

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

appoint none who valued the ordinance weekly. This avoided a stumbling-block. Let us give freedom and take it, protecting ourselves, and considering our brethren.

---

## Reviews.

---

*The Great Problem; or, Christianity as it is.* By a STUDENT OF SCIENCE  
Pp. 445. London: The Religious Tract Society.

THIS anonymous volume is the work of a master-mind. It contains a closely reasoned argument for the truth of Christianity—an argument which cannot fail to satisfy the candid inquirer. The reader is led along, step by step, from principles to facts, from facts to proofs, from proofs to results, until he feels his feet planted on a rock of certainty from which he can never be moved.

The writer of this notice having carefully read through the volume, pencil in hand, to score remarkable passages, discovered on looking back that almost every page had been more or less lined with marks of assent and admiration. It is a matter of extreme thankfulness that in this age of doubt and unbelief a writer so peculiarly suited for the task has been led to contend thus earnestly and successfully for the "Truth once for all delivered to the saints." We can put at the end of this Christian solution of the Great Problem, as at the end of a proposition of Euclid—*Quod erat demonstrandum.*

A summary survey of the author's argument may well be given.

Part I. is named "Principles:" and the necessity of attention is laid down. Christianity exists. It is as much a fact as the solar system. It must be accounted for. It is worthy of consideration. (The inquiry cannot be met with the assumption that Christianity is incredible.) It claims the position of a department of true science, or knowledge of a really accurate and available kind. It is marked by certain external features and characteristics.

Part II. contains the "Facts" connected with Christianity. 1. *The Book*—The New Testament is the most wonderful Book in the world. The Book of Christianity is the King of books. 2. *The Man.* Jesus of Nazareth, as portrayed in the New Testament, is a Man by Himself.—The First of Mankind. 3. *The Society.* The Church, with all its imperfections and drawbacks is the greatest society ever yet known. 4. *The Cross.* Nothing in Christianity is so peculiarly Christian as the death of its Founder; which might have been expected to involve the destruction of His religion. But out of His death came irresistible life.

Part III. is styled "Theories." What is Faith's solution of the Great Problem? It is found in the central article of the Creed—that "Jesus rose again from the dead." This is the true essence of the Christian explanation of the Great Problem of Christianity. The author then meets the objections of prejudiced unbelief. "The argument from experience cannot prove a thing to be impossible merely because nothing of the same kind can be shown to have happened before." Our area of observation and knowledge of facts is exceedingly limited.

Part IV. gives the "Proofs" of the Resurrection of Christ, comprising Circumstantial evidence, Direct evidence, and Decisive evidence. For the consideration of these well-argued and striking chapters we must send the reader to the book itself, only observing that he who wishes to

find the Truth will rise from the perusal with an assurance in his own mind which amounts to full and triumphant certainty.

The author shows that we have "legal" and "scientific," if not "mathematical" evidence of the Fact of Christ's resurrection. And with regard to the other miracles recorded in the New Testament, he observes (p. 410):—

In a system which already possesses, and that altogether beyond dispute, all those supremely singular features already described by us, the occurrence of almost any number of others of a similar nature is no real difficulty, to say the least. We applied a like argument once before, when feeling our way, as it were, to the great truth of the Resurrection of Christ. Given, we said then, such a Book—given, also, such a Man or Prophet—given, finally, such a Society—as those which we find to be connected so distinctively, and at the same time so undeniably with the system of Christianity; and it is not unreasonable to expect, in such circumstances, even the Resurrection of such a Man. We may now carry the same argument a further step yet. Given, not only such a Book, such a Prophet, such a Society, but also, and just as certainly, in the part of that Prophet, such a singular Death, and such an actual Rising again; and what is there in the way of minor accompanying wonder which we may not meet with in addition? Which we may not even expect? What more natural to such a magnificent Orb, than a crowd of such satellites round about it? To so great a Sovereign, what more befitting than so uncommon a Court? . . . This is the true argument here. That the subject of such a Volume, that the possessor of such a Name, that the Founder of such a Kingdom, that the Man with such an experience, should also have marked the days of His presence here by so many wonders of mercy and power as we read of, is a consideration which only deepens, if possible, that fulness of concord of which we were conscious before. These wonderful stories, in fact, do but give an added glory even to that glorious Face. This list of marvels is simply a most marvellous supplement to the whole previous argument in this case. How could things well be otherwise during His stay upon earth? How could those Almighty Hands be at work among us so long without sometimes showing their power?

The chapters on "Circumstantial Evidence" are extremely interesting, and contain a chain of arguments, irresistible in their combination. We subjoin the author's own summary of "the five principal lines of circumstantial evidence in favour of the truth of the Resurrection of Christ:"—

The First of them regarded the system of Christianity as a system of great facts, and as having already presented us with the greatest book or document, the greatest man or teacher, the greatest society or community, and the greatest symbol or emblem, yet known amongst men. And the special point in this connection which it asked us to notice was this, that even so confessedly unexampled an event as the alleged Resurrection of the Founder of such a system, would not be anything out of harmony, to say the very least, with so confessedly unexampled a succession of facts. After so many prodigies, even this further prodigy would not be an unnatural thing.

The Second line of argument under review was founded on a closer consideration of one of these giant facts—viz., the special pre-eminence of Jesus of Nazareth, the Founder of Christianity, among all men ever born—He being, beyond dispute, by far the kingliest, by far the holiest, and by far the most ill-used of mankind. Consequently—so this argument showed us—if ever such a thing as a real rising again from the dead was in any case to take place, it might well do so in His. Being what He was, how came He ever to die? And to die in such a manner? And to die by such hands? Here is the first, the supreme difficulty, in regard to this case. How it could afterwards come to pass, that having so died, the process should be reversed in His instance, is not a greater difficulty, to say the least, from this standpoint. The rising again of such a Sun, with all its wonders, is only a natural consequence of that previous wonder—its setting.

The Third line of argument in favour of Christ's resurrection depended on the undoubted occurrence, in a collateral sphere, of a similar triumph. There can be no doubt we perceived, that the death of Jesus of Nazareth destroyed his religion as well as Himself. There can be no doubt, also, that that religion was found, very soon after, as it were, to rise again and to triumph: and to triumph, moreover, by the same weapon which had been the previous instrument of its death. What cause for this "resurrection" do we know of, except the intervening resurrection of Christ Himself? What more likely cause for it can be even suggested? As a probable cause, in fact, and until some competing probable cause shall make its appearance, this cause must undoubtedly be regarded as possessing this whole field. We do not really know of any reason whatever for this sudden re-illumination of that darkened reflector, but such a sudden alleged rekindling of that extinguished light which it had previously reflected.

In the Fourth line of argument we found ourselves in presence of a very singular revolution. An ancient empire of such previously unparalleled extent and authority, that its iron sway is telling to this day in countless ways on us all, is nevertheless, in one conspicuous particular, not only defied and successfully resisted, but habitually overcome, by us all. In other words, the once highly esteemed Græco-Roman practice of cremation is now entirely supplanted by the once despised Jewish practice of burial; and the "ashes" and "urns" which, at the time of the birth of Christianity, were so universally regnant amongst men, have now become only so many curious relics of a state of things which has gone. Further, in endeavouring to account satisfactorily for so striking a change, we not only find that the burial and subsequent resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, as believed in by Christians, will exactly supply in every way such a cause as the case necessitates; but, also, that no other portion of alleged history known to us does supply such a cause. We have, in short, in this case, a most singular conquest. What we seek for is to find the conquering force. So far as we know at present, in that vanquished grave alone (as Christians hold it to be) out of which the tree of Christianity has certainly grown, can this required force be discovered.

In the Fifth and last line of argument adduced by us, we have another and still more remarkable instance of revolution and conquest, the authority concerned in this case being still greater than in the previous instance, and being also regarded and treated as such even by those persons who, in the point now referred to, seem to be setting it on one side. On the one hand—that is, in this instance, the empire interfered with is as supreme as any empire can be—even at the moment of interference. On the other hand, the interference itself is as radical as any interference can be—as to the point which it touches. In the fourth of "the Ten Commandments," instead of "seventh" read "first." Such is the revolution that is now meant. From a Christian point of view—and it is by those who are Christians, be it remembered, that this substitution is made and accepted—can any conceivable revolution be greater? Can any cause, therefore, except some very special and potent cause, be competent to explain it? Can any such apparently competent cause, moreover, be anywhere found by us, except (as before pointed out) in connection with the alleged resurrection of the "Lord of the Sabbath" on the first day of the week? A *virtual repeal*, in one express and important particular, of an enactment revered, by those who repeal it, as the direct enactment of Heaven itself! That is what we have here. What but some mighty previous wonder could have possibly given birth to a wonder like this? And what other such previous wonder competent to produce such a result, has ever anywhere been even heard of, except that now adduced? (p. 280).

In the chapter entitled "General Results" (p. 403) appears a clear and convincing summary of "the chief mental conclusions" obtained. Concisely put, the conclusions are these:—

"First, that the principal admitted outward phenomena of Christianity are such as to present us with a GREAT PROBLEM of unsurpassed interest and unrivalled importance.

"Second, that amongst all the various proposed solutions of this

“Problem in existence, the solution known as the Christian solution, or the Solution of Faith, is the only one really deserving—at any rate in the first instance—of our serious attention, because the only one really enjoying any general, or even respectable, amount of support.

“Third, that, judging both from the contents of the Christian creed—confessedly the most authentic extant synopsis of the solution in question—and also from the express language of many portions of the Christian Book itself, the gist and turning-point of this well-known solution lies in its equally well-known and positive affirmation that the Crucified Founder of the Christian Religion ‘rose again from the dead.’

“Fourth, that, so far as we are able to decide on such a subject at all from purely *à priori* considerations, there are amply sufficient reasons for believing in the perfect abstract *possibility*—to say the least—of such an occurrence.

“Fifth, that the amount and variety of *circumstantial* evidence producible in favour of the truth of Christ’s Resurrection, are such as to warrant us—to say the very least again—in pronouncing that alleged occurrence as *likely as not to be true*.

“Sixth, that the writings or documents contained in the Christian Book alone, even when regarded with a hostile and hypercritical eye, are such as to furnish us with a mass of competent and unimpeachable *testimony* in favour of Christ’s Resurrection which would more than justify any honest and sensible jury—under the circumstances just referred to—in acting on it as true.

“Seventh, and last, that the *actual experience* of mankind at large respecting the statement referred to, even when only ascertained—as such experience always may be, and constantly is—from a sufficient number of observations on the language, character, and conduct of those multitudes who profess to have experimentally tested it for themselves, is entirely in favour of its truth, and is such, therefore, as most truly to furnish us, when combined with the presumptive, circumstantial, and direct evidence before named, with a *strictly ‘scientific’ demonstration* of the Resurrection of Christ.”

A pleasing duty remains. We must express our thanks to the author for his exhaustive treatise on the most important of all subjects; and we venture to urge our readers to obtain for themselves, and make known to others, so valuable and reasonable a work.

---

*Count Campello.* An Autobiography, giving his Reasons for leaving the Papal Church. With an Introduction by the Rev. WILLIAM ARTHUR, M.A. Pp. 150. Hodder & Stoughton.

THE fact that a tonsured Roman noble, a Canon of St. Peter’s, could leave his Basilica, cross over to the slopes of the Quirinal, there, in a small and humble church, solemnly renounce the tonsure and avow the Protestant faith, and still retain not only life and liberty, but also the title and his civil rights, represents, in itself, a great revolution, and a pregnant one. How great and how pregnant, is further shown when we find that this gentleman can, in the Eternal City, sit down and write an autobiography, giving his reasons for the step he has taken, can send his manuscripts to the presses of the printer to the Senate, and can publish his book as freely within sound of the bells of St. Peter’s as any convert from Protestantism might publish one within sound of those of St. Paul’s.

So writes the accomplished author by whom the translation of the Autobiography of Count Campello, now before us, has been carried through the press. Made in Rome, the translation is close, and very

readable. Mr. Arthur has carefully compared the original with the English: and he has written the valuable Introduction, the opening paragraph of which we have quoted.

Of Italian "converted priests, personally," says Mr. Arthur, "I have met with at least thirty; among them several men of talent, and some of public note. Several of the company have finished their course with joy. I well remember Pattucelli, a clear-headed and vigorous preacher; and Bosio, a frail, mild, bright man, and a well-beloved pastor, both ex-professors: also, sensible, solid, old Gualtiere, who, in Florence, spent his days respected by all, not far from the place where he had been parish priest; and Spaziante, who had been a Canon." The earliest of these converted priests who were known to Mr. Arthur, is the one named by Campello—Luigi Desanctis. A Roman, who held as his incumbency the Church of the Maddelena, Desanctis has now for his sphere of action the whole of Italy, for while he rests from his labours his works do follow him; his writings, weighted, pointed, at every turn trustworthy, are spread over the country. Mr. Arthur's first sight of Desanctis, was in the "Gloucester Hotel," Piccadilly, as the guest of the late excellent Mr. James Evans, fresh from the scene of the first flight in Malta. Next in Turin, expounding the Scriptures to a few poor people, in a dim back room; and last, he saw him in Florence, then near the happy close of a career, the fruit of which is multiplying itself day by day.

No men better knew than did these converted priests, how fair was the popular estimate in Italy of the corruption caused by the law of celibacy; but it was not on these that they ever cared to dwell, but on God's good tidings of grace.

"Only those," writes Mr. Arthur, "who have some knowledge of the clerical press in Italy, of its rage in controversy, its lavishing of low personalities, and some knowledge of the tone of that portion of the secular press which designs to retort by exposing priestly morals, and also some knowledge of the latter subject in the writings of the so-called National Catholics; or, indeed, in writings of men still submitting to the Church, and criticizing, like Liverani, only with a view to reforms of which he had his dreams, like Campello and some innocent Englishmen, can estimate the difference between such writing, and that in the pages [of the Autobiography] before us."

Count Campello, like the other ex-priests to whom Mr. Arthur refers, feels that there are topics which "even a gentleman, and much more a Christian," naturally shuns. Consequently his allusions to the general corruption which for ages has been the horror or the delight of writers on Rome, according to their character, are only such allusions as are inevitable, and they are free from any personal charges.<sup>1</sup> If his language, now and then, seem to any English readers somewhat harsh, let them take the trouble to compare it with the language of the speeches of Pius IX.

The appearance of this Autobiography, one cannot but think, marks a stage in the Protestant movement in Italy, and will lead to important results. At all events, it shows that a work, like the spreading of a secret leaven, is going forward. Count Campello is not the first Noble who has declared himself a Protestant; nor is he the first Canon, nor the first Roman prelate; but he is, probably, the first who was noble, canon,

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Arthur quotes, in contrast, from *Il Papato, l'Impero, e il Regno d'Italia*. For instance (as to the Academy), p. 106: "The scenes to be witnessed among these young nobles destined to fill the highest places in Church and State, were those of blasphemies and curses fit for a pothouse, gambling kept up the whole night through, bad language, and bragging of shameful acts."

and prelate, and certainly the first from the Chapter of St. Peter's. A book entitled *Civiltà Moderna Difesa*, by Monsignor Giambattista Savarese, Domestic Prelate to his Holiness, Doctor of Canon and Civil Law, calls attention to this fact. "The recent fact," says Monsignor Savarese, "of a Monsignore, a Canon of the patriarchal Vatican Basilica, a nobleman, not deficient in learning, of unspotted life and reputation, who, unable any longer to live under the harassing dilemma between Church and country, solemnly abjures Catholicism, is a fact of the utmost gravity." Campello, no doubt, counted the cost before he took this decisive step, abandoning place and power. "May God give him grace," says the esteemed editor of this Autobiography, "grace to fight a good fight, to finish his course, and to keep the faith!"

Enrico di Campello was born in Rome, Nov. 15, 1831. He was called after Prince Henry of Prussia, uncle of the present Emperor, who from friendship to the grandfather, formerly a general under the First Empire, stood godfather to him by private proxy. At the age of nine Enrico was sent to the noble College of the Nazarene, when he went through the gymnasial course, ending with rhetoric at the close of 1848. The Roman Republic was crushed by the French soldiery in 1849: and Count Solon di Campello, Enrico's father, who had accepted a post under the Republican Government, was treated with severity by the "furious Junta of Cardinals and Prelates." It was hinted, that in order to regain the favour of the Pontiff, the Campello family must furnish "in one of its members, a pledge of humble subjection and inviolable fidelity." Enrico, then little over twenty, was chosen to be the expiatory victim. Cardinal Serafini undertook the management of the case:—

The youth [writes Campello] had been kept in seclusion owing to the disturbed character of the times. Thus, having spent the years of his adolescence almost cut off from society, without experience in the affairs of life, his very studies circumscribed by the severe laws of monastic schools, what wonder if Cardinal Serafini found him malleable? We must add that the Cardinal discharged his task with consummate  *finesse*.

Nearly every day he would invite him to dinner; and that he might not be left to himself, drove him out in his Cardinal's carriage. The conversation was always of the splendid future the prelacy offered him. The time would come when he too would be robed in purple and dwell in a sumptuous palace, revered, bowed down to, and held of great account for the eminent offices that would then be open to him. "And you," the Cardinal always concluded, "who so love your brothers and your two little sisters, will be the Joseph of your family, which through you will regain its ancient splendour."

These daily allurements were not without effect on the young Enrico. Still he hesitated. At length one day the Cardinal, who continued to urge him, said: "Tell me, Enrico, what is the ultimate reason which keeps you from making up your mind?" "Your Eminence," answered the youth, "I dread throwing away my liberty." The Cardinal received this reply with a sonorous burst of laughter. "You fool!" he exclaimed, "I entered the Church very young; was soon made a prelate, and obtained lucrative offices; became a Canon of St. Peter's, and am now a Cardinal. Yet *never* did I surrender my liberty, but always lived as I pleased.

The youth being thus driven to bay by the Cardinal, his family were upon him as by a secret understanding. His father and mother having called him to them, congratulated him, telling him to his surprise how they had learned from the Cardinal of his immovable resolution to become a priest. They overwhelmed him with caresses and kisses.

On his return to Rome, Campello entered the Academy of Noble Ecclesiastics. In the year 1855, when twenty-four years of age, he was consecrated a priest.

On September 13, 1881, in a letter to the celebrated Arch-priest of the Vatican Basilica, Cardinal Borromeo, he announced his secession from the

Papal Church.<sup>1</sup> "I go forth out of the ranks of the Roman clergy," he wrote, "to war in those of the pure gospel of Christ, remaining thus faithful to my vocation, and persuaded that in this course I shall find peace to my soul: for strong in the teaching of the Divine Master, neither adulterated nor counterfeited, it will be given to me, with head erect, to profess myself a Christian without hypocrisy, and an Italian citizen without the mask of a traitor to my country."<sup>2</sup>

*Church Courts.* An Historical Inquiry into the Status of the Ecclesiastical Courts. By LEWIS T. DIBDIN, M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. London: Hatchard, 187, Piccadilly. 1881.

MR. DIBDIN has rendered good service to the Church of England by the publication of this learned pamphlet. We hope that it will be widely circulated, and that due attention will be given to the evidence which it supplies. There is a vast amount of misconception on the subject, which ought by all means to be corrected. We hope that the Royal

<sup>1</sup> It seems probable that he will join an "Old Catholic" community, recently, the Rev. Dr. Nevin wrote from Rome to the *Guardian*, concerning a report that Campello had lost all faith in Christianity. Dr. Nevin says:—"The charge of loss of faith in Christianity would seem to be sufficiently met by the spirit and words in which Campello's letter of resignation is conceived and uttered. I freely give my own testimony that through the nine years that I have known Campello I have never heard a word from him which would justify such an accusation. Latterly I have seen but little of him; but at the beginning of the Old Catholic movement, and about the time that he himself was trying to found a Society, whose aim was the recovery to the Roman clergy and people of their ancient power of electing their Bishop, I saw him frequently and had long conversations with him on theological and Church points, in which he always used a frankness of speech such as I have never found in any other Roman Catholic ecclesiastic. He always stood up strongly for the Catholic theology and order of the Church. Nor has he given up these views. He has renounced Romanism, but in favour simply of Christian Reform, not of Methodism. He used the Methodist chapel, as the only Italian Protestant place of worship at the time open in Rome, to make his renunciation of Romanism in. He wanted to do it openly, and in a place of *Christian* worship, that it might be known openly that he did not change from Rome to unbelief, but was and would remain distinctly Christian. But it is impossible that a man with his views, and his knowledge of his people, should find his ecclesiastical home in the unhistoric and unliturgic system which seems to satisfy the religious wants of our Methodist brethren."

<sup>2</sup> Count Campello relates an anecdote, worth quoting, as to the magnificence of Papal services, the *mise en scène* of a theatrical spectacle:—"In one of those splendid services—and there were many of them during the pontificate of Pius IX., before he gave himself out as a prisoner—whilst Campello, among a throng of prelates, was following the Pope, who, borne aloft in his portable throne, between two huge fans which shaded his person, proceeded up the nave of the church leading to the throne—a friend of Campello's, a distinguished foreign prelate, now a cardinal, with whom he sometimes jested on the subject of nationality, approached him and whispered in his ear, 'No question about it; you Italians are the first comedians in the world.' 'Yes, Monsignore,' was Campello's reply, 'this is a comedy which, performed amongst a flock of owls, pays tremendously; and for this reason you left white-cliffed England and came amongst us.' The joke was pursued no further; and the elegant prelate blushed and was silent."



Commission will further elicit such evidence as will dispel the clouds and mists under which the Ritualists have sought refuge. Mr. Dibdin's pamphlet is a valuable contribution towards this end.

The author sets out with the distinction which ought ever to be kept in view between matters of *faith* and *discipline*. He gives, as an instance, the doctrine of the Trinity. Whether a Church shall hold or teach the doctrine is a matter of faith, but "assuming that point settled, the determination of what the penalty shall be for denying the doctrine, and the machinery for ascertaining whether it has been desired, are matters of discipline." He shows that the *making* and *working* of the law are entirely distinct operations. "It is certainly conceivable," he adds, "that these two powers of *settling* and *maintaining* the teaching of the Church should reside in distinct persons or institutions." The State adopts a religious system as the religion of the country, and takes precautions for its maintenance. It naturally requires that no change of doctrine or ritual shall be made without its consent. This duty is discharged by the erection of tribunals to which are entrusted the adjustment of matters in litigation.

"Thus the supremacy of the State or Crown," as Mr. Dibdin well observes, "is exercised by means of courts set apart, indeed, for ecclesiastical purposes, but deriving their jurisdiction from the State." If it be admitted that the State is in such cases the guardian of the Church's purity and order, "the position of the ecclesiastical courts, created by the State, becomes at once unimpeachable."

Mr. Dibdin, having laid down this distinction, gives in his second chapter a review of historical facts regarding "Legislation as to the *discipline* of the Church in matters of doctrine." He shows how futile was the appeal of the Hon. C. L. Wood and the Rev. Dr. Pusey to the Reformation settlement. As a matter of fact, the State has legislated for the Church, and appointed courts for the settlement of disputes, without thinking it necessary to seek for the sanction of Convocation. The Court of Delegates and the High Court of Commission derived their authority from Acts of Parliament. If the principle upon which the Reformers acted in this matter were wrong, it follows that the Reformation itself proceeded on a false principle.

Dr. Pusey and Mr. Wood have in vain sought a way out of the difficulty. The Doctor "passes over the comprehensive words of the second Statute (of Henry VIII.), by which *all* matters are, on appeal, referred to the King in Chancery, with the remark, that "matrimonial causes, tithes, oblations, and obventions are the only matters mentioned." Mr. Dibdin conclusively shows the fallacy of this, and exhibits the blundering of Mr. Wood.

Further, 1 Elizabeth, ch. 1, sec. 17, restored to the Crown the right to correct "all manner of errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities." It is evident, therefore, that the Ritualists, in appealing to the Reformation settlement, have made a great mistake.

In his third chapter, Mr. Dibdin reviews the measures which have been taken as to the doctrine of the Church. He considers that legislation affecting the substance of the Liturgy, as dealing with something beyond discipline, ought not to be effected without the assent of the Church. As a general principle this is true, but it does not admit of rigid adherence. The Nicene Creed itself, in its present form, is a witness to the fact that a formula of faith which had received the sanction of the first four General Councils, was altered without the formal consent of a General Council. The words, "And from the Son," were thus introduced by the authority of a Spanish King, and were gradually adopted by the Western Church, notwithstanding the protests of the great Eastern Churches which sternly adhered to the ancient formula. The Crown in the early ages exercised

great influence in Church matters, as Mr. Dibdin shows in his chapter on "Church and State in Early Times." We know that Constantine the Great convened and presided in the Council of Nice. He acted as a moderator, and we think that the Nicene Creed is largely due to him. There are cases where an abstract principle cannot be enforced. Convocation consented to the rejection of the Papal Supremacy in the reign of Henry VIII., but it protested against the Reformation on the accession of Elizabeth to the throne. Many of the leading steps of the Reformation were taken without the formal sanction of Convocation. The Reformers would have obtained that sanction if they could. But they were not bound to wait until a corrupt body was prepared to act with them. Hezekiah, Josiah, and other godly kings, reformed the Church upon the authority of the Word of God, without waiting for the consent of the priesthood. Yea, even our Lord himself and his Apostles proclaimed the glorious truths of the Gospel, notwithstanding the anathemas of the Sanhedrim of the great Council or Synod of the Church.

In point of fact, Parliament has not in any instance originated and settled formulas of doctrine. The books of 1552 and 1559 were prepared by men of high authority in Church and State appointed by the Crown, and were proposed to Parliament, whose sanction was obtained. The constitution of the Ecclesiastical Courts was never submitted to Convocation, and we hope that in this matter there will be no departure from long-established precedent.

The Ritualists have no ground of complaint whatever. Their assertions are not warranted by fact, and their theories are thoroughly at variance with the principles of the Church of England.

---

## Short Notices.

---

*Modern Heroes of the Mission Field.* By the Right Rev. W. PAKENHAM WALSH, D.D., Bishop of Ossory, Ferns, and Leighlin. Pp. 344. Hodder & Stoughton. 1882.

This delightful volume is a sequel to "Heroes of the Mission Field," reviewed a year ago in these columns; and we have much pleasure in recommending both books. They are well printed, and will form excellent gift-books. The "Modern Heroes" are Martyn, Carey, Judson, Morrison, Marsden, Williams, Johnson (of West Africa, 1816-1823), Hunt, Gardiner, Duff, Livingstone, Patteson. The characters chosen, it will be observed, are those of typical men, representatives of different fields of labour and various modes of action. It is unnecessary to remark that the book is valuable; the style of the right reverend author is well known. One extract from the biographical sketch of Bishop Patteson—facts which the present writer was glad to use in an Epiphany sermon—we may give. It is a specimen of many deeply interesting passages:—

Bishop Selwyn came to take leave of the Pattesons, with whom he had long been intimate, and in doing so, he said to Lady Patteson, half in play and half in earnest, "Will you give me Coley?" The question startled the fond mother, and she made no reply at the time; but when the boy told her that "the one grand wish of his heart was to go with the bishop," she replied that if that continued to be his wish when he grew up, she would give him both her consent and her blessing. Alas! she only lived a year, and did not see the fruit of that request and of that promise. But she had taught him to read his Bible