person to offer the sacrifice of the Mass and to administer the Sacrament of Penance.

In the section of the Charge which relates to "the Church of the Future," the Right Rev. Prelate says: "No one can have paid attention to what is passing around us, and made himself acquainted with prevalent ideas about religion, without many anxious, and I may say painful, thoughts about the progress of Christianity." He gives wise words of warning. For instance, with respect to the early Fathers. The gratitude with which we remember their labours as regards the Canonical books, "must not urge us to forget the caution with which a sound and exact criticism warns us to accept their writings":

> The late Professor Blunt, of Cambridge, who had studied the writings of the authors of the sub-Apostolic age with more than usual diligence, and who was remarkable among men for accuracy of observation and expression, has left on record his opinion that "old recollections attached to the Jewish Church had still their effect on the views and vocabulary of the early Christians." The careful

[1] The Ordinal was not printed as part of the Prayer Book.

reader of these early writings will find numerous instances where the germ of doctrine and ritual, for which there is really no foundation in the undoubted records of Holy Writ, has served as the source of subsequent errors which, though easily detected in their full development afterwards, lay concealed in the words of the unsuspecting authors of the evil.

In our effort to shake off the undoubted and obvious errors which the tract of time and the incurable ignorance and infirmity of fallible men have allowed to gather round our religion, continues the Bishop, "*we must not be content to stop short of the fountain head. We cannot set our feet with full confidence on any ground but that which has been laid for us by our Lord Himself and His Apostles. We must go back to the beginning . . .*" (The italics are our own.) This is one of those "principles of the Reformation" against which Ritualists are apt to sneer: it is the sheet anchor of the Church of England.

A Popular Introduction to the Pentateuch. By the Rev. R. WHEELER BUSH, M.A., Rector of St. Alphage, London Wall, and formerly Select Preacher at Oxford. pp. 186. Religious Tract Society.

A thoughtful and very timely work. It replies to recent rationalistic objections, and gives, in a small compass, a good deal of information.

Luther Anecdotes. Memorable sayings and doings of Martin Luther, gathered by Dr. MACAULAY, editor of 'The Leisure Hour.' Religious Tract Society.

This is a charming little book, and right welcome; coming out just now it can hardly fail to be widely read. Not too big, not dull, with more of the concrete than of the abstract; not lacking unction, it is—take it all in all—the best book of this Luther Festival for general circulation.

Worship and Ritual. By the Rev. E. A. LITTON, M.A., London; Church Association, 14, Buckingham Street, W.C. John F. Shaw and Co., 1883.

A shilling pamphlet of ninety pages, clearly written, neither dry nor of much detail, and thus within the reach and comprehension of educated members of the "general reader" class, this work ought to be of great service, inasmuch as it displays literary ability, good judgment, and theological knowledge of the very highest type. Without the slightest parade of learning, the eminent author has given, in small compass, in simple style, the results of long and laborious investigations. The work is, strictly speaking, constructive, rather than controversial. Mr. Litton leads his reader, so to say, step by step, in quiet ways; he points out mistakes which have been made, gives reasons why one thing is to be preferred rather than another, unfolds the real meaning of common key-note phrases, and, lastly, calls attention to the needs of the time. He seeks to build up, but never and in nowise with untempered mortar. Of the value of such a work we can hardly speak too highly; and all we should desire, for ourselves, with regard to it, is that thousands of earnest Churchmen who rate truth higher than party, who really seek to understand the mind and teaching of our grand old Church, who, while tolerant, liberal, and large-hearted, are unmistakably loyal to the principles of the Reformation, would give it a fair and careful reading. A few would-be readers, perhaps, who see on its title-page, or notice the words in an advertisement, *Church Association*, may fancy the book is—to use the cant of so-called "Catholics"—"Puritan," sour, narrow, and so forth; but they would be vastly mistaken.

The contents of Part I. are these: 'Theory of Christian Worship." Chapter I., Historical: § 1. Introduction; § 2. Natural Religion; § 3.

Law of Moses; § 4. Synagogue; § 5. New Testament. Chapter II., Principles of Christian Worship: § 1. Christian Worship not Sacerdotal; § 2. Liberty; § 3. Art and Symbolism; § 4. Order; § 5. Communion. Chapter III., Corruptions of Christian Worship. In Part II., "The Church of England," are these five chapters: English Reformation; History of English Liturgy; Peculiarities; Rationale of English Liturgy; Concluding Remarks.

As regards the argument upon Jewish ritual, Mr. Litton's points, we think, are unanswerable. He says:

> To remodel the Christian Church or its worship on the Jewish model were to forget the progressive character of the Divine dispensations, and to rob both the law and the Gospel of the distinctive features which renders each a fitting stage in the history of revealed religion.

Of Christian worship in the earliest days he says: "There can be no doubt, if the original record is to decide the question, that it was framed on the model of the synagogue rather than that of the temple." A second edition of Mr. Litton's work, we hope, will soon give us an opportunity of touching upon these and other deeply interesting questions.

From several chapters (we had marked several passages with pencil) we should gladly give extracts did space permit.

In a note on page 22, the words "either," and "or the Deity," should clearly be omitted.

Dusty Diamonds. By N. M. BALLANTYNE. Nisbet and Co.

We gladly welcome another tale by Mr. Ballantyne. All his stories are excellent; and not a few of them have been strongly recommended in THE CHURCHMAN. The full title of the one before us is "Dusty Diamonds Cut and Polished; a Tale of City-Arab Life and Adventure." The sketch of Police Constable No. 666 is very good; and so is the bath of Sammy the prodigal. We are pleased to see Miss Annie Macpherson's work for city waifs and strays well brought out in a description of farm life in Canada. As usual, the volume is well printed, and has several illustrations.

A Six Months' Friend. By HELEN SHIPTON, author of "Christopher," etc. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

This is a well-written and interesting story. The descriptive bits about the miners are well done; and Will's courtship is capital. Thoroughly devout, with quotations from Scripture practically applied, the book is one of prayer and duty. The story is intensely real. There are criticisms on Salvationists' talk about sudden "conversion;" but a touch of the Evangel would give a lacking glow to the pure religious pictures. And should not the *sermons* in church be such as to direct earnest inquirers like Will towards "joy and peace in believing"?

Straight to the Mark. By the Rev. T. S. MILLINGTON, author of "Boy and Man," etc. pp. 430. Religious Tract Society.

This is a big book; but we are not prepared to say it is too big. The author's subject is truth or truthfulness; the subject is skilfully brought out in a wholesome and interesting story. Miss Beverley, being "disappointed," ceased to accompany her parents to the parish church; she went to St. Winifred's, where the services were more frequent and more elaborate. Her attendance at the early morning services, and late evening services, caused a good deal of inconvenience in the household. One evening when the guests were assembled for a dinner-party, she was missing; she had left a note to say she had joined a sisterhood. She had not gone "to a convent, or the same thing as a convent," we read;

and the sisterhood which she joined may have been perfectly Scriptural. But such a step should have been, we think, much more sharply criticized; and we cannot think the words happily chosen which appear to imply that to join even a most beneficent sisterhood, in preference to staying at home as the parents desire, "was to devote herself wholly to a *religious life.*" The italics are our own.

The Sevenfold Gift; or, *the Power of the Spirit.* By the Rev. JAMES GOSSET TANNER, M.A., Vicar of Emmanuel Church, Maida Hill; author of "The Church in the Cherubim," etc., pp. 14. John F. Shaw and Co.

The first two chapters of this book relate to the work of the Holy Spirit, in convicting of sin, and testifying of Christ. Chapter III., headed "The Spirit possessed by all Believers," is not so clear as we could wish. Elsewhere, indeed, Mr. Tanner's exposition, in a second edition, may be made more clear, and, we may add, a little more pointed. It is of high importance always, but especially in these controversial days, to keep closely to the statements of Scripture; and in protesting against sacerdotal views of baptism, or in instructing our young people in sound Church principles, the precise language of inspiration should be very carefully noted and reverently followed.

The drift of this affectionate and deeply earnest little book is all that could be desired. May the author's pleadings, under the blessed Spirit's influence, be richly blessed to many souls!

The Jerusalem Bishopric. Documents with translations chiefly derived from "Das Evangelische Bisthum, in Jerusalem. Geschichtliche Darlegung mit Urkunden, Berlin, 1842;" published by command of Frederic William IV. Arranged and supplemented by the Rev. Professor H. Hechler. Pp. 201. Trübner and Co.

At a time when the eyes of the Church of Christ are looking towards Jerusalem in expectation of the momentous events which many students of prophecy believe are coming to pass, it has been considered desirable, says Mr. Hechler, to collect the leading facts and documents in connection with "The Jerusalem Bishopric." "The English Deed of Endowment," with a German translation of the Abstract, and several letters from the King of Prussia to Baron Bunsen, are now published for the first time. In the preface, Mr. Hechler gives an interesting extract from a letter of the present Archbishop of Canterbury.

It was in June, 1841, that Bunsen arrived in London. The Ministry of Lord Melbourne, then about to resign office, and that of Sir Robert Peel about to enter upon it, showed equal readiness to meet the King of Prussia's wishes. Archbishops Howley and Harcourt, and Bishop Blomfield, warmly encouraged the plan, and the Earl of Shaftesbury (then Lord Ashley) strongly supported it. Bishop Alexander was consecrated in Lambeth Palace, Nov. 7, 1841. The Trustees of the English portion of the Endowment Fund, were Lord Ashley, Right Hon. Sir G. H. Rose, Sir Thomas Baring, Sir R. H. Inglis, and John Labouchere, Esq. The present Trustees are, the Earls of Shaftesbury, and Aberdeen, Bishops of Ripon and Rochester, and the Rev. A. I. McCaul. Lord Aberdeen's father, we may add, signed the Queen's licence for consecration Nov. 6, 1841. In October, 1841, Mr. Gladstone proposed "Prosperity to the Church of St. James in Jerusalem, and to her first Bishop." Of our Premier's action at the time a lively record is given in one of Baron Bunsen's letters to his wife:

Then I went to fetch Gladstone, to drive with me to the dinner at the "Star and Garter," at Richmond . . . Dr. Alexander gave the King's health [Oct. 15 was King Frederic's birthday]. I returned thanks, and gave the health of the Queen,

and afterwards of the Queen Dowager; whereupon we sang (in chorus) "Heil! Freidrich Wilhelm, heil!" Then I rose and proposed "The Church of England and the venerable Prelates at its head," and spoke as I felt. M'Caul returned thanks, speaking of Jerusalem, which led to Gladstone's toast "Prosperity to the Church of St. James at Jerusalem, and to her first Bishop." Never was heard a more exquisite speech . . . .

Statistics of the Jerusalem diocese are given by Mr. Hechler, showing the agents of the Jews Society, the Church Missionary Society, the British Syrian Schools, and Bible Mission, and the workers sent out by the German Church. As one looks over the list of these in Palestine, Egypt, and Abyssinia, the chief thought, perhaps, is "How little is being done"! Yet many readers of this volume may agree with the author's remark, that the "Jerusalem Bishopric has been a great success." A letter of Bishop Barclay (July, 1880) gives clear and very encouraging testimony in regard to the British Syrian Schools: "To all those who long for the establishment of truth and justice in Syria, Palestine and Asia Minor," wrote the lamented Bishop, "I cordially commend their support."

To our brief notice of this timely publication we should add, that there are several engravings and a map of Jerusalem; also a table of the Jewish population of various countries. Mr. Hechler was formerly, we believe, a Missionary of the Church Missionary Society.

Introductory Hints to English Readers of the Old Testament. By the Rev. JOHN A. CROSS, M.A. Longmans.

To show the character of this book, a single quotation will suffice. For this we grudge the space; but a warning for some readers may be necessary. In the section headed "Historical Truth of the Exodus," the author says:

It is easy to see that the numbers of the Israelites who marched out of Egypt, as they are given in the Pentateuch, are too large to be reconciled with other passages in the history of these times; and the artificial character of the present narrative, as well as the legendary nature of some of the materials from which it has been compiled, betray themselves in many particulars. But it is impossible to doubt that the story is founded on fact, and that it is true in its leading features.

If this last sentence was a criticism on some grand historical writing outside the Word of God, one might reckon it amusing. The "story," forsooth, is *founded on fact!*

Selections from the Writings of Archbishop Leighton. Edited, with a Memoir and Notes, by WILLIAM BLAIR, D.D., Dunblane. Edinburgh: Macniven and Wallace.

This is a very pleasing little book, and we gladly recommend it.

Pictorial Architecture of the British Isles. By the Rev. H. H. BISHOP, M.A. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

A handsome and in every way very attractive book. It is full of illustrations, and the descriptive letterpress is exceedingly good. A sketch of abbey, cathedral, village or town church, hall, public office, inn, museum, or other interesting building, appears on every page. We are much pleased with this volume.

Conditional Immortality. The substance of a sermon preached in Trinity Church, Tunbridge Wells. By the Rev. EDWARD HOARE, M.A. Tunbridge Wells: H. S. Colbran.

Within thirteen pages Canon Hoare has given a great deal of matter now specially important. His treatment of this solemn subject is just

what might have been expected from so well instructed, so faithful, and so gentle a teacher. We must quote a few words :

I believe that the whole difficulty arises from the inexpressible solemnity of the subject, and from the reluctance of the heart to admit the conclusions to which we are brought by the Scriptures. The heart recoils from the thought of such a sentence, and is glad to grasp at any way of escape. I have heard it said, "I cannot believe that a merciful God would pass such a sentence." And again, "God is love, and I cannot reconcile it to my ideas of love that He should inflict such a punishment." But when people say that, do they not set themselves up as judges of the righteousness of their God? Is not man sitting in judgment upon God? I can feel with those who find the subject almost more than they can bear. I have myself scarcely known how to preach about it, and I dare not allow the imagination to conjure up its own pictures respecting it. I am not going to condemn those who shrink from it, for I do so myself. But I am persuaded that our part is submission.

In the last CHURCHMAN appeared a few lines of notice of the new edition of the illustrated *New Testament*, published by Messrs. Longman. We heartily commend this cheap edition of a work with which, when it was first published, we were greatly pleased. It is a very choice and delightful gift-book, and at present exceedingly cheap. It has engravings on wood after paintings by Fra Angelio, P. Perugino, Fra Bartolommeo, Titian, Raphael, and other artists, chiefly of the early Italian School. The borders, etc., are extremely beautiful; and as to paper and printing this most tasteful volume is a *ne plus ultra*.

A new cheap edition of Miss GORDON CUMMING'S work, *In the Hebrides* (Chatto and Windus), deserves to be widely read. It is a remarkably interesting book, and informing; we are pleased to recommend it.

Dr. STOUGHTON'S *Homes and Haunts of Luther* (Religious Tract Society) is well known and much esteemed. The present edition, improved in many ways, is excellent. As a choice gift-book for this time it has few rivals.

The annual volumes of the Religious Tract Society's *Cottager and Artizan*, *Tract Magazine*, and *Child's Companion*, merit not less than the customary commendation.

The Rev. C. BULLOCK'S capital little work, *Who gave us the Book?* sets forth pleasingly and instructively "England's debt to Tyndale" (1, Paternoster Buildings, E.C.).

The Religious Tract Society, we gladly notice, keeps publishing simple stories, cheap and good, in neatly got-up books, illustrated, suitable as Sunday-school and other gift-books, or prizes. *The Beautiful House with its Seven Pillars* (meekness, unselfishness, and such "pillars") is easy for young children to understand. *Rebecca the Peacemaker* will be of service to adult readers of a parish library. *Look on the Sunny Side*, several short sketches: a good book for District Visitors. *The First Gift* is a larger story (pp. 216), and it deserves a separate notice; it is very well written, and may teach many maidens the song which has for its key-note, "First gave their own selves to the Lord."

Under the title "By-paths of Bible Knowledge" the Religious Tract Society has published two volumes of what seems likely to be a useful series: *Cleopatra's Needle*, by the Rev. JAMES KING, M.A., and *Assyrian Life and History*, with an Introduction by Mr. R. STUART POOLE: illustrated, up to date, and very cheap.

A very timely and instructive gift-book is *The Children of India*, (Religious Tract Society); well illustrated, bright and pleasing; a volume of 480 pages, but by no means too large. We quite agree that there are very few good books about missions written for children; there ought to be more. The present work will supply a need.

From Messrs. Nelson and Sons (Paternoster Row) we have received two packets of charming cards—*Plants* and *Flowers of the Holy Land*.

The new number of the *Quarterly Review* (Murray) has reached us too late for a worthy notice. It contains several ably-written and really interesting articles. The Ecclesiastical Courts question is handled evidently by one thoroughly well up in it, and we trust the paper—eminently sound and judicious—may have its due influence.

A review of Dr. BARDSLEY'S valuable and very timely pamphlet, *Apostolic Succession* (Hatchards), is unavoidably postponed. Several other notices of new books in type are deferred.

To the second volume of Professor SCHAFF'S *Biblical Encyclopædia*, founded on Herzog (T. and T. Clark), we may give the same praise which we afforded to the first volume. When the third volume is published, a review of the work as a whole will of course be given.

THE MONTH.

AT the Carlisle Diocesan Conference the Bishop paid a tribute of respect to that "good and holy man," Canon Battersby.

At the Durham Diocesan Conference, we gladly note, it was agreed to send representatives to the Central Council.[1]

In regard to the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission the *Record* remarks on the fact that the constitution of the Final Appeal Court, as recommended, is, according to the Bishop of Oxford, the very essence of the scheme:

This being so, the Ritualists repudiate the Report. They will not concur in the maintenance of the Crown's right to hear appeals from the Church Courts. In other words, they renounce the Supremacy, and consequently, as we have explained, Establishment. It has been clear from

[1] The Bishop of Durham said: "This Central Association has been in existence now two years. Its deliberations have been conducted with great wisdom, and its efforts have already borne fruit. Moreover, it has already won an amount of support which secures its position. You will have to say to-day whether you will send delegates, and, if so, how they shall be appointed. If you decide in the affirmative, I shall heartily concur. It is the only agency which brings together a general representative body of zealous and influential laymen for deliberation with the clergy on the highest interests of the Church, more especially with reference to the action of Parliament. This is confessedly in itself an object of the greatest moment; and, until some better solution of the problem is offered, it may be our wisest course to avail ourselves of the means at hand. Indefinite delay will be the consequence of excessive fastidiousness."

the beginning that Ritualism could not find a home in the Church of England without a revolution. Its advocates have hitherto, for the most part, sought to conceal this fact from the public, and probably have in many cases not perceived it themselves. The publication of the Report, however, seems likely to remove all ambiguity. The Commissioners have done no more than simply retain the Supremacy. By repudiating their scheme the Ritualists are proclaiming themselves the party of disestablishment.

Conservatism is still alive in Ulster. Sir Stafford Northcote's campaign will probably bear fruit at the next General Election.

Dr. Boultbee, the honoured Principal of the London College of Divinity, has been made a Prebendary of St. Paul's. His services to the Church will soon, we trust, receive some more substantial acknowledgment.

Some leaders of the Salvation Army have been expelled by the State Council of Neuchâtel. In many country districts of England their Sunday processions, with bands, are a real nuisance.

The King of Spain was hooted by a mob as he passed through the streets of Paris. The French Ministry have not shown much tact in correspondence with the Spanish Government, or in regard to China and Tonquin, or in regard to Madagascar. No apology has yet (October 13) been tendered to Mr. Shaw, the esteemed representative of the London Missionary Society, now in England.

Bishop Short, who resigned the see of Adelaide last year, has entered into rest.

The Congress at Reading was one of the largest of all Church Congresses, and one of the most successful. The number of tickets sold was very large. All the arrangements of the local authorities were admirable; and the hospitality of the town and neighbourhood most generous.[1] The Bishop made an excellent Chairman; as we expected, thoroughly fair. In nearly all the meetings there was a feeling of brotherly-kindness. Oxford has long been decidedly a High Church diocese; and at a Church Congress in that diocese Evangelicals were naturally in a very decided minority. But their representative speakers were, as a rule, listened to with respect; and not seldom they were very generally applauded. The Congress was unmistakably in earnest, and a Christian temper was happily felt.

[1] The Congress sermons were preached by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops of Winchester and Meath. We enjoyed Lord Plunket's sermon greatly. On Monday night an admirable sermon on the Lord's Supper was preached by Bishop Perry in the church of St. John, Reading. The esteemed and devoted Incumbent of St. John's church, Canon Payne, was one of the Hon. Secs.

The Ritualistic element may have been influenced by many who are High Churchmen and nothing more; it seemed, indeed, as though a word of warning had been privately given; at all events, the prevailing tone was just what devout and loyal Churchmen might desire.[1]

There had been some correspondence in the *Record* about the list of readers and speakers; and complaints, naturally enough, were made in regard to the exclusion of Evangelical readers and speakers from two or three of the leading subjects. The criticisms of the *Guardian*, and other newspapers, in fact, were just. In one subject, however (Ecclesiastical Courts), almost at the last moment, changes were made by the Bishop; and in the selection of speakers on the platform his Lordship made it pretty plain that representatives of Evangelical Churchmanship were not excluded by himself.

Canon Hoare was cordially cheered at several of the meetings, and spoke with his usual power and unction. The two speeches of Mr. Sydney Gedge[2] were full of point; and Mr.

---

[1] Canon Hoare writes (October 10th): "Nothing could be more fair or friendly than the conduct of those in authority, and the same spirit appeared to pervade the audience. Although there was great freedom of speech, there was none of that noisy violence which has so greatly disturbed the usefulness of some Congresses; and I do not believe that anyone has reason to complain of not having had a fair opportunity of speaking, or a fair reception when he was called by the Chairman to do so. For my own part, therefore, I am thankful that I was present; and I came away having experienced more profit and more pleasure, with less pain, than from any previous Congress."

[2] Speaking on sermons, Mr. Gedge said: "To a very large proportion of the congregations attending our churches, the Sunday sermon supplies the only religious instruction and education that they ever get. The other part of the service gives the worship and praise of God and prayer, but to 'preach the Word' is the Divinely-appointed means of edifying the saints and converting sinners. Yet preaching has been much neglected of late years. Sermons have been cut down to a minimum to make time for musical services. 'Many (as Pope says), to church repair, not for the doctrine, but the music there,' and the result is that clergy too often preach as if they knew that they must say something for a few minutes rather than because they have something to say; some message from God to deliver. No wonder, then, that the question, 'What was the sermon about?' is answered by the reply, 'About a quarter of an hour,' or that lazy indifference is the attitude with which sermons are generally regarded by the congregation. And I read the other day, turning over the pages of *Once a Week*, an article, the writer of which stated that he could not remember a single word of any sermon he had ever heard. Surely the right course with sermons, as with speeches or lectures on other subjects, is for the preacher to master his subject, think it out, and make up his mind what he has to say upon it, and then to say it in the best language of which he is capable, regardless whether his sermon lasts fifteen or twenty minutes, or three quarters of an hour, or longer."

Dibdin, on the Church Courts question—thoroughly at home—made an excellent speech, closely reasoned, and very effective in reply to Dr. Phillimore.

The Sunday question, we were glad to notice, worthily opened by Mr. Daniel Moore, was reverently and practically debated; and, in his opening address as President, the Bishop of Oxford was emphatic.

From the meeting of Friday morning (subject, "Personal Religion"), Canon Cadman, it was matter of general regret, was prevented from being present. As Canon of Canterbury, the devoted Vicar of Holy Trinity, Marylebone, would have been greeted with a hearty welcome.

Mr. Goe, Mr. Chavasse, Mr. Christopher, Mr. Eugene Stock, and other representative men, either read or spoke. With what may be called the Missionary meeting a few members of the Congress, at all events, were somewhat disappointed.

As soon as the official Congress Report is published, we shall give some extracts and comments upon several of the debates.

Upon the whole, the Reading Congress gives, we believe, reason to thank God and take courage. Many who feel an interest in the Evangelical party, and many who say they care nothing for the "party," but advocate and love Evangelical principles, will thankfully acknowledge that the prayers offered specially with regard to this Church Congress, were answered even as they desired.

The state of affairs, without doubt, is critical. Not only the principle "Church and State," but Christian truth in some of its chiefest forms, may soon have to be debated through the length and breadth of Britain. A small section of English Churchmen, possibly, will make their influence operate on the side of Liberationists and their Secularist allies. It is for all loyal supporters of our grand old Church, Churchmen who love Christ's Gospel,[1] to consider what is at stake, and so to act that, in the well-chosen words of the author of "Church Courts," we may preserve intact—and leave unimpaired to our children—the noble heritage of a Reformed Church established in a Christian kingdom.

[1] The *Record* says that Evangelical truth seems to be making way amongst High Churchmen. "If High Churchmen and Evangelicals can together take their stand on the Scriptural doctrines upon which the Church of England laid firm hold at the Reformation, and can allow to each other such reasonable latitude in other matters, both doctrinal and ceremonial, as the Articles and Formularies permit, the English Church, as the English State, need not fear the small though noisy band of Irreconcilables, but may go on her way in the strength of God as the evangelizer of her own and heathen lands." For ourselves, our readers will remember that the principle which underlies these wise words of the *Record* has prevailed in the conduct of THE CHURCHMAN from the first.