

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

THE
CHURCHMAN

FEBRUARY, 1881.

ART. I.—THE MORALITY OF THE RITUALIST
MUTINY.

A LAYMAN'S VIEW.

IT is a peculiarity, perhaps, inseparable from free institutions, and if so, not to be regretted, that any minority which energetically and persistently complains of a grievance never fails to attract an amount of public attention and sympathy which is quite irrespective of the intrinsic merits of their case, and is by no means necessarily commensurate with the actual numbers of the complainers. This attention is now bestowed on what is popularly known as the Ritualistic party; with the necessary result that their attitude, their claims, and the arguments by which they support them are closely scrutinized.

There are times when a man may justifiably refuse to depart from a position of strict neutrality towards contending parties; but there are also times when a man is bound to take a side. No clergyman, no person who by profession or position is obliged or expected to take a lead in matters of morals, can justify indifference when morality itself is involved. The time has now arrived when such men must make up their minds one way or the other on the subject of the present ecclesiastical disputes. Impartiality ceases to be meritorious when it is merely the artificial result of laziness or wilful blindness.

Now the important question which arises for a churchman in regard to the clergymen who have refused to obey the directions of their Bishops and to submit to the decisions of the Courts, is simply this: Shall I give my sympathy to these persons, or not? It is in truth a moral question, and the answer does not necessarily involve as many disputed facts in law and history

as is generally supposed. Let us approach the question as far as we may with a large common sense.

In the first place it is necessary to guard against the impatience which is naturally excited at the difficulty found in convicting and punishing the offenders. That is part of the price we pay for the independence of our clergy at large. They are not removable at pleasure; but so many of them at least as are beneficed, have a freehold in their position, and so long as they do their legal duty, are safe from interference either, on the one hand, from their Bishop—as in the Romish Church—or, on the other, from their congregation, as in the case of Dissenters. What is it but this independence which induces men to exchange curacies for the very smallest benefices? And it must be remembered that their independence may be easily destroyed, but when once destroyed it can never be restored again. The inconveniences of our system are often irksome enough, but they are temporary, and should be patiently endured for the sake of the permanent advantages which lie deep down under the surface.

If the clergy as a rule did no more than their legal duty, the laity might find it advisable to alter their tenure; but they do much more than their legal duty, as a layman may gratefully acknowledge, and much more and much better than they could ever be forced to do by a slavedriver behind them, or payment by results as a stimulus. It is only in an Established Church that the clergy can be as free as they are in the Church of England. It is only license, not liberty, that can be obtained without law, whether in Ireland or in England.

The first thing necessary to be borne in mind is, that until the last few years the Church was undisturbed by Ritualists. The disputes over ritual were bitter enough, indeed, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, but the Church finally settled itself at the Restoration of 1660, in the form which from that time to this has been, if not theoretically perfect, at least sufficient to satisfy plenty of good Christians. It is a matter within everybody's knowledge that albes and chasubles were introduced, or re-introduced, quite lately. The Ritualists themselves see the force of this, and so they have denied the fact. If any one wishes to investigate the fact for himself, let him refer to Mr. Malcolm Maccoll's book on the "Lawlessness, &c.," of the Ritualists, where he will find history ransacked for real and imaginary instances of the use of vestments; and when he has counted up every single instance, even assuming every quoted instance to be true, let him consider what proportion the whole number of those instances bear to the number of services in every parish church in England from 1660 to 1880. We assert, therefore, as a fact, that vestments are, at all events, an innova-

tion, and, as such, require good justification before they are forced on a Church which for more than 200 years has done without them.

Unable to deny this successfully, the Ritualist party in the first place fell back on law. "These vestments," they say, "are ordered by the Prayer-book itself, and we are only obeying the Prayer-book." Now this is a legal question as to the proper meaning of the directions given by the Prayer-book; and accordingly it has been over and over again discussed as such in the ecclesiastical courts, and it has been finally settled by the highest court of Appeal—viz., the Queen in Council, to say nothing of other courts, that the Ritualists are *not* obeying the rubric, and that the rubric *does* forbid the vestments. Twice has the question come before this high tribunal; first, in Mr. Purchas's case, and secondly in Mr. Ridsdale's case; with the same result on both occasions, so that there is no longer any possible ground for maintaining that vestments are ordered by the Prayer-book, unless one is prepared to say that this high tribunal twice misinterpreted the rubric. The Ritualists are prepared to say this, and do say it; and we must meet what they say. The judges who decided the first of these two decisions—viz., Mr. Purchas's case, were four in number; Lord Hatherley, the Archbishop of York, the Bishop of London, and Lord Chelmsford. The judges who decided Mr. Ridsdale's case were ten: Lord Cairns, Lord Selborne, Sir James Colville, the Lord Chief Baron (Sir Fitzroy Kelly), Sir Robert Phillimore, Lord Justice James, Sir Montague Smith, Sir Robert Collier, Sir Baliol Brett (now Lord Justice Brett), and Sir Richard Amphlett, to say nothing of five bishops and an archbishop, who sat at the same time as episcopal assessors. Now who are the Ritualists that they should say that these courts, composed of the most eminent judges and bishops, mistook the law? No doubt, in the second of the two cases, we are told that the court was not unanimous. Well, it has never been contended by the Church party that this purely legal question was free from difficulty, so that it is not surprising to find a difference of opinion. Let us, for the sake of argument, suppose that in each case the court was divided, and that in each case the dissentient minority was as large as possible; still, it can only have consisted of one in the first case, and of four in the second; and there remain six judges out of the ten in the Ridsdale case, and three out of the four in the Purchas case, who *must* have come to the conclusion that the vestments were unlawful, and (according to the Ritualists) have mistaken the law.

The Ritualists feel that this explanation, though theoretically possible, is to the common sense of Englishmen so improbable that it would be useless to rest their case upon this alone. But how do they get out of the difficulty?

Now here we come to one of those matters which are as straws thrown up to show which way the wind is blowing ; one of those things by means of which we may obtain a glimpse of the inner workings of these men's minds. When such glimpses have been obtained in sufficient number, we shall be able to form a trustworthy opinion of their inner springs of action, and to apply our knowledge so gained to the explanation of other acts of an apparently ambiguous character, the morality of which can only be judged by the actuating motives.

Not reluctantly, not solemnly, not tentatively, but "with a light heart," the Ritualists do not hesitate to assert recklessly and roundly, that these eminent judges gave a judgment of policy, and against their consciences decided the law to be what all the time they knew it was not. Nothing could be more insulting, more stinging, to any judge than to have such a thing said of him ; and if it was the intention of the Ritualists to insult and sting to the very quick, they may rest assured that the end has been fully attained.

But we must not be run away with ; we are now upon dry argument. We will not impute an improper motive to a single act ; though if, as we proceed in our investigation we find a series of acts each of which requires a stretch of our charity to explain it favourably, the case may be altered. At present, therefore, all we say about this conduct of the Ritualists is, that it requires an exercise of charity to excuse it. We must not be prejudiced by the thought that the Ritualists themselves, in the first instance, might not unreasonably have been restrained by somewhat similar feelings from launching their accusation.

Putting moral considerations aside, and looking at the accusation simply as a move in the game, it has this advantage over the course of declaring the courts to have mistaken the law, that it stops the argument, and leaves the last word with the Ritualists. Suppose a Ritualist arguing the question with a Churchman, and suppose the Churchman quotes these two legal decisions ; if then the Ritualist says : " Oh, but the courts mistook the law," there is a certain touch of absurdity and very-far-goneness about the reply which cannot fail to be perceptible. But if, on the other hand, the Ritualist, with a confident and back-stairs sort of knowingness, contemptuously asks, " Why, don't you know those decisions were notoriously based upon policy ? Everybody knows that. Why, you *are* behindhand !" what can the man say ? He cannot say he knows the contrary, for he was not present in the Privy Council, and he cannot call the slanderer by the name he deserves, inasmuch as it is not at present fashionable to treat the Ritualists otherwise than as good but mistaken persons. Therefore, it is practically an unanswerable argument.

Of the probability of the accusation being true, every one

must judge for himself. Lawyers will understand easily the impossibility of a number of men, lawyers all their lives and judges at the end, conspiring together to give a corrupt decision, contrary to the "plain words" of the Prayer-book or of any other law. You might just as well be told that six doctors conspired to kill a patient. A single doctor might, perhaps, be accused of such a thing, with a semblance of probability, by any one who was prepared to stand a prosecution for libel; but if it were said that six doctors conspired together to do it in a single case—six doctors against whom nothing of the kind had ever been whispered before or since—then what would be only the presumption of innocence in favour of one individual by himself, becomes the impossibility of guilt in favour of the six together. History is not unacquainted with a Scroggs and a Jeffreys; but they could not have attained their unenviable distinction if they had never presided at more than one trial. And we are asked to believe that in the present day there are six Scroggses or Jeffreyses on the bench together, and all happened to be selected for a single case!

Being driven from all these positions successively, the Ritualists next say that the court which pronounced these two decisions against them was a secular court, and that secular courts ought not to meddle with spiritual matters such as the interpretation of the law as to vestments, and that consequently they cannot recognize any jurisdiction to pronounce the decisions, or defer in any way to such decisions. And, in connection with this point, they raise the large question of the relation between Church and State.

What the State should do for the Church, what the Church should do for the State, where the boundaries between them should be set, how far either should control or guide the other—all these are, happily, questions upon which people may differ as much as they please without any imputation on their motives. They are, in fact, questions for the intellect and not for the heart. But a man must be decently consistent. If you find him justifying himself one day by certain opinions which he tells you he holds on these subjects, and the next day maintaining the opposite opinions for a different purpose, and you are quite sure of the inconsistency and also quite sure he is not a lunatic, you are entitled to say that on one of the two occasions the man must have been *dishonest*. And it must be pointed out that we may have materials which will enable us to characterize the acts and criticize the motives of a numerous and extensive party, though the same materials would not suffice in the case of some single member of the party. Let us explain ourselves.

Far be it from any one who endeavours, in however humble

a way, to be a faithful son of the Church of England as by law established, and to act up to that character to the best of his understanding, to allow himself to jump to the conclusion that any particular person, least of all a clergyman, cannot consistently with a straightforward morality maintain the attitude which has been assumed by Mr. T. Pelham Dale for instance. But our common sense was given to us to be used, and not to be frittered away by sentimental and enthusiastic charity. If we find, or think we find, a man eating the bread of the Church of England, trained in her schools, and after having in the most solemn manner sworn to administer her rites, to submit himself to her regulations and discipline, and to obey her duly constituted officers, entrusted on the faith of those undertakings with the spiritual concerns of her members, nevertheless explaining away his oaths, repudiating the authority of her officers of every kind, violating her rites, and dispersing the flock entrusted to his charge, we may not perhaps be wrong in giving credit to that man's strenuous professions of loyalty and affection; if we are wrong, it will be we hope but a venial mistake, as it will certainly be a generous one, to attribute his conduct to some of the inevitable differences of constitution by which the minds of men have been separated in all ages. Our common sense, however, tells us that the case is completely altered when instead of a single individual we have to deal with an organized party of considerable numbers, who all profess more or less the same object. There is no room for the explanation which is possible in the case of the individual. Mr. Hampden no doubt conscientiously believes the earth to be flat; but then he has no party. The conclusion is inevitable that the Ritualists as a party are not monomaniacs, but are, intellectually at least, open to reason.

Bearing this in mind, let us now pass in review some of the principles by which the Ritualists at present profess to stand, and compare their conduct with those principles. In effect, they maintain that there has been an undue interference by secular courts and Parliament with spiritual matters; that the Queen in Council and the Arches Court as at present constituted are secular courts, and have consequently no jurisdiction to interpret the law of the Church.

Now every time that the Ritualists appeal to the temporal courts of law for protection and assistance against the sentences of Lord Penzance, they distinctly recognize the authority of the State and of secular courts in those very matters with which they protest that a secular court has no right to deal. They protest that it is against their consciences to allow Lord Penzance's court to have any jurisdiction, because they say he was set up by Act of Parliament; but they have no conscientious scruples in

recognizing the authority in the same matters of the Queen's Bench Division of Her Majesty's High Court of Justice; as if the latter court had not been set up by Act of Parliament in 1875. If it is sacrilegious in Lord Penzance to suspend him, how can it be otherwise than sacrilegious in the Queen's Bench Division to set him up again? It is to be presumed that the sacrilege (if any) is committed by meddling in the matter at all, and does not depend on which way the decision goes.

Moreover, it is quite an afterthought on the part of the Ritualists that the Queen in Council had no jurisdiction to give the two decisions above referred to. Till those decisions, no one ever heard any objection to the jurisdiction; and indeed the Ritualists themselves, so far from having any conscientious scruples about recognizing the jurisdiction, have voluntarily appealed to the same court on the same matters. Mr. Purchas and Mr. Ridsdale both did so, supported as we know by the whole English Church Union. There was no scruple in those days, when they hoped the decision might be in their favour. It was this very appeal of Mr. Ridsdale, or the English Church Union in his name, that finally established the unlawfulness of the vestments. They now repudiate, and profess that their consciences compel them to repudiate, the jurisdiction of the very court to which they themselves appealed, and in the very case in which they themselves appealed to it.

We are irresistibly reminded of the scene in the *Merchant of Venice* :—

"*Shylock*. You call me, misbeliever, cut-throat dog, and spit upon my Jewish gaberdine. . . . Well then, it now appears you need my help; Go to, then

"*Antonio*. I am as like to call thee so again, to spit on thee again, to spurn thee too."

Again we say, such inconsistency may possibly be actuated by the best of motives, but it is ambiguous, and undoubtedly requires explanation.

Sometimes they say that the Court of Arches as it existed in Sir Robert Phillimore's time was the true spiritual court which they would be prepared to obey if it had not been destroyed (as they say) by Parliament in 1874. But Sir Robert Phillimore, the judge of the Arches Court in 1868, decided in that year that it was unlawful to elevate the elements; so that one would expect to find the Ritualists, if they had any regard to consistency, abstaining from such elevation. On the contrary, their consciences (they say) compel them to elevate; and accordingly they disregard the law laid down by the Court of Arches in 1868, as well as the law laid down by it since. Is it possible that they can be sincere in such unreasonableness?

Now let us come to closer quarters with the attitude they

have for the present assumed with regard to the "ornaments rubric." They complain that a secular court, meaning the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, has misinterpreted "the plain words" of the Prayer-book; and when they insist on wearing illegal vestments, they pretend to justify themselves by declaring that they alone are the upholders of what they call "our beloved Prayer-book" against the intrusion of purely Parliamentary courts; regardless of the fact that the very rubric they appeal to, whatever its true interpretation may be, does in so many words found itself upon Parliament only! The actual words are:—

And here it is to be noted that such ornaments of the Church and of the ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be retained, and be in use, as were in this Church of England *by the authority of Parliament* in the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth.

Now, whatever be the true interpretation of this rubric, one thing must at all events be clear to everybody who is not sufficiently learned to have lost his senses, and that is, that the rubric sets up something which, in the opinion of the bishops and divines who framed it, rested *upon the authority of Parliament*. And yet this is the rubric of which these gentry have constituted themselves the champions against what they call the unjust claim of Parliament to legislate for the Church.

Could anything be more absurd? The ornaments rubric bases itself on parliamentary authority, but Parliament must not meddle or set up any court to meddle with the ornaments prescribed in the rubric, because they are spiritual matters which Parliament has no right to touch! "The plain words of the Prayer-book" may be retorted upon them with much greater force than they probably anticipated.

The crowning absurdity we have kept for the last, as it was in fact the last consummated. Bearing in mind the contention of the Ritualists, that it is against their conscience to recognize Lord Penzance's court or obey his orders, and that Mr. Dale was obliged to go to prison rather than violate his conscience by obeying those orders, what shall we say to the undertaking voluntarily given by Mr. Dale in order to get out of prison till his appeal was heard on the 11th of January? He actually undertook to obey Lord Penzance's inhibition till the 11th of January as a condition of being at large till that date. He did not undertake to omit this or that ceremony; but in so many words, not to contravene *Lord Penzance's inhibition*.

What was he put in prison for? Not for disobeying the monition, but for disobeying the inhibition; this very inhibition which he has temporarily undertaken to obey. Is it, or is it not against his conscience to obey the inhibition, which is all he

is asked to do? If it is, why not take his services as usual? If it is not, why on earth go to prison again?

The force of folly can no farther go. It *must* be immoral to reduce the reason with which God has endowed mankind to such a level as is necessary for swallowing all these inconsistencies. The moral feeling of mankind revolts against such an outrage to the Intellect; and they who would persuade us that it is demanded by religion can only succeed by first divorcing, and are in fact divorcing, Religion from Morality.

Now our object in pointing out all these inconsistencies is this: After making every possible allowance for enthusiasm, however erroneous, we submit that we have brought together a sufficient number of instances of what must be admitted to be ambiguous conduct, to entitle us to say, without uncharitableness, "This can only be excused by the very purest motives. Your conduct is so extraordinary that when you ask us to accept it as the outcome of sincere Christianity, we cannot do so until we have looked into the rest of your conduct to see whether it is consonant to your professions."

The first instance we will take for this purpose comes to hand in connection with what we have just been discussing. Notwithstanding the fact that the highest court of the realm has twice ruled the meaning of the ornaments rubric to be different from that for which the Ritualists contend, and notwithstanding that this fact is not only well known to them, but has lately been publicly recalled to their notice by the Bishop of Manchester, they are disingenuous enough to persist in retaining the expression "the plain words of the Book of Common Prayer" in the form of resolution which has been sent down from the English Church Union to be passed at its different branches, as if there was no doubt at all about it.

Let us see how Dr. Littledale, one of their great men, writing to the *Times* of December 2, comments on the circumstance that the Queen's Bench Division had granted a rule to show cause why Mr. Dale should not be discharged from prison. He writes:—

Let him (*i.e.*, Mr. Dale) prove victorious, and what must be the effect on legal, or even thoughtful and dispassionate lay minds? Must it not be one or both of these conclusions—either that Lord Penzance is administering a law of which he knows nothing, and intends to learn nothing (as the late Lord Chief Justice of England, who had a keen appreciation of his merits, not obscurely alleged in a famous pamphlet), or that he is in such a hurry to put down Ritualism that he thrusts the law aside as a cumbrous obstacle, and, to use his own phrase, leaves justice prostrate?

To say nothing of the absurdity to a "legal or even a thoughtful and dispassionate lay mind" of jumping to the conclusion,

that because a judge is overruled on some technical point (a thing which has many times happened to every judge on the bench) therefore he *knows nothing* of the law he has to administer, what shall be said of the malicious addition, "and intends to learn nothing?" That the Lord Chief Justice's pamphlet alleged such a thing, obscurely or not obscurely, is more than untrue; it is slanderous to the Lord Chief Justice himself, who, if alive, would be the first to repudiate the illogical and unmannerly suggestion.

Mr. Dale, writing to the Bishop of London, allows himself to say: "The Zwinglian Calvinism which this Association" (*i.e.*, the Church Association) "seeks to force on us." Not only has this clergyman no ground for saying so, but he ought to have known that it is contrary to the fact. In the same letter Mr. Dale says: "They have proved utterly irreconcilable, notwithstanding every effort on my part to find a *modus vivendi* which could be accepted by me without loss of principle." Why should Mr. Dale's principles be left inviolate, and not the principles of his parishioners? Is it to be all give and no take? If Mr. Dale has in fact offered to give up anything which he could give up without loss of principle, it only shows that he has bullied his parish not only with things that are matters of principle with him, but with things which are not. The truth is, as Mr. Dale well knows, that a *modus vivendi* would readily enough be found if he would only resign his living and go elsewhere; unless, indeed, he interprets *modus vivendi* to signify "means of keeping my living."

Canon Liddon, in a letter to the *Guardian* of the 24th November last, says: "Mr. Dale's persecutors are endeavouring to coerce him into professing a conviction which he feels unable to accept."¹ Now Mr. Dale's prosecutors are not endeavouring to coerce him into professing anything whatever. It is difficult to conceive how Canon Liddon can have been ignorant of what everybody else knows, that Mr. Dale is prosecuted for no profession or non-profession of any conviction, but simply for not conducting the services in the way in which, when both he and Canon Liddon took their orders, they both believed they would have to conduct them. The charitable explanation of ignorance on Canon Liddon's part is more difficult when we observe the malicious substitution of the word "persecutors" for "prosecutors."

¹ Dr. Pusey commits himself to the same statement in the same paper. He writes: "Mr. Dale is in prison, not as some say, for the use of vestments, but for the great truth which the persecutors too acknowledge it to be their aim to exterminate, and which they hope to exterminate through it. He is imprisoned for contravening a biased and unjust judgment of an authority constituted without the consent of the Church."

In the same number of the *Guardian* there is reported a crowded and influential meeting of the party. The speeches are reported at length. The speakers appear to have been selected, and certainly included some of the most prominent men of the party. Let us take, as an example of their spirit, the speech of Mr. C. W. Wilshere of Welwyn:—

The Archbishop holds us up to public reprobation because we neither regard the opinion of the hundred bishops assembled at Lambeth, nor that of the convocation of Canterbury. The hundred bishops declared their opinion that no change should be made in long-established ritual without the consent of the ordinary. Theoretically this is excellent advice. But we cannot forget, &c. &c.

Well, if the gentleman was minded to display his Christian modesty to advantage, he could not perhaps begin better than by discussing in this manner the most solemn assembly of the English Church that has ever been held.

Our bishops, taking possession of their episcopal thrones with the writ of *premunire* in the one hand, and the record of a blasphemous mock-election in the other, cannot be trusted, &c.

Of course the Bishops cannot be expected to fare better than the Pan-Anglican Synod. Of the Archbishop of Canterbury:—

Nor is the author of the Public Worship Regulation Act, and ally of Colenso, the most fitting advocate of confidence in the wisdom and orthodoxy of the Episcopate (cheers).¹

The speaker thus treats of Convocation:—

As to that big vestry, the Convocation of Canterbury, it has itself distinctly confessed that although on two or three occasions consulted when parliamentary legislation affecting the Church was in contemplation, it has no authority to speak formally in the Church's name. For Canon 139, of 1604, declares that a national synod (not a provincial convocation) is the Church of England by representation. And as in such a body the two archbishops with their suffragans alone would sit as of right, and alone would decide, may Heaven preserve us from its revival until we have orthodox bishops canonically elected (cheers).

It would have been sufficient for the gentleman's argument, though not for his feelings, to have omitted this imputation of heterodoxy.

The Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, left to itself, voted against the abolition of the ornaments rubric. It was only

¹ In connection with this charitable insinuation that the Archbishop is heterodox with the heterodoxy popularly associated with the Bishop of Natal, we may call attention to a letter in *The Times* of Dec. 23 from Bishop Piers Claughton, forcibly condemning a similar attempt of the Dean of St. Paul's to connect the defenders of the Royal Supremacy with Mr. Voysey's doctrines.

when the Upper House appeared in its midst that the proctors for the clergy, dazed at the sight of their lordships in their scarlet robes, surrendered in an access of flunkeyism the ritual of the altar to those who were banded together to abolish it.

Of course Lord Penzance cannot be let off. He is "the judicial blunderer to whom our primates committed the rule of the Church."

It is needless to multiply instances. We assert that the specimens we have given are trustworthy samples of what everybody may see for himself. Thereupon we assert that such things are inconsistent with any form of real Christianity; that though any one man may possibly do these things and yet be morally blameless, there is no such possibility when we consider the party as a whole. And further, if we have been compelled to come to this conclusion, we are not to be blamed for want of charity if we suppose similar motives to have actuated the ambiguous conduct to which we have above referred.

Before we conclude, we must notice an objection which has been made to the imprisonment of Mr. Dale and Mr. Enraght, on the ground that it would have been better to wait to the end of the three years appointed by the Public Worship Regulation Act. The Archbishop of Canterbury in an address to the rural deanery of Westbere spoke of "the very unwise course lately taken by the four churchwardens representing the parishioners of St. Vedast, Foster Lane, in pressing for the imprisonment of their pastor on a writ of contumacy."

The Bishop of Manchester is reported to have said at Blackburn, referring to the imprisoned clergymen, that he regretted that the law should have taken that particular form, and he would be glad if they could be released from prison and punished by other penalties. And the Bishop of London has expressed similar views.

We must say that we entirely concur in regretting that imprisonment was found necessary. It is due to the Church Association who have borne the burden and heat of the day in maintaining the Established Church in its established form, to quote their own language to the same effect. In a meeting on the 6th of December, by unanimous resolution, they "regretted that any necessity should have arisen for the enforcement by imprisonment for contempt of court, of the judgments obtained against the Rev. T. P. Dale and other clergymen."

It is no part of our purpose to vindicate the proceedings of the aggrieved laity or of the Church Association. They require no vindication from the scurrilous abuse of their opponents. The particular objection, however, which is taken to this particular proceeding, becomes important from the high position of

the three prelates; and being based, as we think, on a misapprehension of the legal difficulties attending any other alternative, deserves more attention. We must premise that we have only an outsider's knowledge of the case.

We all know that the temporal courts, besides the final sentences which they award for the regular criminal offences, have the power of enforcing their orders, whether made in the course of the proceedings, or as final judgments, by summary proceedings for contempt of court; as where a man, while a suit is proceeding, endeavours to prejudice the case by improper comments in a newspaper, or by threatening a witness, or where a witness refuses to answer, or where a defendant disobeys an injunction in a Chancery suit. The Ecclesiastical Courts had a similar power of enforcing their orders. But it is not the same power; they cannot send a man off to prison on their own authority for contempt of court, or, as it is called in the Ecclesiastical Courts, contumacy. They inform the Lord Chancellor of the contumacy, or, in technical language, they "signify" it to him, and there their authority stops. It is the Lord Chancellor who then, on his own responsibility, imprisons the party until he shall submit.

So matters stood until the passing of the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874. That Act provided a new and alternative procedure for those who chose to proceed under it.¹

It provided that upon proof of the offence, the sentence of the court should be a monition, enjoining the party to desist from the conduct in question. Then it provides that this monition may be forced by "inhibition," and that if the inhibition remain in force for three years the living is to become void *ipso facto*, without more ado. Now what is "inhibition?" Whatever it may mean, it was not before the passing of this Act, known to the ecclesiastical law as a punishment for a beneficed clergyman. The word itself, indeed, was not unknown. When a litigant in

¹ This Act was intended to provide a cheaper and more expeditious remedy than the old procedure, and one which should be less encumbered with technicalities. The remedy actually provided by it is no less expensive, is slower in its effect, and literally bristles with doubtful points and technicalities. No lawyer can say for certain what it means. Was it, then, a useless piece of legislation? By no means. By passing it on the second reading, *without a division*, and in its other stages by enormous majorities, after a declaration by two such prominent and influential persons, on either side of the house, as Mr. Gladstone and Lord Cranbrook (then Mr. Gathorne Hardy) that it should be opposed by them with all their might, the British public—the law-abiding, church-loving public, which thinks more of the quiet and humble discharge of duty than of demonstrations and public meetings, whether on the right or the wrong side—just showed its teeth. Moreover, it was necessary to provide some method of appointing a new judge.

an Ecclesiastical Court, whether in a civil or criminal suit, appealed from one court to a higher court, the higher court was wont at once to "inhibit" the inferior court. It said, in effect, to the inferior court, "Take notice that this suit has been appealed to us, and until we have heard and decided the appeal and have sent your judgment back to you, either affirmed or reversed, you must hold your hand and not enforce your judgment, or do anything to the prejudice of the appeal." So also at a visitation, when the bishop "visits" his diocese to see that all is going on right, he usually "inhibits" all inferior jurisdictions of archdeacons, rural deans and so forth. When the Archbishop visits his province, the jurisdiction of the bishops themselves is similarly "inhibited," or paralyzed as it were, for the time.

We can only guess what "inhibition" means in the Public Worship Act by trying to find some analogy (which may after all be fanciful) with the inhibition already known to the law. It is laid down in Ayliffe's "Parergon" (one of the great authorities in ecclesiastical matters) that the court inhibited loses its jurisdiction, and the judge becomes "as a private man" in that case. It would seem, therefore, that a clergyman "inhibited" under the Public Worship Act, becomes "as a private man," and, if so, this inhibition would seem to be equivalent to suspension *ab officio*.

The principal legal question raised in Mr. Dale's case is whether the orders of the court, made in suits under the Public Worship Act, can be enforced by the same summary process by which orders made under the old procedure could have been enforced. The Act does not say so; but neither does it say they cannot. The Ritualists (or rather their counsel) have of course to maintain that these orders cannot be so enforced: the Church party have to argue the contrary. No one (except a Ritualist) can say for certain which is right. The arguments *pro* and *con* are so nicely balanced, that either side would be justified in appealing up to the House of Lords itself. Moreover, how can any one say that an order of "inhibition" has been disobeyed until it is first of all decided what inhibition means?

But though this is the principal point in the case, the public will not fail to have observed all the other technicalities raised on behalf of Mr. Dale. If none of these latter technicalities had been raised now, they would undoubtedly have been raised at the end of the three years prescribed by the Act. At the end of that time, when we should all have been expecting that Mr. Dale would lose his living *ipso facto*, and that the scandal of a three years' defiance of the law would terminate, Mr. Dale would quietly raise all these technical objections to the previous proceedings against him, and if any single one

succeeded, the whole of the suit would have been in vain! Surely no scandal would have been equal to that. But by trying the *significavit*, the churchwardens have compelled the other side to show its hand. If there has been any technical error, it is far better that it should be brought out at once than after three years' weary waiting. The risk involved in waiting for the "slow but sure process of the Act" was so enormous, that it was hardly fair to ask the churchwardens to run it. Moreover, the error might have been repeated over and over again in other suits before it was discovered. So Dale was first "signified;" but the Ritualists would not move. It was only when Enraght and Green were also threatened, that the Ritualist lawyers could be induced to show their hand. We respectfully submit to the three bishops that, though imprisonment is to be deplored, it may have been, under the circumstances, absolutely necessary.

NOTE.—Since this Article was written, Mr. De la Bere, of Prestbury, a notorious mutineer, has incurred the sentence of deprivation. We rejoice that in the ecclesiastical proceedings against him imprisonment has not been found necessary. If, indeed, he wishes to go to prison he will have plenty of opportunity, but the orders which, for this purpose, he must resist, will probably be those of a temporal Court in a prosaic action of trespass or ejection.

ART. II.—DAVID LIVINGSTONE.

The Personal Life of David Livingstone, LL.D., D.C.L. Chiefly from his Unpublished Journals and Correspondence in the possession of his Family. By WILLIAM GARDEN BLAIKIE, D.D., LL.D., New College, Edinburgh. With Portrait and Map. London: John Murray. 1880.

PERHAPS Florence Nightingale, writing out of her womanly sympathy to Livingstone's daughter on the arrival in England of the news of his death, went a little too far when she called him "the greatest man of his generation;" yet her very striking and beautiful letter, printed in Dr. Blaikie's "Life" (p. 458), rightly points out his peculiar place in the history of our time. "There are few enough," she says, "but a few statesmen. There are few enough, but a few great in medicine, or in art, or in poetry. There are a few great travellers. But Dr. Livingstone stood alone as the great Missionary Traveller, the bringer-in of civilization; or rather the pioneer of civilization—he that cometh before—to races lying in darkness. I always think of him as what John the Baptist, had he been living in the nineteenth century, would have been."

There are not a few, however, who would have some hesitation in endorsing language like this; not a few who, while admitting, as a matter of course, the claim of Livingstone to be the greatest of African explorers, and recognizing his many admirable personal qualities, are yet conscious of a certain underlying uneasiness respecting him. Did he not desert his original calling as a missionary? Did he not forget the souls of the heathen in his consuming desire to trace the fountains of the Nile? Was he not wilful, impracticable, and one-sided in his judgments of men? Were not his companions in travel compelled, however reluctantly, to criticize unfavourably both his plans and his methods of carrying them out? Have not his praises been pitched in too high a key?

These questions found frequent utterance in Livingstone's lifetime; and although his extraordinary posthumous influence has tended to silence them, they have had to wait till now for a complete reply. But the reply, now it has come, is conclusive. Dr. Blaikie's "Personal Life" must satisfy the most sceptical; while the warmest admirers of Livingstone will find in it fresh cause for their admiration. The story of his travels is familiar enough; and the "Last Journals" gave us glimpses of his mind and heart not afforded by the books published under his own eye; but still *the man* was not there. At all events, if we have hitherto believed that he was there, Dr. Blaikie will undeceive us. We now obtain, for the first time, a full view of his life as a whole; of the providential leadings that shaped it from the beginning to the end; of the motives that guided it, the principles that ruled it, the objects for which it was lived, and for which it was laid down. Dr. Blaikie describes the purpose of his book as "to make the world acquainted with the character of Livingstone." "Those," he continues, "who knew him best feel that little is known of the strength of his affections, the depth and purity of his devotion, or the intensity of his aspirations as a Christian missionary. The growth of his character, and the providential shaping of his career, are also matters of remarkable interest, of which not much has yet been made known." The book abundantly fulfils its purpose. Few will lay it down without assenting to the author's remark, that Livingstone's life "shows the minimum of infirmity with the maximum of goodness," and is "an evidence of the truth and power of Christianity," "a plea for Christian missions and civilization," "a demonstration of the true connection between religion and science."

In the preparation of the work, Dr. Blaikie has had not only the recollections of Livingstone's family and friends, and his voluminous correspondence with them—for he was an untiring letter-writer—but also private diaries never yet published,

belonging to at least three important periods of his life. One of these, relating to his journey to Loanda, on the west coast, in 1853-4, is described as "probably the most wonderful thing of the kind ever taken on such a journey. It is a strongly bound quarto volume of more than 800 pages, with a lock and key. The writing is so neat and clear that it might almost be taken for lithograph." This diary differs materially from the printed record afterwards published. "It is," says Dr. Blaikie, "much more explicit in setting forth the bad treatment he often received. When he spoke of these things to the public, he made constant use of the mantle of charity, and the record of many a bad deed and many a bad character is toned down." Further, it is "more free in recording the play of his feelings. It does not hide the communings of his heart with his heavenly Father. It is built up in a random-rubble style; here a solemn prayer; in the next line a note of lunar observations; then a dissertation on the habits of the hippopotamus." It will readily be imagined how much light is thrown upon Livingstone's real character by the publication of extracts from a journal of this kind, as well as from many of his letters. To take one instance only. Every reader of "The Zambesi and its Tributaries" is startled by the quiet, not to say cold, way in which Livingstone there records the death of his wife. The real cause of this is, that he regarded that work as a kind of official report of the Zambesi Expedition, in which he could not properly give way to personal feeling; and we now find that, not only in his private journals, not only in letters to the bereaved mother (Mrs. Moffat), and to his own bereaved children, but in other letters "of the like tenor written to every intimate friend," he poured out his grief and the praises of her who was gone. For instance, to Sir Roderick Murchison, to whom he wrote, after referring to other matters, "It will somewhat ease my aching heart to tell you about my dear departed Mary Moffat, the faithful companion of eighteen years," and then went on to give a sketch of her life and labours, as well as all particulars of her last illness and death.

Let us take a rapid glance at some of the principal features of Livingstone's life as told by Dr. Blaikie. His family sprang from the island of Ulva, one of the same group as Staffa; and at the banquet given in his honour at Freemasons' Tavern in 1858, the present Duke of Argyll happily observed that "as Ulva was close to Iona, 'that illustrious island,' as Dr. Johnson called it, whence roving tribes and rude barbarians derived the benefits of knowledge and the blessings of religion, so might the son of Ulva carry the same blessings to Africa, and be remembered, perhaps, by millions of the human race as the first pioneer of civilization and the first harbinger of the Gospel." Dr. Blaikie notices the influence in several ways of his Highland blood

upon his character—for instance his appreciation of the tribal relations of the natives of Africa. Certainly his home life and education could scarcely have been more suitable as a preparation for his future work. His father was a man of “great spiritual earnestness,” a total abstainer, a Sunday-school teacher, an ardent member of a missionary society, at a time when to be so was to be a marked man in a sense we can hardly understand now; and it is related of him that he learned Gaelic on purpose to be able to read the Bible in that tongue to his mother. His wife, David’s mother, “contributed to the home a remarkable element of brightness and serenity,” and “it was the genial gentle influences that had moved him under her training that enabled Livingstone to move the savages of Africa.” The humble dwelling at Blantyre was ruled by “an industry that never lost an hour of the six days, and that welcomed and honoured the day of rest; a thrift that made the most of everything, though it never got far beyond the bare necessities of life; a self-restraint that admitted no stimulant within the door, and that faced bravely and steadily all the burdens of life; a love of books that showed the presence of a cultivated taste, with a fear of God that dignified the life which it moulded and controlled.”

David Livingstone’s boyhood was marked by not a few illustrations of the qualities afterwards so conspicuous in him. Once, when quite a child, on reaching home after dusk, at which time his father required them all to be indoors, he found the door barred. “He made no cry nor disturbance, but having preserved a piece of bread, sat down contentedly to pass the night on the doorstep,” where his mother looking out found him. At the age of nine he got a Testament from his Sunday-school teacher for repeating the 119th Psalm on two successive evenings with only five errors. Part of his first week’s wages as a piecer in a factory were spent on a Latin “Rudiments,” which he studied assiduously in every moment of leisure; and he “devoured all the books that came into his hands, except novels.” Nor was book-learning the only kind of study that attracted him. He was a student of Nature also, and scoured the country in search of specimens, botanical, geological, zoological.

From his twelfth year the great truths of the Gospel, which he had been most carefully taught, and which his mind had no difficulty in grasping, began to lay hold of his conscience. “He began to reflect on his state as a sinner, and became anxious to realize the state of mind that flows from the reception of the truth into the heart.” But he waited, and waited, for a great supernatural impulse within, instead of looking away from himself to Christ; and “at length his convictions were effaced, and

his feelings blunted." It was not until his twentieth year that he was enabled to enter into rest. The instrument in God's hand of the decisive change was Dick's *Philosophy of a Future State*. It opened his eyes; in his own words, he "saw the duty and inestimable privilege *immediately* to accept salvation by Christ," and "through sovereign grace and mercy was enabled to do so." Dr. Blaikie justly observes that "there can be no doubt that David Livingstone's heart was very thoroughly penetrated by the new life that now flowed into it." Of this his book supplies abundant evidence.

It was in the following year, apparently, that the first conscientious call to a missionary life came to him, from an appeal on behalf of China issued by Mr. Gutzlaff. To China his heart at once turned, and again and again, long afterwards, when his name had become indissolubly associated with Africa, we find his sympathies flowing out to the millions of the far East. It was with a view to service in that field that he resolved to obtain a medical education, and during two winters he managed to attend the medical classes at Glasgow, defraying his expenses, which he cut down to the lowest point, out of the wages he earned at the mill at Blantyre during the summer months. Before his course was finished he offered himself to the London Missionary Society, and was ultimately accepted. Some interesting recollections of him while studying at Ongar, where the Society had some young men training, are contributed to the Memoir by a fellow-student, the Rev. J. Moore, afterwards a missionary in Tahiti; among which is a notice of his attendance at the great meeting in Exeter Hall in 1840, to promote the Niger Expedition, when Prince Albert made his maiden speech in England, and Samuel Wilberforce his first reputation as a great platform orator.

The opium war stood in the way of Livingstone being sent to China, and the Directors of the Society, who evidently had no high opinion of his talents, and had very nearly parted with him in consequence of his failure as a preacher, proposed to send him to the West Indies; but against this he earnestly protested, on the ground that medical knowledge was not required by missionaries there. Just at this time he chanced to come across Dr. Moffat, who was then in England. Struck with the appeals of the great missionary, Livingstone asked him whether he would do for Africa. Moffat's answer, recorded by himself, was remarkable: "I said I believed he would, if he would not go to an old station, but would advance to unoccupied ground, specifying the vast plain to the north, where I had sometimes seen, in the morning sun, the smoke of a thousand villages, where no missionary had ever been." It was an unconscious prophecy, though no doubt the utterance of a shrewd perception that the young inquirer was

more fitted to be a pioneer than a pastor. But how strange that his steps should have been directed at the critical moment to Africa by a missionary who went out thither when Livingstone was only three years old, who subsequently became his father-in-law, and who has already survived him nearly nine years !

On December 8, 1840, David Livingstone sailed for Africa. It would be impossible here, and quite needless, to attempt even the briefest sketch of his career as a missionary and explorer. Its three great periods have been long before the public in the three well-known books, "Missionary Travels in South Africa," "The Zambesi and its Tributaries," and "The Last Journals." The two former were published respectively during the two visits to England which divided the first period from the second, and the second from the third—viz., in 1857-8 and 1864-5. But some of the features of his character and work which are brought into special prominence by Dr. Blaikie may be noted.

During the first ten years of his South African life we find him labouring assiduously as a regular station missionary in an uncivilized country. He himself said, at the Freemasons' Tavern banquet already alluded to, that in a country like Africa "the wife must be maid-of-all-work within, while the husband must be jack-of-all-trades without;" and Dr. Blaikie winds up the chapter on his residence at Kolobeng, among the Bakwain tribe, with a graphic picture of the variety of his occupations:—

"A jack-of-all-trades, he is building houses and schools, cultivating gardens, scheming in every manner of way how to get water; as a missionary, he is holding meetings every other night, preaching on Sundays, and taking such other opportunities as he can find to bring the people to Christ; as a medical man, he is dealing with the more difficult cases of disease; as a man of science, he is taking observations, collecting specimens, thinking out geographical, geological, meteorological and other problems bearing on the structure and condition of the continent; as a missionary statesman, he is planning how the natural force might be disposed of to most advantage, and is looking round in this direction and in that, over hundreds of miles, for openings for native agents; and to promote these objects he is writing long letters to the Directors, to the *Missionary Chronicle*, to the *British Banner*, to private friends, to any one likely to take an interest in his plans" (p. 95).

He was already corresponding with Professor Buckland, Professor Owen, and Mr. (afterwards Sir T.) Maclear, the Astronomer Royal at Cape Town. His religious teaching was that of a true-hearted evangelical missionary. A sermon preached at Cape Town (one of the very few he ever preached in English), the manuscript of which still exists, is described by his biographer as "very simple, scriptural, and earnest, in the style of Bishop Ryle or of Mr. Moody." Some letters to his children, which are

printed, are very pretty in their simplicity and perfect naturalness. Here is a bit of one to his eldest daughter, Agnes, aged five:—

“I shall not see you again for a long time, and I am very sorry. I have no Nannie now. I have given you back to Jesus, your Friend—your Papa who is in heaven. He is above you, but He is always near you. When we ask things from Him, that is praying to Him; and if you do or say a naughty thing, ask Him to pardon you, and bless you, and make you one of His children. Love Jesus much, for He loves you, and He came and died for you. Oh, how good Jesus is! I love Him, and I shall love Him as long as I live. You must love Him too, and you must love your brothers and mamma, and never tease them or be naughty, for Jesus does not like to see naughtiness” (p. 132).

If there is a true mark of the true missionary, it is love for the souls of the people among whom he labours. Had Livingstone that mark? The answer is simply this—that his private journals and letters teem with expressions of it. A broken finger is broken again by the recoil of a pistol fired at a lion which frightened his native companions on a journey, and they try to comfort him when they see the blood flowing, by saying, “You have hurt yourself, but you have redeemed us; henceforth we will only swear by you.” Upon which his comment is, in a letter to Dr. Risdon Bennett, “Poor creatures! I wish they had felt gratitude for the blood that was shed for their precious souls.” One of his native attendants dies suddenly of fever:—

“Poor Schamy,” he writes, “where art thou now? . . . Oh, am I guilty of the blood of thy soul, my poor dear Schamy? If so, how shall I look upon thee in the judgment? But I told thee of a Saviour: didst thou think of Him, and did He lead thee through the dark valley? Did He comfort as only He can? Help me, O Lord Jesus, to be faithful to every one. Remember me, and let me not be guilty of the blood of souls.”

No very marked results attended Livingstone’s labours at Kolobeng and the other stations in the south; but there were some baptisms, including that of Sechele, the Bakwain chief, who survives to this day, and still, “though not without some drawbacks, maintains his Christian profession.” But though the harvest was not reaped, the seed was faithfully sown. Livingstone seems to have gone out with the usual ardent expectations of a young missionary, and the actual condition of the Society’s missions disappointed him. The reaction led him to think their results had been exaggerated at home; but experience gave him a truer view of the case, and when he went into the interior, and saw heathenism “in all its unmitigated ferocity,” his opinion entirely changed, and he was enabled to thank God for what had been done among such a people. The conviction deepened in him—and he frequently gives

expression to it—that the number of conversions is not a fair test of the success of a mission; but that they are, however few, a true token that the mission has the Divine approval, and is therefore “of the right sort.” “A few conversions show whether God’s Spirit is in a mission or not;” “they show the direction of the stream which is set in motion by Him who rules the nations, and which is destined to overflow the world.” “We work for a glorious future, which we are not destined to see. We are only morning stars shining in the dark.” Accordingly, he thought it “more important to sow the seed broadcast over a wide field, than to reap a few heads of grain on a single spot. Concentration was not the true theory of Missions.” Perhaps Livingstone pressed this view too far; and certainly we sometimes find his perception of what a particular district needed leading him to conclusions not consistent with it, as when he says of one tribe he met with on a journey, “A permanent station among them might effect something in time, but a considerable time is necessary.” Exactly. Only by a permanent station, worked with unflinching patience, can the leaven be deposited which will by-and-by leaven the whole lump. The fact is, there is room for both methods, and neither can be spared. Livingstone’s pioneer work is indispensable; and so is the daily round of patient toil in one spot, such as that of Robert Noble for twenty-four years in one school, the influence of which is felt to-day through a whole province, or that of J. T. Tucker, for as long a period in one Tinnevely “circle,” baptizing in that time three thousand persons with his own hands.

From the first, Livingstone’s motto for himself was “Forward.” Within two years of his arrival in Africa he had founded a new station, concerning which he wrote to the Directors that he hoped they would approve of it; but if not, he was ready to go “anywhere, *provided it be forward.*” More than one of his earlier journeys was undertaken in the teeth of protests from others, including Mrs. Moffat. But he held to Sir Herbert Edwardes’s maxim—“He who has to act on his own responsibility is a slave if he does not act on his own judgment,” while seeking guidance for that judgment by great minuteness in his prayers, and constant watchfulness for “all the providential indications that might throw light on the Divine Will.” And, as Dr. Blaikie happily observes, “it was in front, and not in rear, that he expected to find the pillar of cloud and the pillar of fire.” And very interesting are his retrospects from time to time of “all the way that the Lord had led him,” in which he traces the distinct and often unexpected providential direction vouchsafed to him; particularly in a letter to the London Missionary Society, which is printed in an appendix to the volume.

He warmly resented the application to his travels of the term "wanderings." "The very word," he said, "contains a lie coiled like a serpent in its bosom. It means travelling without an object, or uselessly."

When he came to England in 1856, after his first great journey from Lake Ngami to Loanda, and thence right across Africa, from the west to the east coast, honours of all kinds were lavished upon him, and two very interesting chapters detail his reception by the Royal Geographical Society, the British Association, the Universities, leading statesmen like Lord Palmerston and Lord Clarendon, and the Queen herself. But he did not escape criticism from those who thought more of the spread of the Gospel than of geographical discoveries. The London Missionary Society, indeed, gave him a warm reception, and Lord Shaftesbury, who presided at its meeting on the occasion, spoke in the highest terms of him and his work. But his sturdy countrymen in Scotland shook their heads; and both his public addresses and his book, the "Missionary Travels," were complained of as lacking in missionary tone. Yet Livingstone invariably spoke of the opening up of Africa to the Gospel as his one great ruling purpose. Writing to Sir Roderick Murchison on the completion of his journey across the continent, he used this pregnant phrase, "*The end of the geographical feat is only the beginning of the enterprise;*" and to a crowded meeting in the Town Hall at Cambridge he said, "I contend that we ought not to be ashamed of our religion, and had we not kept this so much out of sight in India, we should not now be in such straits in that country [referring to the Indian Mutiny]. Let us appear what we are. For my part, I intend to be a missionary. My object in Africa is not only the elevation of man, but that the country might be so opened that man might see the need of his soul's salvation." At the same time he was exhorting the members of Scottish literary and scientific institutes, before whom he lectured, "to accept God's offers of mercy in Christ, and give themselves wholly to Him," and diffusing a happy Christian influence in houses where he stayed, as Dr. Risdon Bennett and others testify. One gentleman writes: "He usually conducted our family worship. On Sunday mornings he always gave us a text for the day. His prayers were very direct and simple, just like a child asking his father for what he needed."

Nevertheless, Livingstone felt that the pioneer work to which he now intended to devote his life could not be undertaken by the London Missionary Society and at its expense, and he resigned his connection with it—against the advice of one of his best friends, Mr. J. B. Braithwaite, who feared the effect of such a step upon the mind of the Christian public. The effect dreaded was at once produced; but looking back now, most readers of

this volume will judge Livingstone to have been right. In fact he was going out in an entirely new capacity. His visit had greatly quickened the interest of England in Africa; the public realized now that what they had supposed to be a vast sandy desert was a magnificent country, needing only the introduction of lawful commerce and civilization, and the stoppage of the desolating slave trade, to make it enormously productive; and the Government were maturing a plan for the exploration of the great river whose course he had tracked, the Zambesi, and had appointed him commander of the expedition, and Consul for the East Coast. Lord Palmerston and Lord Clarendon needed no encouragement to enter upon such a work, but if they did, Lord Shaftesbury and Sir R. Murchison were ready to give it. It is not of course to be supposed that all who promoted the scheme shared in Livingstone's own desires and hopes. But if they did not, like him, view exploration as the means and missionary enterprise as the end, they were only too glad to recognize the value of missionary influence as a means to their own end. Eight years before, when the Geographical Society voted the yet scarcely known missionary £25 for the discovery of Lake Ngami, the then President acknowledged that the feat was due to his influence as a Christian missionary with the natives; and when, in 1855, the gold medal was awarded him, Lord Ellesmere spoke of "his work in science as subordinate to those higher ends which he had ever prosecuted in the true spirit of a missionary."

The Zambesi expedition, with the exploration of the Shiré valley and the discovery of Lake Nyassa, cover the second period of Livingstone's African career, 1858-64. It is difficult to realize now the state of our knowledge of the Dark Continent at the time he sailed. Nothing was then known of the great lakes now so familiar to us, except that the famous map, drawn by Rebmann, of the Church Missionary Society, from native sources, had recently astonished the geographical world with the representation of a huge inland sea covering twelve degrees of latitude; and when Livingstone discovered Nyassa he wrote home: "This is what the Church Missionary Society has been thinking of for many years." But while this period of six years, through his researches and those of Burton and Speke and Grant, completely reconstructed our maps of Central Africa, they were a time of sore distress and disappointment to Livingstone. In earlier years his indignation had been aroused by the barbarous treatment of the native races by a professedly Christian people, the Boers of the Transvaal; and now he found another nation statistically reckoned as Christian, the Portuguese, dogging his steps and throwing all sorts of obstacles in his path in the interests of the slave trade. After two or three years' experience of them on the Zambesi, he wrote: "After all, I am con-

vinced that, *were Christianity not divine, it would be trampled out by its professors.*" But his disgust at the wickedness of so-called Christians did not beguile him, as some have been beguiled, into the notion that Mohammedanism was the panacea for the miseries of Africa. On the contrary, he again and again denounces it as "worse than African heathenism." Years afterwards, when he had seen more of Moslem influence farther north, this conviction was fully confirmed. In one place he writes:—

"I have travelled more than most people, and with all sorts of followers. The Christians of Kuruman and Kolobeng were out of sight the best I ever had. The Makololo, who were very partially Christianized, were next best—honest, truthful and brave. Heathen Africans are much superior to the Mohammedans, who are the most worthless one can have."

Perhaps the heaviest of his disappointments at this period was the failure of what had awakened his liveliest hopes, the Universities' Mission. It was the fruit of his own Cambridge speeches, and he welcomed it to the Zambesi with unaffected delight. Proportionately keen was his distress, first at its adoption in some respects of methods of dealing with the natives which he did not approve; then, at the untimely death of its devoted leader, Bishop Mackenzie, for whom personally he expresses the warmest regard ("He is A 1," he wrote, "and in his readiness to put his hand to anything resembles my good father-in-law Moffat"); then, at the attempt made by some of its members to throw the blame of the failure on himself; finally at its abandonment of the enterprise. When Bishop Tozer, Mackenzie's successor, resolved to remove the mission to the island of Zanzibar, Livingstone declared he could "sit down and cry." He wrote an imploring appeal to Dr. Tozer. "I hope, dear Bishop," he said, "you will not think me impertinent in thus writing to you with a sore heart. I see that, if you go, the last ray of hope for this wretched, trodden-down people disappears, and I again from the bottom of my heart entreat you to reconsider the matter, and may the All-wise One guide to that decision which will be most for His glory." It is pleasant to think that the country he thus pleaded for is now the field of flourishing missions, sent forth by his Scottish countrymen, and that the principal station bears the name of Livingstonia. Nor should it be forgotten that the Universities' Mission itself has latterly, under its third Bishop, Dr. Steere, resumed aggressive work upon the continent, though in a more northern latitude.

In the midst of these trials came the death of his wife, to which allusion has already been made; and in 1863 the Zambesi

expedition was recalled. "I don't know," wrote Livingstone, "whether I am to go on the shelf or not. If I do, I make Africa the shelf." However, in the following year he came to England, and was again received with enthusiasm. Space will not allow of any notice of his doings in this country; but an incisive reference to his examination before a Parliamentary Committee on West African matters may be quoted:—

"The monstrous mistake of the Burton school is this: they ignore the point-blank fact that the men that do the most for the mean whites are the same that do the most for the mean blacks, and you never hear one mother's son of them say, 'You do wrong to give to the whites.' I told the Committee I had heard people say that Christianity made the blacks worse, but did not agree with them. I might have said it was 'rot,' and truly. I can stand a good deal of bosh, but to tell me that Christianity makes people worse—ugh!"

In August, 1865, Livingstone left England for the third and last time. What was his object now? Primarily, it was, in his own words, to make "another attempt to open Africa to civilizing influences;" "to endeavour to commence that system on the east which has been so eminently successful on the west coast—a system combining the repressive efforts of Her Majesty's cruisers with lawful trade and Christian missions—the moral and material results of which have been so gratifying." We think of him, on these last journeys, as wandering this way and that in search of the fountains of the Nile, and—*pace* his objection to the term "wandering"—it came pretty much to that. But this was not his own original purpose. While he was in England, Sir R. Murchison, who never concealed his own opinion that "missionary enterprise encumbered and impeded geographical," formally proposed to him that he should undertake the determination of the watersheds of South Africa, "unshackled by other avocations than those of the geographical explorer." Livingstone "would not consent to go simply as a geographer, but as a missionary, and do geography by the way." He would go "to have intercourse with the people," and do what he could "to enlighten them on the slave trade, and give them some idea of our religion." And on his last Sunday in England he assured Dr. James Hamilton's congregation in Regent Square that it was "as much as ever his great object to proclaim the love of Christ." He accepted Sir R. Murchison's proposal, however, as a secondary object, and fitted out an expedition for a prolonged journey of exploration. But, said he,

"I mean to make this a Christian expedition, telling a little about Christ wherever we go. His love in coming down to save men will be our theme. I dislike very much to make my religion distasteful to others. This, with ——'s hypocritical ostentation, made me have

fewer religious services on the Zambesi than would have been desirable, perhaps. . . . Though there is an antipathy in the human heart to the gospel of Christ, yet when Christians make their good works shine, all admire them. . . . The Lord help me to act in all cases in this expedition as a Christian should!"

Undoubtedly the geographical problem itself gradually fascinated Livingstone's mind. The Nile came to have a sacred character in his thoughts as a Bible river. Moses, who had floated upon it as an infant in his ark of bulrushes, had perhaps, as a man, visited those distant fountain-heads, and if he could only discover any confirmation of sacred history, he would not grudge all the toil and pain and hardship he had undergone. And it is touching to observe how he clung to the hope that the Lualaba was indeed the Nile, even when doubts would inject themselves into his mind that it was the Congo after all—as we now know it is. Still, even in all these communings with himself and his correspondents, he did desire above all that his geographical researches might be used to arouse attention to his pleadings for the African race. Only a few months before his death he wrote:—"The Nile sources are only valuable to me as a means of enabling me to open my mouth with power among men. It is this power I hope to apply to remedy an enormous evil, and join my little helping hand in the enormous revolution that in His all-embracing providence He has been carrying on for ages." Again, to his daughter Agnes, about the same time:—"No one can estimate the amount of God-pleasing good that will be done, if, by Divine favour, this awful slave trade, into the midst of which I have come, be abolished. This will be something to have lived for, and the conviction has grown in my mind that it was *for this end* I have been detained so long." And on his last birthday, six weeks before the end, the entry in his journal is:—"Can I hope for ultimate success? So many obstacles have arisen. Let not Satan prevail over me, O my good Lord Jesus!"

All the world has followed the story of those last seven years as unfolded in the "Last Journals." Dr. Blaikie has not much fresh materials to present, but there are some interesting private letters. In his pages we are carried rapidly from Zanzibar to Nyassa and Tanganyika, across the latter lake into Manyuema (where Livingstone, during his eighteen months' detention, read the whole Bible through four times); back to Ujiji; with Stanley round the lake, and to Unyanyembe; and thence on the last weary journey into the country round Lake Bangweolo, where, worn out with fatigue and sickness, David Livingstone, on his knees, by his bedside in Chitambo's unnamed village in Ilala, yielded up his brave and humble spirit to his Saviour. But, as Dr. Blaikie well observes, in a very interesting concluding

chapter on the great traveller's posthumous influence, "his heart was laid under the mvula tree in Ilala, and his bones in Westminster Abbey; but his spirit marched on. The history of his life is not completed with the record of his death. The continual cry of his heart to be permitted to finish his work was answered—answered thoroughly, though not in the way he thought of. The thrill that went through the civilized world when his death, and all its touching circumstances, became known, did more for Africa than he could have done had he completed his task and spent years in this country following it up." And while, as Professor Owen both justly and generously said, in his *Quarterly Review* article on Livingstone, in April, 1875, "Of his primary work (as a missionary) the record is on high—the seeds of the Word of Life implanted lovingly, with pains and labour, and, above all, with faith, the out-door scenes of the simple Sabbath service, the testimony of Him to whom the worship was paid, given in terms of such simplicity as were fitted to the comprehension of the dark-skinned listeners, these seeds will not have been scattered by him in vain"—we see on every side the fruits of his pioneer work in opening up Africa, and drawing thither the sympathies of Christendom. Could Livingstone have known what a few short years would do for the land of his adoption—could he have seen the slave trade, over whose miseries he wept such bitter tears, almost at an end within four years of his death, and miniature Sierra Leones springing up on the East Coast—could he have watched the missionary parties penetrating the interior and establishing their stations on the familiar shores of Nyassa and Tanganyika, and by the still greater lake which he never saw, the Victoria Nyanza—how he would have lifted up his voice in thanksgiving to "his good Lord Jesus!"

EUGENE STOCK.

ART. III.—PREACHING THE WORD.

THE *ordinance* of preaching appears to have existed from the earliest times. St. Jude tells us that Enoch, the seventh from Adam, testified against the ungodly deeds of his own generation, and that he prophesied of the second coming of the Lord Jesus to judge mankind. St. Peter, too, speaks of Noah as a "preacher of righteousness." After the Flood, heads of families instructed their respective households; and in subsequent times we find a regular succession of prophets and sons of prophets. It is accordingly written (2 Chron. xvii.), to the praise of the godly king Jehoshaphat, that he sent forth Levites and priests to teach in the cities of Judah. "And they taught,"

it is said, "in Judah, and had the book of the law of the Lord with them; and they went about throughout all the cities of Judah and taught the people." And what was the blessing granted to this national establishment of religion? The blessing granted was national prosperity, in accordance with the Divine promise. "Them that honour me," whether nations or individuals, "I will honour." "And the fear of the Lord," it is said, "fell upon all the kingdoms and the lands that were round about Judah, so that they made no war against Jehoshaphat." It appears that at and after this date the people were accustomed to assemble in appointed places on the sabbaths and new moons and other solemnities, to worship God and receive instructions from his prophets. Hence we read that, when the Shunammite asked her husband to send to her one of the young men and one of the asses, that she might go and see Elisha, her husband replied, "Wherefore wilt thou go to him to-day? It is neither new moon nor sabbath." Four hundred and sixty years afterwards we find Ezra reading and expounding the Scriptures, and that, too, in very much the same way as prevails amongst ourselves now.

And all the people (Neh. viii.) gathered themselves together as one man into the street that was before the water gate. And Ezra the priest brought the law before the congregation both of men and women, and all that could hear with understanding. And he read therein from the morning until mid-day. And Ezra the scribe stood upon a pulpit of wood which, they had made for the purpose. And the Levites caused the people to understand the law. So they read in the book of the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense and caused them to understand the reading.

There was first the public reading of God's Word and then the preaching, as is our own custom.

I need not mention how the Lord sent Isaiah, Jeremiah and all the prophets with messages to his people, and how the Lord says continually that the messages delivered were really His, and not theirs. And therefore we read "The Lord spake to Manasseh"—"I have spoken unto you." The same was the case in the times of our Lord. All Christ's ministers are sent by the Lord Jesus. "Christ sent me," says St. Paul. First of all He sent forth his twelve Apostles. He afterwards sent out other seventy also, that they should go and preach in the cities and towns of Judæa. These He commissioned to send others. And of all these His ministering servants He says, "As the Father sent Me, even so I send you, He that heareth you heareth Me."

The present dispensation may well, therefore, be called a preaching dispensation. John the Baptist, our Lord's forerunner, was a preacher. He preached in the wilderness of Judæa, and vast congregations assembled to listen to his bold and faithful exhor-

tations. When asked what he was, he replied he was a voice—"the voice of one crying in the wilderness." Our Lord, too, was a preacher. In the synagogue He opened his great commission by reading the sixty-first chapter of Isaiah, "The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me to preach." He then told the assembly that on that day that Scripture was being fulfilled. And the hearers wondered at the gracious words which proceeded out of his lips. On another occasion, when John had sent to ask whether He were the Messiah or not, He gave as one proof of his being the Messiah that He was "a preacher"—a preacher to "the poor." The Holy Ghost sets his seal to this ordinance of preaching. On that memorable day of Pentecost, when Peter was the preacher, the Holy Ghost applied the Word with power to 3,000 souls. On other occasions, we read, the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the Word. There are many serious mistakes made at the present day upon this subject. Some will tell us that preaching is all right and proper to convert sinners, but that the Lord uses other means to build up believers. Others affirm that preaching is all right and proper for the Christian missionary taking his stand among idolaters, but that it is not wanted in a settled Christian community. Now there are various texts in Scripture which serve to show that preaching is God's great ordinance for the conversion of sinners, and that it is as much needed by professed Christians as it is for Jews and heathens. In Rom. x. preaching is spoken of as the great means of *conversion*. The Apostle's argument is this: "How shall men be saved, unless they call upon the Lord Jesus? but how shall they call upon a Saviour in whom they do not believe? and how can they believe in Him of whom they have never heard? and how can they hear unless one is sent to preach?" We see the order: first preaching, then hearing, then faith, then prayer to Christ, and then conversion and salvation. In 1 Tim. iv. we have preaching brought before us as the means of *edification* to professed believers. Timothy was placed over a Christian community at Ephesus. What was St. Paul's solemn advice to Timothy occupying that position? It was this: "I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ—preach, preach the Word." The same was the view taken by our Reformers as to this ordinance. In the 19th Article they say: "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached." The 23rd Article speaks of the "office of public preaching." And, as so few of the clergy at the time of the Reformation could preach, a book of homilies was prepared by Cranmer and others, "to be read in churches by the ministers, diligently and distinctly, that they may be understood of the people." In the Ordination Service ministers are

exhorted "to teach and to premonish, to feed and provide for the Lord's family;" and a prayer is then offered that "God's Word spoken by their mouths may have such success, that it may never be spoken in vain." "We cannot be saved," cried Latimer, in one of his sermons before King Edward VI., "without faith; and faith cometh by the hearing of the Word. I tell you preaching is the footstep of the ladder of Heaven, of our salvation. There must be preaching, if we look to be saved. This is the thing the devil wrestleth most against. It hath been his study to deny this office. Through 700 years he hath set up in this realm a state of unpreaching prelacy. He hath made unpreaching prelates. He hath stirred up by heaps to persecute this office; and thus preaching God's Word hath been trodden underfoot." "Fifteen masses in a church daily," writes Bishop Hooper, "were not too many for the priests of Baal; and should one sermon every day be too much for a godly population and evangelical preacher?" These quotations will explain the high views taken by our Reformers of this ordinance. This, happily, is a preaching age; and as our Saviour preached sometimes in boats, sometimes on the sides of mountains, sometimes on the sea-shore, sometimes in the Temple, sometimes in synagogues, and sometimes in private houses, so in the present day Christ's ministers are seen preaching, not only in cathedrals and churches and schoolrooms, but also in factories and workshops, in mines and quarries, in the pleasure-fair and on the race-course, and in any place where they can find congregations to listen. And a blessed sight it is! We may well exclaim:—

There stands the messenger of truth! There stands
 The legate of the skies! His theme divine!
 His office sacred! His credentials clear!
 By him the violated law speaks out
 Its thunders; and by him, in strains as sweet
 As angels use, the Gospel whispers peace.

COWPER.

The Lord the Spirit bless the Word so spoken, that sinners may everywhere be converted, and Christ's elect people be everywhere edified and comforted! I say, "the *Word* spoken." We are to preach, not our own views and speculations, but "the *Word*."

Let us ask, therefore, what is to be the *subject* of our preaching? The subject of preaching is "the *Word*," "God's *Word* written." Now in that *Word* there is an infinite variety. There need, therefore, be no sameness in the subject-matter of our preaching. The histories, the promises, the threatenings, the precepts, the prophecies—all in their turn may be handled to the hearers' edification. The preacher, too, must have the fullest

confidence in the truth of this Word. Like his Divine Master, he must, in every part of his teaching, only be satisfied when he can say, "Thus saith the Lord;" "Thus and thus is it written;" "Well saith the Holy Ghost." Like St. Paul, he must be able to regard Scripture as the voice of the Holy Ghost Himself. Remarkable are his words: "The *Scripture* hath concluded all under sin." "The *Scripture*, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith." I need not say, however, that as ministers have so few opportunities—in many cases only one in each week—for addressing their people, it is most important that they should choose, as the subject for that precious half-hour, the weightiest topics; not some little points, but topics bearing on the vital subjects of sin and salvation, repentance and faith—repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ. The "Word" is full of the sin of man and of the redemption by Christ Jesus. The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy. "Search the Scriptures," said Jesus, "for they are they which testify of Me." It is the Gospel of his dear Son that the Lord makes the "power of God" unto salvation. We must, therefore, continually explain how the Word shows man's utterly lost and ruined estate by reason of Adam's fall. We must also as clearly explain how Christ's atoning sacrifice on the cross is the only mode whereby the sinner can be reconciled to God. For this cause it was St. Paul's determination to know nothing in preaching the Word save Jesus Christ and Him crucified. We must make all our sermons point more or less to Christ. We may as well speak of a village having no road to the metropolis, as of any point of Christian practice or doctrine that has no reference to the cross of Christ. One of our good bishops, Bishop Reynolds, wrote sensible advice to his clergy, when he said, "Preach Christ Jesus the Lord. Let His name and grace, His Spirit and love, triumph in the midst of all your sermons. Let your great end be to glorify Christ in the heart and to render Christ amiable and precious in the eyes of His people, to lead them to Him, as a sanctuary to protect them, as a propitiation to reconcile them, as a treasure to enrich them, as a physician to heal them, as wisdom to counsel them, as righteousness to justify them, as sanctification to renew them, and as redemption to save them. Let Christ be the diamond to shine in the bosom of all your sermons." "Let there be much of Christ in your ministry," was the Missionary Eliot's advice to a young minister. "Let your sermons be dyed in the blood of the Redeemer," was the strong language of another devoted servant of the Lord Jesus. "People wonder," said good Mr. Romaine, "why it is we are always preaching Christ. But the truth is, we have nothing else to preach." And so said the great Apostle: "Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man

in all wisdom that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus." On the *subject-matter* of our sermons, however, I must say no more. On this a volume might be written.

I would only, in concluding this brief sketch, add a few words as to the *manner* of our preaching. The question whether written or unwritten sermons are best is a difficult one to settle. Most writers on the subject, like Charles Bridges in his "Christian Ministry," end by saying that, after all, local circumstances and personal qualifications must decide the matter. For myself, however, I cannot but think that, in eleven cases out of every twelve, the unwritten address is far more effective for good than that which is written. The unwritten sermon, however, ought to cost as much thought and prayer as the one committed to paper. The late Canon Conway was an eminent example of a painstaking writer of sermons. We may say of him, as it was said of Solomon, that he was wise, and still gave good heed, and sought out suitable food for his flock. As a preacher, he sought to find out acceptable words; and that which was written was upright, even words of truth. His words were indeed as goads, as nails fastened by a wise master of assemblies, all given, in answer to prayer, by the one Shepherd. After his lamented death one of his lay friends wrote:—

His sermons were "apples of gold in pictures of silver." The precious truths were so admirably grouped, the expository and the practical were so blended, that it was a picture both composed and framed in a symmetrical form, without appearance of art, and all tending to solemn edification. The tones of his voice and the expression of his face imparted the fervour and freshness of devotion to his words; whilst the easy flow of his well-arranged matter took off all feeling of stiffness from the reading of his sermons.

Another friend, a clergyman, shows us the method which Canon Conway adopted in his pulpit preparation. After saying, "From his clear teaching I first understood the way of salvation," he gives an extract from a letter which Canon Conway had written to him on the occasion of his ordination. The extract was this:—

I am sure you will find that your success in influencing others will be measured by the power which the truth has over your own heart. I have often prayed that I might not deal in *unfelt truth*. Let me strongly urge you never to stint time for sermon writing, and not to allow even fluency of utterance to detain you from writing, as a rule, one sermon weekly for many years to come. My plan always is, after choosing a text, to ruminate on it and chew it into its own natural divisions. . . . Attend carefully to the words of Scripture—the originals. I was much struck with Mr. H. Venn's advice to me when a very young man: "Get up your Bible." Be a deep reader of the Word, and your people's souls will not fail to fatten on the food you give them.

As Canon Conway well observes, those who desire successfully to preach the Word must be "deep readers of the Word." In doing this we shall become wise householders, bringing out of our treasures not only things that are old but also things that are new. May God, the Lord of the harvest, raise up many such preachers at home and abroad for our Zion! May we never cease to teach and preach Jesus! "A philosopher," says Mr. Cecil, "may philosophize his hearers; but only the preaching of Christ will convert them. Men may preach Christ ignorantly, blunderingly, absurdly; yet God will give it efficacy, because He is determined to magnify his own ordinance." "My Word," God says, "shall not return unto Me void." If, like Ezekiel, we first preach the Word and then pray for the Holy Spirit to breathe upon our slain, those slain will live, to the glory of God's saving grace.

In this matter, however, we must never forget how responsible is the hearer. While the Lord Jesus, the great Head of the Church, says to ministers, "Take heed what ye preach! See that ye preach my Word, and my Word only," He says, at the same time, to the hearers, "Take heed what ye hear, and take heed how ye hear. The Word that I have spoken to you, by the mouths of my ministers, the same shall judge you at the last day." A solemn reflection it is that, while our preaching is to some of our people a savour of life unto life, it is made to others, by their continued impenitence, a savour of death unto death. It was this thought that induced a former Vicar of Bocking, in Essex, to compose for himself the following epitaph, which was engraved after his decease upon his tombstone:—

In yonder sacred house I spent my breath :
 Now silent, senseless, here I lie in death :
 These lips again shall wake, and then declare
 A dread *Amen* to truths I published there.

How soon our opportunity of preaching Christ will be over! Whenever, therefore, we ascend the pulpit we should seek, by the Holy Spirit's aid, to have our feelings in full accordance with what were good Richard Baxter's, when he said—

I'll preach as if I ne'er should preach again,
 And as a dying man to dying men.

"O sirs!" says Baxter again, "they are no trifles or jesting matters that the Gospel speaks of. . . . And for myself, I am ashamed of my dull and careless heart, and of my slow and unprofitable course of life. The Lord knows that I am ashamed of every sermon that I preach. When I think what I am, and who sent me, and how much the salvation and damnation of men is concerned in it, I am ready to tremble lest God should

judge me a slihter of his truth and the souls of men, and lest in my best sermon I should be guilty of their blood." "Take heed unto thyself," writes St. Paul to Timothy, "and unto the doctrine. Continue in them; for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee."

C. CLAYTON.

ART. IV.—COMPREHENSION.

IN the eye of the law of England the Church of England is, for many purposes, though not for all, co-extensive with the people of England. In this view "Church and State" is the same body regarded under different aspects. The State is the Church, viewed in its secular aspect. The Church is the State viewed in its religious aspect. Many illustrations of this might be given. Take the parish. In estimating the population of a parish, no subdivision of the parishioners into "Churchmen" and "Nonconformists," or "Churchmen" and "Dissenters" is ever made. In forming a new Peel parish, in building a new district church, the population is dealt with *in globo*, and not in a fragmentary, and (so to speak) schismatic, way. The notion that the parson's cure of souls is limited to the actual members of his "congregation" is utterly opposed to the genius of the Established Church. It is purely a dissenting notion. All who reside within the bounds of the parish are the parson's parishioners, and have a common interest in his spiritual ministrations. That interest is certainly not limited by any denominational landmarks. Take another illustration—the vestry. The vestry is an assembly of the parson, churchwardens, and the parishioners contributing to public burthens. The parson is *ex officio* chairman of the vestry. Is a vestryman asked whether he is a member of the Church of England? No. It is assumed that he is so. The only test is his qualification as a ratepayer.

Let us ascend higher, and take the two Houses of Parliament. It is a source of dissatisfaction to many that a body which is said to be composed of men of various denominations, or of men of no denomination at all, should be permitted to legislate for the Church of England. But the State makes no inquiry into the creed of the members of the Legislature. Its only test is the oath of allegiance—loyalty to the Sovereign. It is, to all intents and purposes, assumed that the members of the Legislature are members of the Church of England. Parliament legislates for the Church of England. Why? Because the Church of England is the English nation. The English nation, through

its chosen representatives and the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, legislates for itself—in Church as well as in State. “Quod omnes tangit ab omnibus tractari et approbari debet.”

There is nothing which ought to endear the Prayer-Book so much to Englishmen as the fact that it is interwoven with our national life. The first Prayer-Book of Edward VI.'s reign emanated from the authority of Parliament. The second Prayer-Book of Edward VI.'s reign emanated from the authority of Parliament. The Royal Prerogative smoothed the way for the Legislature by appointing Royal Commissions to prepare the measures to be submitted to it. The Prayer-Book of Queen Elizabeth's reign emanated from the authority of Parliament. Convocation opposed it, passing resolutions in favour of the Pope. The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge opposed it. Yet so powerful was the tide of national feeling in its favour, that, in spite of the antagonism of Lords Spiritual, it passed the House of Lords in two days; and it passed the House of Commons in three! There was no Royal Commission to smooth the way of the Legislature in this case, only a small committee of divines, meeting at the house of Sir Thomas Smith! Oddly enough, it was this extremely *secular* Prayer-Book which first contained the Ornaments Rubric!¹

The Statute-Book of the Realm, and the public documents issued by virtue of the Royal Supremacy, bear eloquent testimony to the large and comprehensive spirit in which our parliaments and sovereigns desired to act in effecting ecclesiastical reforms. In the very first sentence of the first statute of the reign of King Edward VI. we find these words:—

The King's most Excellent Majesty, minding [*i.e.*, desiring] the governance and order of his most loving subjects to be in most perfect unity and concord in all things, and, in especial, in the true faith and religion of God.

Parliament, in the recital to the first Act of Uniformity of King Edward VI. (2 & 3 Ed. VI. c. 1), declares that its motive for approving of the Book of Common Prayer is a consideration of—

The favour of God and the great quietness which, by the grace of God, shall ensue upon the one and uniform rite, and order, and external ceremonies to be used throughout England.

The warrant of Charles II. for the Conference at the Savoy, after a brief recital, proceeds as follows:—

We, in accomplishment of our continued and constant care and study for the peace and unity of the churches within our dominions,

¹ See, as to this, Dr. Cardwell's "Conferences on the Prayer-Book."

and for the removal of all exceptions and differences from amongst our good subjects, for or concerning the Book of Common Prayer, or anything therein contained, do appoint you to advise upon and review the said Book of Common Prayer.

The Commission issued by King William III. and Queen Mary for a review of the Liturgy in 1689, after a short recital, proceeds thus :—

We, out of our pious and princely care for the good order and edification and unity of the Church of England, committed to our charge and care, and for reconciling, as much as possible, of all differences among our good subjects, and to take away all occasions of the like for the future, have thought fit to empower you to meet and prepare such alterations of the Liturgy and Canons, as, in your judgments, may most conduce to the ends above mentioned.

Thrice, in the post-Reformation period, have golden opportunities presented themselves of establishing corporate reunion between conforming and non-conforming Churchmen: on the accession of the House of Stuart, on the restoration of Charles II., and on the accession of William and Mary. If it was the fault of James I. that corporate reunion was not achieved at the Hampton Court Conference, it certainly was not the fault of Charles II. that corporate reunion was not established at the Savoy Conference, or of William III. that corporate reunion was not effected by the passing of the Bill "for uniting His Majesty's Protestant subjects." James I. detested the Puritans, and, writing to a friend of his in Scotland, he said, describing the Hampton Court Conference :—

We have kept such a revel with the Puritans as was never heard the like. I have peppered them as soundly as ye have done the Papists there. . . . I have such a book of theirs as may well convert infidels, but it shall never convert me, except by turning me more earnestly against them.¹

A Conference conducted in such a spirit was not likely to be productive of any beneficial results. Charles II. and William III., as we have already seen, were not of the same stubborn disposition. The Savoy Conference failed, according to Dr. Cardwell,² "owing to the headstrong disposition of the Nonconformists," and especially of Richard Baxter.³ Both parties, however, seem to me to have laboured to achieve, not "unity and concord," but victory. Bishop Burnet⁴ ascribes the failure of the

¹ Cott. Libr. Vespasianum, F. 3.

² "History of the Conferences on the Prayer-Book," p. 261.

³ The presentation to the Conference of an *entirely new Prayer Book* composed by him is an illustration.

⁴ Bishop Burnet's "Own Times," vol. iv. p. 59.

efforts to carry a measure of Comprehension, on the accession of William and Mary, to the Jacobite clergy, who "raised such a clamour" against it, that they "prevented its being carried." The authors of the "History of Dissenters,"¹ ascribe its failure to the "violence of the spirit of the times."

In the Archbishop of Canterbury's recent opening Visitation Address, at Croydon, his Grace used the idea of Comprehension in a much wider sense than that with which we are more immediately concerned. "The Church of England," he said, "seems to me to be more and more becoming a centre for *all* the Churches which protest against the Roman usurpation." He instanced the Syrian, Armenian, Chaldean, Nestorian, Coptic and Greek Churches, — Oriental Christianity; the Old Catholics; the Swiss, German, and French Protestants; the Moravians; the Swedish Lutheran Church; the Protestant Churches of North America, Episcopal and Non-Episcopal; and the Protestant Dissenters at home. "The circle of our influence," said his Grace, "is extending. . . . The Oriental Christians show a lively interest in our co-operation, and desire to know more of us, and to act with us in a fraternal spirit." "It will be our own fault," he added, "if *all* the Protestant communities throughout the world, episcopal and non-episcopal, do not feel that their cause is indissolubly united with ours." It must be highly gratifying to all loyal Churchmen to learn, on the testimony of so competent a witness as his Grace of Canterbury, that the Church of England is attracting to herself the affectionate regard and esteem of the entire mass of non-Papal Christianity, both Oriental and Protestant. God grant that she may prove herself worthy of the faith and hope reposed in her!

It is evident, however, that the Church of England, herself a National Church, cannot in the nature of things enter into corporate union with the Oriental Churches, or with foreign Protestant Communions. She may form a "centre" for them to rally round, but she cannot absorb them or amalgamate with them. The body which has been most successful in illustrating the power of British and foreign Protestants to concentrate their energies into one focus is the Evangelical Alliance. But "alliance" is a very different thing from corporate union.

It may not be uninteresting to note the aspects in which this question of "Comprehension" is viewed by the three great schools of thought—as they are now euphuistically termed—in the Church of England.

The Broad Church view has found an amiable exponent in the Dean of Westminster. Writing to the *Northern Echo*, in

¹ Vol. i. p. 207.

reference to some remarks of the editor on "The Nationalization of the Church"—a phrase used by the *Times*, in reproducing the letter—Dean Stanley observes :—

1. You propose that, under certain regulations, the various Non-conforming communities might make use of the parish church for their own religious services at such hours as would not interfere with the regular services. This is perfectly permissible at present. For six years I tried the experiment in Westminster Abbey. . . . What was done in Westminster Abbey is lawful in every parish church in England. The only difference is that, the Dean being the Ordinary, there was no need for reference to the Bishop. But unless the Bishop, as Ordinary, interposed to prevent it, there is nothing in the law which could preclude any parish clergyman from acting on the same principle. . . . The clergyman in charge should be made responsible for the services conducted.

2. You propose that the terms of subscription should be relaxed or modified. Probably you are not aware that all the subscriptions which existed in former times are swept away. About twelve years ago a Royal Commission considered the subject, and introduced changes so radical that the subject . . . has never been revived. The declaration of belief that "the Thirty-nine Articles contain nothing contrary to the Word of God," the declaration of assent to "all and every the Thirty-nine Articles, besides the ratification"—once required from all clergymen and graduates—no longer exist. In their place has been substituted a brief assent to the doctrine of the Church of England as contained in the Book of Common Prayer and the Articles. The word "doctrine," rather than "doctrines," was deliberately adopted by the Royal Commissioners. . . . It is true that there remains that slight and colourless adhesion of which I spoke just now, and the change from that form to its certain abolition would be far less than was accomplished by the change from the complicated and grievous entanglement which existed previously. . . . Bishop Burnet long ago recommended that all such preliminary adhesions should be abolished, and any Government which acted in his spirit would confer an inestimable boon on the Church of England.

The *Times* commented favourably on the part of Dean Stanley's letter which advocates the celebration of Nonconformist worship in parish churches at hours when it would not clash with the regular Church services. "As a rule," observed the *Times*, "all churches are not used more than three hours in the week, and it does seem not very unreasonable to ask whether they could not be lent for an hour or two to those who are ready to use them." "Mutual charity prompts the wish for moral union, rather than exaggeration and perpetuation of formal, often merely nominal differences." The *Globe*, on the other hand, ridiculed the Dean's proposal, on the ground that he "offered the Nonconformists precisely what they did not want and would not have. In their view the churches are [already]

national or parochial property, and should be at the disposal of Baptists or Quakers, or even Secularists, as much as of the members of the Church of England."

The Bishop of Liverpool, at the Leicester Church Congress,¹ dealt incisively with Dean Stanley's proposal. He said:—

I dismiss, as utterly unworthy of notice, the new-born idea that the Church may be nationalized, and Church and Dissent brought together by turning our parish churches into pantheons (great cheering), and throwing open our pulpits to preachers of all denominations. Anything more absurdly Utopian and unpractical I cannot conceive. (Cheers.) I will not waste the time of Congress by dwelling on it. It is liberality run mad. (Laughter and cheers.)

If Dean Stanley had confined his proposal to the admission of orthodox dissenting ministers to Church pulpits on exceptional occasions, I hardly think Bishop Ryle would have denounced the proposal so vigorously, considering the *empressement* with which he spoke of "trained and educated dissenting ministers," and of "serious God-fearing Nonconformists," and "thanked God for the work done by Trinitarian Dissenters." Nothing can be more unwarrantable than Dean Stanley's fashion of lumping up "the various Nonconformist communities." Orthodox Dissenting ministers exchange pulpits freely; but they do not admit Unitarians or Secularists to their pulpits.

With regard to Dean Stanley's second proposal, that clergymen should be no longer required to declare their assent to the doctrine of the Church of England, as contained in the Book of Common Prayer and the Articles, it would, in my opinion, if carried out, do something worse than "turning our parish churches into pantheons"—it would turn the Church of England—our spiritual mother—herself into a pantheon.²

¹ See the *résumé* of his speech in the November number of THE CHURCHMAN, p. 132. See also the *Times*, Sept. 3, 1880.

² Since writing the above, Dean Stanley's address on "Subscription" has been published in the January number of *Macmillan's Magazine*. It is [in Dean Stanley's most gentle and winning style. Its leading arguments, however, appear to be these:—Subscription failed to bind the consciences of the Tractarian clergy of 1844—of the men who "claimed to hold every Roman doctrine compatibly with the signature of the Thirty-Nine Articles;"] therefore it should be abolished. This seems to me tantamount to an argument that law should be abolished on account of the existence of law-breakers. The minds of the Tractarians of 1844 had become saturated with the equivocations and mental reservations of the Mediæval schoolmen, before they ventured publicly to maintain that the Thirty-Nine Articles were to be understood in a "non-natural sense." Ingenuous minds were alienated from Tractarianism when they were brought face to face with the casuistries by which these men sought to

I now pass on to consider the aspect in which the question of "Comprehension" is viewed by High Churchmen.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in his Visitation Address, at Croydon, while looking with satisfaction on the *rapprochement* between the Church of England and the other "Churches which protest against the Roman usurpation," considered that "the Oxford revival" has contracted "Churchmen's sympathies" "in the direction in which before they were ready to expand." "My predecessors," he said, "in the Episcopate had, I think, less difficulty than we should experience nowadays in welcoming the co-operation of such men as was Robert Hall in the days of our fathers, and wishing them 'God speed' in their labours to resist the prevailing infidelity." It is a remarkable fact, however, that the most enthusiastic supporters of the movement for the Comprehension of Dissenters at the present day are very High Churchmen, like Earl Nelson, the Dean of Manchester, and Mr. Talbot. They have formed a Society called "The Home Reunion Society," "to present the Church of England in a conciliatory attitude towards those who regard themselves as outside her pale, so as to lead to the corporate reunion of all Christians holding the doctrines of the Ever-blessed Trinity and the Incarnation and Atonement of our Lord Jesus Christ." The Society declares its inability "to support any scheme of Comprehension compromising the three Creeds or the Episcopal Constitution of the Church," but its willingness "to advocate all reasonable liberty in matters not contravening the Church's faith, order, or discipline." It will be seen that the Society is based on much more Catholic principles than the "Society for Promoting the Unity of Christendom," which declined to recognize, as Christians, any except members of its three pet communions—the Anglican, Greek, and Roman Churches. Some of the objects of the Home Reunion Society are excellent; one is, "the promotion of freer social intercourse between Churchmen and Nonconformists;" another, "the removal of all defects and abuses in the practical

defend their position in the Church of England. If there had been *no subscription* there would have been *no standard* by which to judge them.

Again. Dean Stanley argues that "if one of the causes" of "the failure of gifted men to enter Holy Orders is the small shred of subscription that remains, every man who cares for the welfare of the Church should spare no endeavour to abolish it." For every "gifted man" that the abolition of subscription would attract to Holy Orders, I venture to say scores of "gifted men" would be repelled. The paucity of "gifted men" who enter Holy Orders is due to the *latitudinarianism* that exists within the Church, and the powerlessness or reluctance of the constituted authorities of the Church to grapple with and restrain it. The remedy of Dean Stanley (*vide* his Address) would seem to be to introduce Quakers and Unitarians into Holy Orders!

working of the Church's system, which may justly give offence to Nonconformists ;" another is, " the appointment of committees to arrange for conferences with Nonconformists."

The Society has succeeded in drawing upon itself a good deal of attention at the Diocesan Church Conferences held during the last year or two. At the Peterborough Diocesan Conference, held in October, 1879, the following resolution was carried :—

That, in full recognition of the sin and scandal of divisions among Christians, and in humble consciousness that they have been promoted and encouraged by many shortcomings on the part of the English Church, this Conference would hail with the utmost satisfaction any proposals tending towards home reunion, without compromising scriptural truth and apostolic order ; and that, while unable to perceive that the time has arrived for formal communications between the authorities of the Church and delegates from Nonconformists, it is of opinion that special attention should be directed to a possible concordat with Wesleyan Methodists.

The allusion to " formal communications between the authorities of the Church and delegates from Nonconformists " had reference to a resolution moved by the Dean of Peterborough, " that it is desirable that the archbishops and the bishops and other representatives of the Church should invite delegates from the *orthodox* dissenting bodies to a Conference, with a view to consideration of the terms of reunion." This resolution was too advanced for the meeting, and the resolution previously mentioned was substituted for it. The allusion to a " concordat with the Wesleyan Methodists " was no doubt suggested by two prize Essays of the Home Reunion Society by Mr. Mowbray and the Rev. V. G. Borradaile on the subject of " An Eirenikon for the Wesleyans." Mr. Mowbray formulates the following " scheme " for the reunion of Wesleyan Methodists with the Church :—

1. A certain number (say three or four) of the Wesleyan ministers in full connexion, nominated by the Conference, to be ordained and then elevated to the Episcopate for the purposes of (1) conferring, or assisting in conferring, episcopal ordination upon their brethren ; (2) ordaining, or assisting at the ordination of, future candidates for the ministry ; (3) confirming and (4) generally exercising Episcopal supervision over the Order. These bishops to act as suffragans of the bishops in whose respective dioceses their episcopal functions are to be exercised, to whom and to the Metropolitans of their respective provinces they would owe canonical obedience. Each of these suffragan bishops, except one who would represent the Order in the Upper House, to have seats in the Lower House of Convocation of their province.¹

2. All the ministers who desire to do so to receive episcopal ordi-

¹ The position of the bishops of the Order would be very similar to that of the mitred abbots of the pre-Reformation Church.—(Note by Mr. Mowbray.)

nation (making the usual subscription to the Articles, &c.), those in full connection at once, and those on probation at the expiration of the usual probationary period. Ministers in full connexion not to be required to pass any theological or educational examination, and to be admitted to priests' orders as soon after receiving the Diaconate as possible.

3. The stationing of the ministers, the management of the finances, and the general work of the Order to be under the direction of the Conference, as at present; but the Upper and Lower Houses of Convocation to be represented in the Conference.

4. The bishops and clergy of the Order to be under no disability as regards ecclesiastical preferment by reason of their connection with the Order.

5. The connexional property to be vested in trustees, one-half in number to be nominated by Convocation, and the remainder by the Conference, upon trust for the benefit of the Order as a religious community in full communion with the Church, but not to be sold or put to any secular use.

6. The Order to be, as far as practicable, self-supporting as at present, but to receive pecuniary, as indeed every other kind of help, from the Church generally, whenever required, rendering the same in return whenever necessity may arise.

7. The Church's Creeds (as they are appointed to be said) to be recited once every Sunday in all the churches of the Order; the Church's offices for Baptism and Holy Communion to be adopted; and the Holy Eucharist to be celebrated, wherever practicable, weekly, according to the custom of the Early Church. In all other respects the congregations of the Order to be under no restriction whatever as to the use of liturgical forms. Lay preaching and all other distinctive usages of Methodism to be retained.

Mr. Mowbray considers that "the position assigned to Methodism" in this "scheme," "is that which Wesley designed that it should occupy—namely, an Order in full communion with the Church." Mr. Borradaile's "scheme" is less minute.¹ The chief difference

¹ 1. That the Wesleyan Connexion should be a Home Mission Society within the Church of England; employing its own agents, and regulating its own affairs. 2. That the constitution of the Society should remain in its present condition. 3. That all regular ministers with care of souls should be admitted to the priesthood by episcopal ordination. 4. That all chapels capable of supporting a resident minister should be opened under episcopal license as chapels-of-ease to the parish church. 5. That local preachers and those who wish to retain their secular employment should be admitted into the Diaconate by episcopal ordination and licensed to preach. 6. That the smaller meeting-houses that are not able to support a resident minister should be opened under episcopal license for prayer meetings, preaching, &c., but not for the administration of the sacraments. 7. That all internal arrangements of the Society, appointment and dismissal of ministers, &c., shall, as heretofore, be under the control of the President and Conference. 8. That the bishop of the diocese shall have the same canonical control over the priests and deacons who are members of the Wesleyan connection as he possesses over the rest of the clergy of his diocese.

between the two "schemes," however, is that Mr. Mowbray's contemplates the elevation of three or four Wesleyan ministers to the episcopate for the purpose of re-ordaining their brethren and exercising episcopal supervision over the "Order" (or Connexion generally)—which seems a judicious suggestion; while Mr. Borradaile's omits this courteous preliminary. On the other hand, however, Mr. Mowbray proposes to give Convocation a *locus standi* in connection with the Wesleyan Conference, while Mr. Borradaile judiciously leaves the Conference unfettered. With regard to Mr. Mowbray's suggestion that the Wesleyan bishops should act as suffragans of the bishops of the Church of England in whose dioceses they reside, I do not think that much difficulty would arise. The Rev. Dr. Rule, the eminent Wesleyan Minister, once informed me that the Wesleyans paid the Church of England the compliment of not appointing diocesan bishops in this country, because they regarded the diocesan bishops of the Church of England as, in some sense, *their* bishops. The Wesleyans, he said, were content with the uneclesiastical name of "district chairman" instead of "diocesan bishop" for the same courteous reason. Mr. Borradaile's suggestions for turning "local preachers" into "lay deacons" and Wesleyan chapels into chapels-of-ease, possess at least the merit of ingenuity. I do not quite see, on the other hand, that Churchmen would be justified in imposing on Wesleyan Methodists the condition suggested by Mr. Mowbray, of celebrating, wherever practicable, the Holy Eucharist weekly. Should any variation in the trusts upon which the property of the Wesleyan Connexion is held be necessary, Mr. Mowbray thinks this could be effected through the medium of the Chancery Division of the High Court of Justice. If legislative action is necessary, a precedent, Mr. Mowbray points out, will be found in "The Primitive Methodist Society of Ireland Act, 1871" (34 & 35 Vict. c. 40), which was passed for the purpose of uniting the Primitive Methodists of Ireland with the Church of Ireland. It is a remarkable fact that Mr. Mowbray, who is evidently an extreme High Churchman, declares his belief that "Wesleyan ministers, preaching in our churches, could be thoroughly trusted as regards the orthodoxy of their teaching," and that Mr. Borradaile, "Curate of S. Mary Magdalene, Munster Square," expresses a decided opinion that "the chief difficulties in the way of the reabsorption of the Wesleyan Connexion into the Church of England would be in the matter of organization rather than of doctrine." When such language can be used by men who are tinged with Sacramentalism and Sacerdotalism, ought not the Evangelical party in the Church of England to entertain sanguine views respecting the possibilities of corporate reunion?

Bishop Ryle, however, at the Leicester Church Congress, declared emphatically that "we must not waste time and energy on the pleasant, but Quixotic idea, that we can ever bring about a wholesale reunion of Church and Dissent." A *wholesale* reunion, I grant, but a reunion of *orthodox* Dissenters with the Church, I hold, with deep submission, it is the duty of every Evangelical Churchman to earnestly work and fervently pray for.

If the concessions were to be all on one side—the side of the orthodox Nonconformists, I could quite understand the schism between them and the Church remaining unhealed; but if Churchmen are really in earnest in this matter, they must be prepared to meet the orthodox Nonconformists half-way—there must be mutual concession.¹

The experience of the fate of the sister Church of Ireland ought to carry conviction to our minds that neither the Sovereign nor the House of Lords can or will save the Church of England from disestablishment and disendowment, if once a decisive majority favourable to her severance from the State, and "liberation" from her property, is secured in the House of Commons. I cannot conceive of anything more likely to avert the overthrow of the Established Church, than judicious "Comprehension" of the orthodox Dissenters. And surely for such an object—the maintenance of our beloved Church, as the National Church—all "schools of thought" within her pale should be prepared to make some concessions.

It is a remarkable fact that never was there so hearty a co-operation as there is now between Churchmen and Nonconformists in the council-chambers of religious societies. I have had the honour of a seat at the Council-board of the Religious Tract Society, composed, in equal moieties, of Churchmen and Nonconformists, clerical and lay, and I can from my heart declare that, while the utmost freedom of *criticism* was allowed, and indeed encouraged, no single word of *controversy* arose during my term of office. On doctrinal questions there was the most absolute identity of sentiment, and questions of forms of Church government were never introduced. On the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society, which is, I believe, composed also of Churchmen and Nonconformists in equal moieties, the

¹ One of the most hopeful "signs of the times" is the disposition of Churchmen of eminence to regard Nonconformists with yearning sympathy, instead of looking down upon them with lofty contempt and scorn as "mere Dissenters." History teaches us that the authors of modern Dissent were driven out of the Church of England by the apathy, worldliness, and intolerance of past generations of Churchmen, and it is right that the initial words of Churchmen in mixed assemblies of Churchmen and Nonconformists should be words of humility and self-abasement.

same harmony, I understand, prevails. The Committee of the London City Mission is composed also of Churchmen and Nonconformists in similiar proportions, and similiar concord exists upon it. Churchmen and Nonconformists unite on the Committees of the Christian Evidence Society, of the Young Men's Christian Association, of Ragged Schools, of Reformatories, of Refuges. On all these executive bodies, actively engaged as they are in propagating the Christian faith, "our *common* Christianity" is not a name only, but a deep and abiding reality. Eminent Nonconformists acquire, from contact and co-operation with Churchmen on these executive bodies, a habit of dwelling on the points on which Churchmen and they agree, rather than on the points on which Churchmen and they differ. There is, at the same time, from intimate social intercourse, a softening of that asperity, the offspring of social jealousy, which is so uninviting a characteristic of the Dissenting mind, and which is the mainspring of the movement for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church.

I thoroughly agree with Bishop Ryle's statement at the Leicester Church Congress, that "if we would improve the relations of Church and Dissent, we ought to co-operate with Dissenters whenever we can." "It is vain," he said, "to deny that there is much common ground on which we can work together without the slightest compromise of principle, and I contend that we ought to be always ready to occupy that ground in a brotherly spirit, and not to stand aloof, and turn the cold shoulder on possible allies. The great controversy with infidelity, the cause of scriptural education, the maintenance of Sunday, the improvements of the dwellings of the poor, the grand temperance movement, the translation and circulation of the Bible—all these are points about which I advise every Churchman to work with Dissenters whenever he can. I for one rejoice heartily in the constitution of the Committee for the Revision of the Authorized Version of the Scriptures. That Committee contains not a few Dissenters as well as Churchmen. I thank God for it. . . . It has proved one thing. It has proved most assuredly that Churchmen and Dissenters can work together and respect one another. I grant that this is not union, but it is a long step toward it."

"I think, my lord," said Mr. Clarke, a Congregational minister, addressing Earl Nelson, the Chairman, at a Home Reunion Conference, "you would be surprised to learn in how many hundreds of Nonconformist chapels last Sunday the Psalms of David were chanted, the *Te Deum* sung, the Lord's Prayer repeated; in how many prayers passages from the Liturgy were interwoven; in how many Nonconformist places of worship the Liturgy itself, slightly altered, was used. . . . Substan-

tially, we hold the three Creeds. . . . We have thought it well to build more ornate and elegant places of worship."

As the *Times*¹ has pointed out, "whether inside or outside, you cannot even tell, without looking closely, whether it is a 'church' or a 'chapel.' The spires rise as high, the window tracery is as fanciful, the portals are as lofty and as deeply recessed."

Mr. Clarke observed that "The spirit, the animus—shall I say the demon?—of denominationalism is disappearing."

What a brilliant illustration of this was afforded by the address of the Leicester Nonconformist ministers to the Leicester Church Congress! The address, though local, was national in its tone. It seems like a rainbow of promise spanning this England of ours from sea to sea and re-uniting its people, after centuries of religious discord, in the sweetest of bonds—"the bond of peace:"—

We desire to acknowledge our obligation to you, as representing the Church of England, for the healthy stimulus we have received from the lives of your many saints, confessors, and worthies. The illustrious names of Herbert and Ken, Leighton and Wilson, are as dear to us as to yourselves. Nor are we less indebted to your scholars, your theologians, your masters of sentences, for a vast and instructive literature, for a thousand contributions to a right study of the Bible, and a clear apprehension of Christian truth. The works of Hooker and Jeremy Taylor, of Pearson and Milman, of Lightfoot and Westcott, are all the delight and possession of the Nonconformist ministry as well as of your own. If our forms of worship vary from yours, yet your noble liturgy, enriched by the persistence, the trust, the sorrow, and the gladness of the saints of many ages, is for us, no less than for others, a priceless treasure of devotion. Scarcely ever do we come together to give thanks for the divine goodness without using those hymns which the singers of your Church have given the world, and side by side with Wesley, Watts, and Doddridge we place the solemn and beautiful melodies of Heber, Lyte, and Keble. Your eloquent preachers, your seraphic doctors, your saintly examples have laid us under an immense obligation which we can never repay, and which we confess by uniting with them as we hear their voices calling us in the services of our Lord and Master.

Dec. 1880.

WILLIAM T. CHARLEY.

ART. V.—EMINENT STATESMEN AND WRITERS.²

MR. HAYWARD is certainly one of the most accomplished of our modern essayists. In his works he revives a style of composition which the book-making and hasty conclusions of

¹ September 23, 1880.

² "Sketches of Eminent Statesmen and Writers." By A. Hayward, Q.C. Two volumes. John Murray.

the present day are causing rapidly to die out. Men, the more they read the less they care to pass their time in grave reflections, and in the maturing of critical opinions upon what they have perused. One book finished another is immediately obtained, and provided the reader's literary appetite be only gratified, he is supremely indifferent to what nourishes him and to what he can digest; he does not eat, but bolts his food. A generation ago, when literature was the occupation of the few, and writers appealed to a more restricted class, men read leisurely, and had their judgments influenced by the verdict of the professional critic. Criticism then occupied a recognized and powerful position: its praise, as in the case of Montgomery's poems, could make a foolish book succeed; whilst its abuse, as in the case of Keats's "Endymion," could, for a time, even retard the progress of a work of genius. The class of critics of those days was not filled by the men "who had failed in literature and in art," but by those who, because they had succeeded in letters were well qualified to express an opinion and to be listened to with respect. It is for this reason that the literary judgments of our Hazlitts, our Leigh Hunts, our Giffords, Jeffreys, and Macaulays, and the rest of the fraternity that have passed away, will always be numbered amongst the English classics. In these more degenerate days, since all men read and many men write, the profession of genuine criticism has almost ceased to exist; it is a task often relegated to youth, who hopes to utilize it as a stepping-stone to better things. A book now is read because it is new, or the name of the author justifies its perusal, and the comment of the critic can be dispensed with. We prefer to suit our own taste, and not to have it ordered for us.

From these remarks the essays and republished criticisms of Mr. Hayward have nothing to fear. Their author belongs distinctively to the old-fashioned class of critics which did not admit any within its erudite circle unless fully qualified to pronounce sentence. A man of considerable culture, an excellent linguist, the master of a most readable style (occasionally, however, we must admit, degraded by an unnecessary flippancy in thought and tone), a favourite in the higher ranks of society, the literary judgments of Mr. Hayward, which appear from time to time in the pages of the *Quarterly Review*, upon men and books, are among the most valuable and informing of the various contributions to that periodical. The essayist brings to his work an independent knowledge of his subject; he abounds in anecdote, always humorous or sarcastic, illustrative of his matter; his remarks are clear and incisive. Unlike the more ordinary critic, he does not read up because he has to write; but he writes because he has read so much, and knows so fully what he has to discuss. It is not given to every man of letters

to have lived for the better part of a long life amongst those who, as Burke said, are "busy making history." But if Mr. Hayward has to review the literary labours of a great man—politician, warrior, or ambassador—he not only is familiar with the work of the author, but he knows all about the author as well.

In the two handsome volumes before us, Mr. Hayward has to deal with the books and teaching of Madame de Sévigné, Saint-Simon, Byron, Tennyson, and Montalembert; with the political career of European celebrities like Thiers, Count Cavour, Prince Metternich, and the wiliest of all, Prince Bismarck; with English statesmen like Wellesley and Melbourne; and with such happy subjects for talk and anecdote as Madame de Deffand and her correspondents; the story of those famous *salons*, Holland House and the villa at Strawberry Hill, and with the life and collections of that melancholy fribble Horace Walpole. Yet in discussing these varied matters our author has always something to say which cannot well be found elsewhere—some story he has heard illustrating his subject from famous lips, some remark from a contemporary statesman, some reflection from his own personal observation, some anecdote picked up in his out-of-the-way reading—all of which give a piquancy and reality to his narrative. Human nature is curious; and if we like to see and listen to great men, we like also to know all about them—what they read and how they work, and whether they are nagged by their wives, and the rest of it. It is this which Mr. Hayward offers us in his essays; he lifts the veil, and admits us into little secrets. Let us cull a few of these details from his pages.

He is discussing the character of Thiers as Minister and author, and we have anecdote after anecdote which give a new light to the treatment of the subject. Thiers was regarded as a hot radical, yet before he attained to power he quietly said to the author in course of private conversation, "Well, well, wait till I am a Minister. By habit and associations I am an aristocrat: I have no sympathy with the *bourgeoisie* or with any system in which they are to rule." He found it, however, to suit his ambition to become the tribune of the people, and like many a politician before and since, he swallowed his convictions to further his interests. "You wish to rise," said Talleyrand to him, "make enemies." And the future statesman followed the advice to the letter. In the struggle between England and France for supremacy in the East, Thiers attempted to bully Lord Palmerston, but our stout Foreign Secretary refused to be intimidated. Henry Bulwer was then Secretary of Embassy at Paris, and he had received instructions from home not to permit France to dictate terms. Thiers blustered and fumed, and vowed that unless Lord Palmerston agreed to the demands of France, war would be declared. Nothing disturbed, Bulwer

quietly returned to the embassy, drew up a despatch stating the alternative proposed by the French Minister, and was about to send it off when he thought of showing it to Thiers, who might have further suggestions to make. The Frenchman saw that bluster was useless, and begged that the despatch should not be forwarded. "Do not let us compromise the future more than we can help," said he, "don't send this despatch. Let Lord Palmerston know what you think of our conversation; events may always change, and it is better not to render affairs less liable to their influence than is necessary." On crossing over to England, Henry Bulwer met Mr. Hayward, and in describing this conversation, said that when he asked Thiers whether he was to report his warlike intention as avowed, the French Minister answered: "No, say you read it in my face"—a very mild way of beating a retreat from an untenable position. When Napoleon III., then the Prince-President, was intriguing for power and absolute authority, Mr. Hayward met Thiers out at dinner one evening. Our author remarked to the Minister that he had made a great mistake in despising Napoleon as an antagonist. "Yes," cried Thiers, angrily, "yes, I have despised him; I despise him, and shall always despise him!" The great French statesman and historian was noted for his conversational powers, yet Mr. Hayward, who had frequent opportunities of meeting M. Thiers in society, came to the conclusion that of the two Mr. Gladstone was the better talker. Of Prince Bismarck our author has also much to say, and he deals with his subject after his usual pleasant fashion of anecdote and social reminiscences. His remarks as to the character and policy of the introducer of the theory of "blood and iron" are worth quoting. "There he stands," writes Mr. Hayward, "the idol of hero-worship, the beau-ideal of volition, the genuine representative of muscular Christianity, of force. Since it is conventionally settled that greatness is independent of commonplace morality, of the ordinary rules of right and wrong, there is no denying him to be great; for he has done great things in a grand manner; and the world, at all events the European world, would have been widely different had he never appeared upon the stage. But has he made it better or wiser? Must his fame, his claim to the gratitude of his country, rest on the insulated fact that he has evolved a united Germany out of a heterogeneous mass of conflicting elements? Has it been, will it be, his lot

To scatter plenty o'er a smiling land,
And read his history in a nation's eyes"?

We think not. The land he rules over is anything but smiling. The eyes of a large part of the nation are averted from him, for the milliards of the indemnity have not fructified in Germany

nor impoverished France. The Fatherland is no longer a country but a barrack. In Count Cavour we have a statesman of very different calibre, and one to whom the essayist does full justice. In the policy of the noble-hearted, far-seeing Italian, neither humanity nor diplomatic principle was eliminated. He uniformly appealed to the finer instincts, the nobler aspirations, of those he summoned to act with him, and he never appealed in vain. He did not call upon a people to purchase territorial aggrandizement and military glory with their liberties. His ambition was pure, and merged and forgotten in his patriotism. Like Chatham, he knew that he was the only man who could save his country, and he did not rest until he had handed to the next generation a free and united Italy. His face was the index of his mind, and men knew how affairs were progressing by watching whether it was happy or careworn. A lady one day was buying some wares at a shop when the tradesman hastily ran out of the shop and as hastily returned. "Pardon me," said he to his customer, "but I saw Count Cavour pass by and I wanted to see how we were getting on. He is happy, so affairs are progressing favourably!" He was never bored by the numerous applicants who thronged his ante-chambers. "My recipe is very simple," said he, "I persuade myself that no one is *ennuyé*." Unlike most foreigners he was averse to wearing his decorations. "Don't you see," he said, "that the spirit of society is running counter to this sort of thing? Why create new causes of inequality when an irresistible force is pushing all classes towards equality? I will wager that fifty years hence there will be no orders of knighthood in Europe." He was the most generous of party foes. "In politics," he said, "there is nothing so absurd as vindictiveness."

One story concerning a distinguished man, which has been freely circulated by the press and by the "bare-brained chatter of irresponsible" society, the author of these essays satisfactorily refutes. Nothing succeeds like success, and when a person becomes famous, any anecdote which can be distorted into the shape of a prophecy of his career is readily believed. Never in the annals of statesmanship has there been so remarkable an instance of the brilliant triumph of genius as in the social and political life of the late Mr. Disraeli. Stories innumerable have been told of the past of our ex-Premier, but none more repeatedly than the one Mr. Hayward now refutes. It has been said that when "Disraeli the younger," as he was then called, had returned from his travels in the East he met Lord Melbourne out at dinner. Lord Melbourne was then Home Secretary, and Mr. Disraeli had just been defeated in his attempt to get into Parliament for the borough of Wycombe. As the worldly statesman listened to the uncommonplace language and spirit of

the young novelist, he thought to himself that the brilliant youth would be one well worth serving. Abruptly, but with a certain tone of kindness, which took away any air of assumption, he said: "Well now, tell me—what do you want to be?" The quiet gravity of the reply fairly took the Home Secretary, as well it might, aback. "I want to be," said the Disraeli who was not then four-and-twenty and not in Parliament—"I want to be Prime Minister." Lord Melbourne, it is said, gave a long sigh, and then gravely replied to the audacious aspirant: "No chance of that in our time. It is all arranged and settled. Lord Grey is an old man, but when he gives up he will be succeeded by Stanley. Nobody can compete with Stanley." So much for the story. "The internal improbability, not to say absurdity, of all this," writes Mr. Hayward, "must be obvious to any one who has the slightest knowledge of the two principal actors in the scene. It places both of them in a ridiculous light. The youthful aspirant, not yet in Parliament, gravely replying, 'I want to be Prime Minister;' and the Home Secretary as gravely explaining to him that the place was bespoken, and that he had better think of something else. Can any one believe that Lord Melbourne spoke of Stanley in such terms?" Then our essayist tells us what really took place. Disraeli met Lord Melbourne out at dinner, and the conversation turned on the manners and customs of the countries recently visited by the young author of "Vivian Grey." "Your lordship," remarked Disraeli to the Home Secretary, "appears to have derived all your notions of Oriental matters from the 'Arabian Nights.'" "And a very good place to get them from," rejoined Melbourne, laughing and rubbing his hands. As the conversation proceeded, Mr. Disraeli, in a jocosely way, said that what he looked forward to was the Premiership. "And I wish you may get it," replied the Home Secretary, in the same spirit. This is the sole foundation for the dialogue which has been so frequently reported in such detail. The dinner party was given at the house of Mrs. Norton, and Mr. Hayward was one of the guests. It is these little touches, and they abound in the volumes before us, of personal intimacy with the notables who are being criticized, which, though perhaps slight in themselves, give a character to the work which makes Mr. Hayward's essays almost unique. If we read the articles on Montalembert, Metternich, and Wellesley, it is the same as with as those on Thiers, Bismarck, and Cavour. The essayist knows his subject *au fond*; he can pass judgment upon the motives that were suggested and upon the political combinations that ensued; and at the same time he scatters about the page not only anecdote and epigram, but remarks that he himself has made from personal observation, or that he has listened to from direct hearsay.

And these advantages are especially visible when our author treats of Holland House and the famous villa of Strawberry Hill. When he talks of either of these historical mansions, we feel that he is not deriving his information from the books under review, but that he himself has seen what he so vividly describes. When he speaks of the dining-room of Holland House, where Addison breathed his last, begging his step-son, the young Earl of Warwick: "See how a Christian could die;" of the cameo ring presented by Jeremy Bentham to Miss Fox, the only love of the famous political economist, now kept in the yellow drawing-room; of the eccentricities of the brusque but kindly Lady Holland; of the portly Lord Holland in a white waistcoat, "the image," as the witty Luttrell whispered, "of a turbot standing on its tail;" of the celebrated pictures in its *salons* and galleries; of the dinners at which assembled all the famous in the senate, the studio, and in literature; of the grounds and gardens, and the rest, we are sure that he is not writing from study, but from happy personal reminiscences. Mr. Hayward is indignant with the author of the "Life of Lord Melbourne," for describing the late owner of Holland House as a man who only cared for his great dinners, and who was only amused at the whimsicalities of Lady Holland. "It is difficult to imagine a more erroneous estimate of a character," he writes, "it would make out an earnest, high-minded man, with a noble career before him and intuitively conscious of it—so much so that his future was divined from his bearing—to be like the hero in "L'Homme Blasé." No man had so many objects of interest at all times; and the notion of his envying the lighter qualities or amusements of his distinguished contemporaries is preposterous. Would any one who really knew Lord Holland envy his "happiness in his *great dinners* and *amusement* at my lady's whimsicality?" Mr. Hayward never falls into these errors, for he only writes about what he "really knows." And it is the same with the article on Strawberry Villa. He knows all about the "groves and gothic towers" of Strawberry Hill, and of the famous past with which it is redolent, but he tells us also of much of its present history—of its architectural alterations, its famous pictures, its splendid salons, its rare collections of prints and china—which only a favoured inmate could have become acquainted with.

Of the purely historical articles, those on Saint Simon and the Republic of Venice are the best. Various estimates have been passed upon the character of the famous Duc of the Court of Lewis XIV., whose memoirs are so often quoted and so seldom read, but we think Mr. Hayward has fairly placed the man in the catalogue of historical celebrities. The analysis of Tacitus and the satire of Juvenal were wanting in Saint Simon. He

was not a deep thinker; nor did he write to expose corruption or reform vice. He simply penned his character sketches to indulge his own feelings; and he never meant what he wrote to see the light till the time at which it could be useful, as satire had long passed away. The persons he spared least were those who had wounded his vanity or offended his prejudices. Those he praised most were the persons who had aided, obliged, or flattered him. Hence he was neither actuated by a strong sense of justice, nor a pure love of truth. He was destitute of humour, and piquancy of expression is his nearest approach to wit. In many of his descriptions he is as coarse as Swift; whilst, with few exceptions, his general reflections are commonplace. His memoirs give an accurate picture of the petty social trivialities of the time—who had the honour of holding the king's shirt when he went to bed, who lighted his majesty to the royal apartments, the feuds amongst the Court dames, the squabbles as to precedence, and the like—but of the condition of the people we learn nothing. Their chronicler tells us little of the state or progress of art, science, literature, or philosophy, whilst he can fill pages as to the claim of a duke to seniority of precedence. But like Boswell, and Pepys, and Horace Walpole, it was because Saint Simon was Saint Simon, and not cast in an heroic mould that he occupies his peculiar place in French literature—as the author of the most illustrative collection of contemporary scenes and characters which any age has produced. On the position of Venice, Mr. Hayward is agreeably erudite. The Venetian Republic lasted five hundred years; it was the only European constitution that had successfully resisted revolutionary change during that length of time, and the only modern aristocracy that ever held the supreme power long enough to constitute a settled government at all. Her chief glories were won under her ancient Doges; her few illustrious men flourished in spite of her odious laws; and if she had lived but half her life, her reputation would stand better with posterity.

These Essays are deeply interesting reading, and we are glad to notice that, in the greater portion of them, there is an absence of that levity and mundane form of reflections which occasionally mars the value of Mr. Hayward's reviews.



ART. VI.—THOUGHTS ON THE EPIPHANY.

I DOUBT whether we regard the Epiphany Season as carefully as we ought to do. Or rather I ought to say, I am sure we are apt to treat it with an indifference not quite consistent with the emphatic manner in which it is marked for us in our Book of Common Prayer.

Even on the lower ground of old-fashioned English feeling there are reasons why the Epiphany should not be viewed with indifference. It is a "scarlet day" at Oxford and Cambridge, and probably this usage dates from a very early period. Ancient rhymes and proverbs mark the season, when

The Wise Men's day here followeth, who out of Persia farre
Brought gifts and presents unto Christ, conducted by a starre.

And many circumstances could be added, which, even in a superficial sense, justify a special interest in the season. Two of these aspects of the subject may be particularly named.

First, the Epiphany is "Old Christmas Day." On the sixth of last month, when in our quiet English Churches we were making such observance of this festival as we thought desirable, Christmas Day was being kept in the Eastern churches. The Oriental Christians have so great a repugnance to anything that wears the appearance of dictation by a Pope, that they have never accepted the Gregorian Calendar. Hence on that day Christmas was being observed in those places, the names of which fill the newspapers and touch our hearts with many anxious thoughts—Constantinople, Bulgaria, Athens, Montenegro, and "round about unto Illyricum." I remember well, long ago, in Athens, being in the midst of the Christmas celebration, when I knew that Christmas Day at home was twelve days past. And here I cannot help quoting what has both charmed and amused me in looking over a Greek Service-book which I brought with me from that city. In the "Anthologium," the Epiphany, or, as it is there termed, the Theophany, occupies a large space; and I find there two Greek iambics, the sense of which is as follows:—"One Swallow does not make a spring; but these three Swallows from the East make the spring of all pious souls."

The second old association of the Epiphany, which is worthy of being remembered, is that it is Twelfth Day. That phrase used to be far more common in England than it is now; and many curious customs were connected with it. With the festivities of Twelfth Night we have here nothing to do. But we should not forget that at this time the Lord Mayor of London, with the Aldermen, used to go to St. Paul's to hear a sermon. This is named as an ancient observance in Queen Elizabeth's reign; and it is probable that on these occasions Latimer sometimes warmed the hearts of the people, when the snow was cold on the pinnacles and high gables of old St. Paul's, which was a building very different from that which we see on the same site now. And another custom still survives. At the Royal Chapel of St. James's Palace, gold, frankincense and myrrh are even now pre-

¹ Rom. xv. 19.

sented. Before the illness of King George III. the monarch himself used to go, with heralds and Knights of the Garter, Thistle, and Bath, all habited in the grand robes of their Orders.

Whatever we may think of such celebrations as these, there is no doubt that the spiritual aspects of the Epiphany deserve our thoughtful attention. What view are we to take of the exact meaning of this sacred season? How are the clergy to make the most of it, for themselves and for their flocks? What are they to teach their people as to the significance of this festival and its profit? It is the purpose of this paper to invite the answering of such questions. I have said that the Epiphany season is inadequately observed among us; and for this it is easy to give more reasons than one.

In the first place, there is a certain prevalent vagueness in our apprehension of its meaning. This will probably be admitted by most persons. Our thoughts are as definite as possible on Easter Day or Whitsun Day, on Christmas Day or Ascension Day; but this is not quite the case with most of us in the commemoration of the Epiphany.

The Collect furnishes us with very little help. It always seems to me that the Collect for the Epiphany is the least satisfactory in the whole Prayer Book. In several instances these wonderful prayers have gained considerably in their translation from the Latin, and in their modification for our use. In this case, however, the fact is quite the contrary. There is no charm in the liturgical use of the word "fruition." Probably our country people enter into its meaning as little as into the meaning of the phrase "happy retribution" in a hymn, which used recently to be very popular. But in two respects we have really lost much in the English rendering of the Collect for the Epiphany. In the original there is a contrast between *faith* and *sight* which exactly fits the occasion, and which we can ill afford to spare; and there is great force and beauty in the "perducamur," which is the concluding word of the Latin Collect, and which expresses that patient following of Divine guidance which is part of the lesson of the Festival. These two latter circumstances have been well pointed out by Dean Goulburn in his recently-published book on the Collects. It should be added that the same thought is present also in the Latin word "usque."

One reason, perhaps, of our disregard of the Epiphany is that we are apt to view it simply as the commemoration of the visit of the Wise Men from the East to our Saviour in His infancy. Not that we are indifferent, taking the matter thus, to the charm of this incident, or to its instructiveness. We feel all its poetry and wonder; we know how it interests children; we are aware that a series of Christmas pictures would be very

incomplete without it. Moreover, we can easily draw from the occasion very useful teaching for ourselves. We see in the offerings of the Wise Men

Sacred gifts of mystic meaning :
Incense doth their God disclose,
Gold the King of kings proclaimeth,
Myrrh His sepulchre foreshows.

Or we may take the lesson in another way, and see in the Frankincense the adoration of the heart, in the Gold the devotion of our best gifts to God, and in the Myrrh the mortifying of our corrupt nature. These, however, are only allegorical applications of a historical event. The occasion does not seem to concern ourselves, or the present Church at large, very closely. We hardly see why this incident should be made the ground of a great commemoration, marking out separately one of the prominent Christian seasons. And, indeed, the observance of Epiphany was not originally separate from that of Christmas. It is not till the fourth century that we find it fully established as a self-existent festival. And here a remark may be permitted which has a general bearing on the arrangement of Church seasons, as well as a particular reference to the festival under our present notice.

It is quite according to the analogy of Church history, if sacred seasons acquire their recognized place and distinctive meaning gradually. At first the Epiphany, no doubt, had chief reference to the visit of the Wise Men to Bethlehem. But this visit was emblematic of something greater than itself; and as Christianity spread over the world from nation to nation, the thought of "the manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles" acquired a larger meaning than before. The Church ought in this matter, as in other respects, to learn by experience. The mapping out of the territories of the Christian Year may be expected to make progress, and to become definite, in proportion as religious truths are realized. The appointment of Trinity Sunday, for instance, came late, and was practically a crowning summary of the doctrines which had been taught through all the preceding seasons, from the festival of the Nativity to the commemoration of the Descent of the Holy Ghost. So with the ultimate disengaging of the Epiphany from Christmas-tide. Of course, there are limitations to this view of the subject. All religious celebrations must be in harmony with the truth and are liable to be corrected by Holy Scripture. A consecrated season may propagate and deepen error as well as truth. Few of us in England would wish to adopt the feelings which are prevalent in France regarding the 15th of August; and it is with good reason that we have abolished the observance of Corpus Christi Day, which could not hold its ground co-ordinately with the

Twenty-Eighth Article. But in the case before us the larger the development, and the more definite the meaning, we give to the phrase, "the manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles," the closer we are in sympathy with the whole spirit of the New Testament.

We at once perceive that to regard the Epiphany as the mere commemoration of the visit of the Wise Men to Bethlehem is far too limited a view of the matter, when we note the description of the festival given in connection with the Collect. It is there set before us as "the Manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles." Yet here again we fail to mark the rich significance of the phrase. For a different reason from the former the Epiphany hardly exerts its legitimate action upon our feelings. The blessings which we are accustomed to, and of which we have never been destitute, fail to attract our notice simply because we are used to them. The daylight, which is given to us daily, inasmuch as the sun rises every day, is seldom made in our hearts a ground of conscious thankfulness and praise. And so it is with this gracious large Epiphany of the Gospel—this free and full "manifestation" of religious truth to the Gentiles. There never was a time when we knew any other religious dispensation. We are only acquainted through history with the barriers—national, local, social, ceremonial barriers—which of old divided Hebrew life and Gentile life in the matter of religion. So we forget our greatest blessings for the very reason which makes them the greatest—namely, that they are common and customary—and thus it is that we fail to appreciate the rich meaning of this season of the Church, through which we are now passing, between Christmas-time and Lent.

The Epistle for the day of the Epiphany (Eph. ii. 1-12) is well adapted to correct this state of mind, to quicken our perception of the rich largess of blessing which has been bequeathed to these Christian ages, in comparison with the restrictions, hindrances, and comparative darkness which prevailed in the ages that preceded them, and to feel how worthy this great revolution is to be annually commemorated. Here we see St. Paul, with the amplest exuberance and utmost variety of language, pointing out that his very mission to the world was the manifestation of a great truth which was altogether unknown, and could not be known, to the world before—namely, that all the religious barriers which had previously divided man from man, nation from nation, Hebrew from Gentile, were now absolutely gone, and that all were now on equal terms, all equally acceptable, all equally blest, in the daylight of God's revelation. And, as his manner is, to give force to his teaching on a great subject, he borrows a word, a most remarkable word—the word "mystery"¹—from

¹ In the short selection for the day this word occurs three times, as the word "Gentiles" occurs three times.

one of the institutions of the Heathen world in which his Missionary work was cast. The introduction of this epistle into the first English Prayer Book has struck the clear key-note of the full meaning of this festival. It would indeed be altogether unjust to say that there had been previously no apprehension of the large doctrinal significance of the Epiphany. In the Roman Breviary we find, under the rules for this season, extracts from those two chapters of Isaiah, the fifty-fifth and sixtieth, which, since 1549, have been lessons for the season in the English Church. Still, previous to the Reformation, the pilgrimage to Bethlehem was the predominant topic of this festival; and it is interesting and instructive to note that, with our habit of more careful biblical study, and with our enlarged responsibility for missionary work in the world, there has come a more distinct and more comprehensive understanding of the meaning of the festival which is now before our thoughts.

Yet, here again, even with this luminous Epistle before them, most men are at a disadvantage, and for a new reason fail to appreciate the full significance of the Epiphany. It requires some knowledge of history and some careful study of language to enable us to understand the whole force of the Apostle's warm and eloquent appeal. It is in questions of this kind that we are conscious of our obligations to men of learning and to scholars; and all the helps they furnish to us in such cases ought to be diligently used. As to historical facts, however, the Bible itself, if we give attention to it, will supply us with information enough to make the case very clear. The Bible is pre-eminently a historical book, and we can read history in it, as well as employ history for its illustration.

What we have to observe is, that when Christ was born at Bethlehem, the Hebrew and Gentile worlds were fenced off, one over against the other, by *double* barriers. Each of these sections of the human family built against the other a fence constructed of prejudice and antipathy, strengthened by custom and observance. These barriers were, as I have said, national, local, social and ceremonial. This point might be illustrated copiously from Heathen literature. Here it is enough, if we take under each head, simply and briefly, part of what we find in the Bible itself.

And first, there was the separation caused by *national feeling*. To realize how strong this was on the Hebrew side, we have only to call to mind many familiar expressions distributed all through the Book of Psalms. And it is not difficult to find traces of the same feeling on the *other* side—*i.e.* of the Gentiles toward the Jews. "What do these feeble Jews?" was the language of the Persian officials when the Hebrews

under Nehemiah were rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem.¹ It is easy to detect here the feeling of national antipathy. And to take one instance from the New Testament, and thus to pass from the Persian Empire to the Roman, when a disturbance was made at Philippi in consequence of the preaching of Paul and Silas, and they were brought before the magistrates, the exclamation was, these men "*being Jews to begin with*"—for that is the correct translation—"do exceedingly trouble our city."² And to turn again to the feeling entertained on the Hebrew side (for I am anxious to mark the fact that a barrier was erected on both sides, and on this side, to a certain extent, with Divine sanction), we find our Lord Himself, though about to abolish all these differences, urging this state of mind as a ground of appeal: "After all these things do the Gentiles seek."³ We find the Jews, in their animosity against the Lord, saying on one occasion: "Will he go to the dispersed among the Gentiles and teach the Gentiles?" St. Paul, too, knows very well the sentiment with which he has to deal when he writes: "We also are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles." This feeling was, as I have said, in the course of God's mysterious dispensations, in some degree authorized on the Jewish side. But when Christianity came there came a vast power which changed all this. There came a holy revolution. All nationality in religion is now utterly extinguished. No enlightened person now holds this exclusive principle as a theory, however much it may try to assert itself in practice. We know perfectly well that every human being, of every nation, is equally welcome to the Gospel. There is no argument in this, be it observed, against national churches; on the contrary, the fact that Christianity is capable of being made national in any country whatever is one of the proofs of the point before us. No power could have taken the Jewish religion, in its completeness, away from Jerusalem, and made it national in London. Remove Judaism from Palestine, and it would not be Judaism in its completeness at all.

This brings us to the second barrier—the *local* barrier—in the matter of religion, which existed in force at the time of the founding of Christianity. We know how this was, and by a Divine authority for a time, in the preparatory stage of the world's history, among the Hebrews. "This is God's hill, in which it pleaseth Him to dwell," is a sentiment, not rebuked, but sanctioned. We forget, however, that the same was the case among the Gentiles. Localized religion was, in that preparatory time, equally characteristic of the Heathen world. The Acts of the Apostles will supply us with illustrations, if we read

¹ Nehem. iv. 2.² Acts xvi. 20.³ Matt. vi. 32.

that book carefully. When the poor heathens of Lycaonia wished to offer sacrifice to Paul and Barnabas, the officiating priest is termed "the priest of Jupiter before the city." There was a local temple of Jupiter at Lystra, and the divinity was supposed to be something more there than he was elsewhere; and what was true of Lystra was true, more or less, of all the heathen cities which St. Paul visited. The most marked instance is that of Diana and Ephesus. The chief enthusiasm of the place, its local pride, its profit and fame, were bound up with the local divinity of the place. "Great is Diana of the Ephesians"¹ was like a war-cry in times of excitement. Nor are these the only instances which we find, if we bring classical knowledge to bear upon the Book of the Acts. "Castor and Pollux," who gave the name to the ship which took St. Paul from Malta to Puteoli,² were patron-deities of travellers by sea. When it is said that he saw Athens "wholly given up to idolatry,"³ the meaning is that it was full of the tokens of such local worship, the presiding goddess being represented by a lofty statue, with a spear, on the top of the Acropolis, so as to be visible at sea beyond Cape Colonna. Now all this localizing of religion, with its inevitable rivalry and separation, is by Divine authority gone. It is a great principle of Christianity that, to quote one of the Hebrew books, "the God of the hills is the God of the valleys."⁴ No doubt the old habits of thought have a tendency to come back and reassert themselves. The localizing of religion has been common enough through the Christian centuries. Human nature finds it very difficult to disentangle itself from the ancient rudimentary notions in such matters. Ideas belonging to the Jewish temple are often applied to Christian churches, in spite of the teaching of the New Testament,⁵ which sets *spiritual* realities before us as the antitypes of the past.⁶ It might seem rather harsh to say that the cry "Great is Diana of the Ephesians" has sometimes found an echo in Christian times; but often we hear words equivalent to "This is God's hill, in which it delighteth Him to dwell," used as though they expressed now a truth of the Gospel. In the teaching, however, of the New Testament—in the Gospel as preached by the Apostles—all this is swept away. "He taketh away the first, that He may establish the second."

But, in the next place, there was a *social barrier* erected between the domestic life of the Jews and the domestic life of the Gentiles, which prevented the existence of one comprehensive religion for all the world. Even long before the time of Christianity, even before the giving of the Mosaic Law itself,

¹ Acts xx. 28.

² Acts xxviii. 11.

³ Acts xvii. 16.

⁴ 1 Kings xx. 28.

⁵ See John iv. 21; Acts vii. 48; xvii. 14.

⁶ See 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; vi. 19. 2 Cor. vi. 16. Rev. xxi. 22.

this kind of hindrance to union was in force. "The Egyptians might not eat bread with the Hebrews: for that was an abomination to the Egyptians."¹ The great illustration, however, to which the mind naturally turns is that furnished by the history of St. Peter and Cornelius. This very hindrance is a turning point in the narrative of the first great Gentile conversion. It required a special vision, and a very careful spiritual training, before Peter could see that this barrier was now gone. It was not till the further disclosures at Cæsarea were made that the whole truth flashed into this Apostle's mind: "Now of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but that in every nation he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him."² How deeply this view of an imperative social separation was ingrained in the Jewish mind we see from what the other Apostles said when they called Peter to account for what he had done at Cæsarea: "Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and didst eat with them."³ It must be sorrowfully admitted that this great evil of social religious separation exists to this day in the East on a vast scale in the form of caste, and may exist there for a long period still. But yet we may say, and we must say, that Christianity has come into the world as a magnificent power which in the end will do away with these distinctions. The true religion of Christ does not recognize their existence.

There remains one barrier more—a barrier erected on both sides—that of *separate ceremonial worship*. All the associations of the Jewish Temple service—the killing of animals, the streams of blood, the dead carcasses, the burning of flesh in fire—all this has so completely passed away from our minds, that we find it extremely difficult to realize it. We can hardly even conceive what it was like. Yet all this existed once; and it made an absolute division between the Jews and all other nations. And we must remember that over against this there was a sacrificial system among the Gentiles also, with its blood, its altars and its priests; and the repugnance which every pious Jew must have felt towards such ceremonies we can infer from a sentence written by St. Paul in his First Epistle to the Corinthians: "The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with demons."⁴ In that passage he is speaking of the Lord's Supper; and without pursuing further this question of Temple-sacrifices, whether Jewish or Heathen, I will simply name a ceremony, which, though religious, was domestic; and I will ask my readers to contrast, in the light of the Epiphany,

Gen. xliii. 32.

² Acts x. 34, 35.³ Acts xi. 3.⁴ 1 Cor xi. 20.

the Passover and the Lord's Supper. The one was exclusive in the most emphatic sense; the other is, in the strongest sense, inclusive. The former asserted the absolute ceremonial separation of the Jews from the rest of mankind; the latter proclaims that in Christ all are one. The bread which we break, "is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread."¹ The mere institution of this sacrament may most truly be said to be a "manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles:" for all meet here on equal terms, the Gentile and the Hebrew, the master and the slave, the negro and the white man. Those who are different in everything else are alike here. In the institution of the Eucharist the Saviour has for ever thrown all these differences far away into the forgotten past.

By following steadily this line of historical thought we reach a point from which we can survey the full glory of the Epiphany. A large illustration of this part of the subject could easily be obtained from classical literature, but what has here been selected from biblical sources is enough for our present purpose. In our ecclesiastical year a light is thrown forward, as it were, from Christmas through the Epiphany season, and a shadow thrown back from the season of Lent, the meeting-point of the two being Septuagesima Sunday. It is highly desirable that we should appreciate the significance of the ecclesiastical place in which we are at this moment; and we can gain this advantage by a careful study of history.

But in order to master the whole case we must have recourse, not simply to the historian, but to the philologist. Reference was made above to St. Paul's employment of the word "mystery," which appears profusely in connection with our subject in the Epistle to the Ephesians,² as well as in that to the Colossians,³ and at the close of the Epistle to the Romans.⁴ After his manner he draws an image from one of the institutions of the society in which he is moving. Just as in writing to Corinth he draws metaphorical language from the Greek games at the Isthmus, or as in writing to the Asiatic Churches he establishes and strengthens his meaning by allusions to such architecture as was seen in the temple of the great goddess Diana, or as when in writing from Rome his imagery is suggested by the armour of the imperial soldiers, whom he saw daily; so it is in the present instance. In the various places which he visited he found "mysteries" an established institution. Probably at Ephesus and in Asia Minor generally such observances of secret societies (for so we may term them) were common. Certainly the practice of "curious arts" meets us prominently in the

¹ 1 Cor. x. 16, 17.³ Col. i. 26, 27; ii. 2; iv. 3.² Eph. i. 9; iii. 3, 4, 9; vi. 19.⁴ Rom. xvi. 25, 27; see 1 Tim. iii. 9.

account of St. Paul's work in that region. But the "great mysteries," as they were called—the most famous of all—were at Eleusis, by which place he certainly passed on one of his journeys at least between Athens and Corinth.

The essential feature of a "mystery" was this, that to some by initiation all became light, which was absolutely dark to others. The word denotes not a secret, but the revelation of a secret. In the use of the word, as to whether it denotes obscurity or illumination, all depends upon whether the reference is made to the initiated or the uninitiated. Now in St. Paul's use of it he always has reference to the former. This can be easily ascertained by an examination of the various contexts in which he employs the term. It is quite similar to that one place in the Gospel history where we find it used: "Unto you it is given to *know* the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven." The whole stress is laid on the communication of light, without any reference to the fact that in all our religious knowledge much remains dark.

We shall catch St. Paul's meaning better if we observe in what senses the word "mystery" is *not* used by him. And in the first place, it is obvious enough that this Scripture language has nothing in common with those mystery-plays, such as the scenic representation of sacred things at Ober-Ammergau, which were common in the Middle Ages. Yet it is for three reasons quite worth while just to touch this usage of the word. First, it is very easy to understand how it arose; next it is the opinion of learned men that the heathen mysteries of the ancients were more or less of this character; and thirdly, this very history of the visit of the Wise Men was a frequent subject of mystery-plays. Such plays, including this very subject, were acted in the city of Chester at a period much later than is commonly supposed.

It is more important to note that "mysteries," in St. Paul's language, never mean sacraments. Often as he employs the term, there is no trace of such a reference in any single instance. It is indeed true that the word "mystery," like the word "sacrament" itself, did at an early date become used ecclesiastically for the appointed ordinances of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. They were co-ordinate terms in the East and West for these holy ceremonies. And it is very easy, too, to understand how this terminology arose. It is most interesting also to find in our Prayer-Book side by side "this holy sacrament," derived from the oath of the Roman soldiers, and "these holy mysteries,"

¹ It is a remarkable coincidence that St. Paul twice uses the phrase "great mystery."

² Matt. xiii. 11; Mark iv. 11; Luke viii. 10.

derived from the secret societies of the Greeks. In strict analogy too with this language we speak in our Baptismal Service of the sanctifying of water to the "mystical" washing away of sin. A good illustration of the use of this language in the earlier Oriental Church may be adduced from Chrysostom,¹ who says in his interpretation of the water and blood which issued from the Saviour's wounded side: "They that are initiated (*ὁ μυσταγωγούμενος*)¹ know that they are regenerated by the water, and fed by the blood and flesh; and hence the mysteries (or rites of initiation—*μυστήρια*) have their origin." We are not concerned here with any questions arising out of Chrysostom's language or opinions upon these subjects. Such a passage is of considerable value to us, both because it illustrates part of the history of the word under our present consideration, and partly because it furnishes a comparatively late testimony in favour of our English view of the exclusive honour with which, among all sacred ordinances, we ought to regard Baptism and the Supper of the Lord.

It may be observed at the same time, by the way, that the word "mystery" and the word "sacrament" were curiously co-ordinated in another respect, in that they were popularly and loosely applied to things religious of various kinds. Nor ought we to forget, while considering this verbal question, how largely the Greek language was spoken in the West during the earliest ages of Christianity. The easy interchange of the words "mystery" and "sacrament" is illustrated in the Vulgate. In the passages where St. Paul uses the Greek word, the two terms in the Latin translation are most singularly interchanged.

Once more. It is of the utmost importance to mark that when the Apostle employs this term he does not employ it in our modern popular sense. When in conversation we speak of anything as being a "mystery," we mean that it is obscure and dark and hard to be understood. It is on this point that we lay the chief stress. But with St. Paul's theological use of the term it is precisely the contrary. He lays the chief stress on brightness, illumination and the informing of the understanding. In this language he does not tell us that religious truth, though partially revealed, is very dark after all; but he tells that what was once altogether hidden is now openly revealed. It is not so much the revelation of a mystery with which we have in these passages to deal, as that the word "mystery" itself denotes revelation. Just as St. Paul elsewhere represents himself as a priest, offering up converted heathendom as a sacrifice to God, so in these passages he speaks of himself as a hierophant of

¹ Hom. lxxxv. on Is. xix. 34. The passage is given in Suicer's useful article on *μυστήριον*.

Eleusis, going everywhere to initiate the world. He is a "steward of the mysteries of God,"¹ and his duty is to keep them safe and to dispense them to all; and these mysteries are the cardinal truths of the Christian religion. "Great is the mystery of godliness: God manifest in the flesh, *preached* unto the Gentiles, *believed on* in the world."² This is the mystery or revelation of Christmas. "Behold, *I shew you* a mystery: we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed."³ This is the mystery or revelation of Easter. "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church⁴ . . . This is a great mystery: but I *speak* concerning Christ and the Church." This might be termed the mystery or revelation of Whitsuntide. In all these cases we observe that it is revelation or illumination in which he exults and teaches us to exult.

But nowhere is his language so luminous and full as when he speaks of the mystery or revelation of the Epiphany. At first sight we might be surprised by this fact. But if we call to mind the historical circumstances that have been named above, and if, taking these as our starting-point, we give a little play to our imagination, we shall cease to wonder that he felt a special exultation in the breaking down of the old barriers, and in the consciousness that the full Gospel now may have "a free course and be glorified." This mystery in one sense includes all other mysteries, because it is the assurance that all the world is welcome to the whole.

Now, therefore, a few concluding words may be said on the practical bearings of the question. It was asked at the beginning how we, the Clergy, are to help our people to get a definite view of the subject, so as to be edified thereby; and some of the right answers to this question are as follows.

We ought to expound the meaning of the word "Epiphany" itself. It is a most beautiful and glorious word, denoting light "shining upon" that which would otherwise be dark. If we take a Greek concordance in order to search for this noun and its corresponding verb, we find that out of the ten instances of their use in the New Testament, six are in the Pastoral Epistles. The sentence which fills the space from the eleventh to the thirteenth of the second chapter of the Epistle to Titus is a good text to preach on, so far as the word is concerned; and the illustration of the word is quite enough to fill a sermon.

But in preaching we should likewise explain the word "mystery." We should show what it means, we should point out how peculiarly it is a part of St. Paul's phraseology,⁵ how con-

¹ 1 Cor. iv. 1. ² 1 Tim. iii. 16. ³ 1 Cor. xv. 51. ⁴ Eph. v. 25, 32.

⁵ The three places where it occurs in the Gospel are really one. It is found four times in the Book of Revelation. St. Paul uses it twenty times.

sistent he is in the use of it, with what a powerful hand he wields the imagery it contains, and how the people of his own day would certainly understand his meaning. There must be a resolute disentangling of the Scriptural use of the word from other uses, or we shall mislead our people. We must see that we ourselves understand its meaning, and must be willing to give up mistakes to which we may have been accustomed. We must tell our people that, as they have been baptized, so they have been *initiated* into Christian truth, and that in this truth they must seek ever clearer and clearer illumination, must "go on unto perfection."¹

Once more, we must instruct our flocks in the facts of the case, as they are historically, contrasting what used to be with what is. We must point out what a prodigious difference there is between the condition of the world—as to freedom and fulness of revelation, as to comprehensiveness and facility of union—now and in the reign of Tiberius, not only because we have Christianity as a fact, and because the Christian Church exists, but because our religion is different in kind from the religion of those days—that it is not exclusive, not local, not fenced off by barriers; but free, expansive, universal, Catholic.

With all this comes the sense of responsibility, and that in several respects. First, there is the responsibility of maintaining a thankful heart for so boundless a blessing. The simplest homeliest words express most fitly the greatness of our obligation :

Not more than others we deserve,
Yet God hath given us more.

The Almighty Father fixes the limits of the habitation of men and the time of their living. We have been appointed to live in the illuminated era of the world. The light is free and full upon our pathway. Our case, historically, compared with the case of those who lived in ancient days, when the mystery really was a secret, is like that of the Israelites: "It was cloud and darkness to them, but gave light by night to these."²

Next, there is the responsibility of maintaining a charitable mind. We shall surely not be wanting in this, if we have caught the true spirit of the Epiphany. In the Sermon on the Mount one of the arguments presented to us for maintaining a spirit of kindness and forbearance towards all, and for readily pardoning our enemies, is this, "that we may be the children of our Father which is in heaven: for He makes His sun to rise on the evil and on the good." This is the radiant lesson of the very dispensation under which we live. If we are conscious of this mercy, we cannot foster a grudging, narrow, exclusive, habit of mind.

¹ Heb. vi. 1.

² Exod. xiv. 20.

And a wider responsibility still is inculcated by the Epiphany. This season is an eloquent exhortation to missionary zeal and enterprise. It tells us that we must go, like St. Paul, to initiate all the world. The day of secrecy is gone. The holy beneficent illumination is for all. "The darkness is past: the true light now shineth." If our Christianity is according to this great truth, the desire for missionary progress must be ever present with us; and we must long that our native country, its institutions, its tone of thought, the character of its people (alas! that this should be so imperfectly the case) may be "as manifestations of Christ to the Gentiles."

Finally, there is our personal responsibility. If we are true Christians, then a correct description of our life is precisely this, that it is a "manifestation of Christ" to those who are leading heathen lives around us. That many are leading such lives is too palpable. Our anxious desire must be that the light, where-with we have been illuminated, may shine upon them, so that they too may be "light in the Lord." When following such trains of thought as these, we often find our way back again to the Sermon on the Mount. "Ye are the light of the world. . . . Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven."

I regard the Epiphany as the Sunrise of the Christian Year. If we take this image vigorously into our minds—if we remember how the sun's rays, at its rising, dart everywhere, how they brighten all Nature, how they raise our spirits, relax the tension of anxious thought, invite us to cheerful views of life, to charitable feeling, to the active discharge of duty—then we shall realize what I have desired to express. The Epiphany "goeth forth from the uttermost part of the heaven, and runneth about unto the end of it again; and there is nothing hid from the heat thereof."¹

J. S. HOWSON.

Reviews.

The Book of Psalms, with an Explanatory and Critical Commentary. By G. H. S. JOHNSON, M.A., F.R.S., Dean of Wells; C. J. ELLIOTT, M.A., Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and Vicar of Winkfield, Berks; F. C. COOK, M.A., Canon and Precentor of Exeter, Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen. New and Revised Edition. Reprinted from the Speaker's Commentary. John Murray. 1880.

THE short Notice prefixed to this Volume explains with sufficient clearness the circumstances of its publication. The general interest which was excited by the Notes upon the Psalms which appeared in the fourth volume of "The Speaker's Commentary" called forth numerous

¹ Ps. xix. 6.

applications to the distinguished publisher to reprint this portion of the work in a separate volume with a view to wider circulation. Under these circumstances the authors of the "Commentary" were requested to revise their respective contributions; and at the close of the last year the volume now before us was sent to the press and submitted to the judgment of that large and increasing class of readers who are ready to welcome every new effort to throw light upon the Holy Scriptures, and more especially upon that portion of the sacred volume which has been in all ages the peculiar "treasure-house" of the Church.

It would obviously be impracticable, within the very limited space at our command, to do more than direct attention to some of the salient characteristics of the volume before us. It is important, however, to state distinctly what the reader may *not*, as well as what he may, expect to find in these pages. We have heard, and, if our memory does not deceive us, we have also seen it alleged, as a grave accusation against the "Speaker's Commentary" that it is deficient in one of the most important departments of Biblical exposition—viz., in practical and devotional application. We are far, indeed, from denying that such application of the truths contained in Holy Scripture is, not only of great but of primary importance, and that without it all other exposition of its meaning will fall short of the great end for which the sacred treasure has been committed to earthen vessels. We think, however, that it will be admitted by every duly qualified expositor of Scripture, that in order rightly to apply the Word of God, we must endeavour, by the use of all the means entrusted to us, to arrive at a just conception of the literal and grammatical meaning of the language in which it is clothed. In Devotional Commentaries on Holy Scripture generally, and more especially in Commentaries of this description on the Book of Psalms, we already abound. Until a very recent period, however, little has been done in England to furnish the biblical student with an explanatory and critical commentary upon the text, together with such emendations of the Authorized Version as the scholarship of the nineteenth century has been able to supply. It is this want which the "Speaker's Commentary" was designed to meet; and it is in accordance with its success or failure in this department of biblical criticism that every impartial reader will pronounce judgment upon its merits or defects.

We are indebted to the learned and accomplished Editor for the extremely valuable and comprehensive "Introduction" to the Book of Psalms which is contained in the volume now before us. In this Introduction Canon Cook investigates with much care and candour the amount of authority which is due to the Titles or Inscriptions which are prefixed to one hundred and one of the one hundred and fifty Psalms of which the Psalter is composed. The result of this inquiry is upon the whole favourable to the authenticity of these inscriptions, the free and fearless discussion of which, however, Canon Cook considers to fall within the legitimate province of the biblical critic, and to be altogether outside the question of the supreme authority of Holy Writ.

The remarks of the Editor on the distinctive characteristics of the Psalms of David are entitled to the careful consideration of the reader, and are calculated to throw much light upon the character and personal history of the writer, as well as to impart fresh interest to that large portion of the Psalter which is ascribed to David, and which has supplied a traditional title to the whole of these compositions. The remarks of Canon Cook upon the Psalms which have been referred to the Maccabean age are also entitled to the reader's careful perusal. The result at which the writer arrives is, that whilst it is unjust to regard the modern theory which ascribes many Psalms to this late period as necessarily indicating

any tendency to scepticism, the external and internal evidence is in favour of their earlier composition; and that even in the case of the three Psalms which so orthodox a commentator as Calvin ascribes to the Macabean period—viz., the xlivth, the lxxivth, and the lxxixth, the internal evidence is opposed to the conclusion at which he arrived. The observations of the Editor upon the “ethical teaching” of the Psalter as exhibiting a considerable advance upon that of the Pentateuch, and more particularly his remarks upon the “notices of a future state,” will be read with peculiar interest by the thoughtful biblical student. In regard to the latter subject, Canon Cook observes that the xvth and xviiith Psalms, which even Hitzig allows to belong to the Davidic age, supply conclusive evidence of a deep-rooted belief in the doctrine of a future state at the time of the earliest collection of these writings. We must not fail to notice the equally interesting and important section of the Introduction which deals with the great question of the Messianic interpretation of the Psalms. Whilst justly discriminating between an absolute acceptance or rejection of the ancient and mediæval system of interpretation which saw in every Psalm such distinct utterances of the Spirit of Christ as completely suppressed the individuality of the respective writers, Canon Cook observes that were there “no alternative save that of rejecting the Messianic interpretation altogether, or of applying it throughout, few earnest Christians would hesitate to cast in their lot with those who accepted the latter.” We think that the larger portion of our readers will agree with the learned Editor that there is no necessity for the adoption of either of these alternatives, and that whilst maintaining generally the pervading tone of Messianic anticipation, and in regard to certain of the Psalms, their direct and exclusive reference to Christ, the candid expositor will not fail to recognize, even in many of those Psalms which contain strong and unmistakable reference to the Messiah, many unequivocal indications of personal feelings and many characteristics of a strongly marked individuality.

We refrain from committing ourselves in this extremely difficult subject from acquiescence in every opinion which is expressed by Canon Cook. We do not hesitate, however, to commend his thoughtful and suggestive remarks to the careful consideration of every student of that most important and most deeply interesting portion of the sacred volume which is comprised in the Psalter.

It may prove interesting to our readers if we give a few extracts from this volume by way of illustration, from which they will be enabled to form some conception, however imperfect, of the general character and merits of the work.

Our first extract shall be from the Notes upon the first Psalm. In the note upon the third verse, “And he shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water,” &c., Canon Cook refers to Dean Stanley’s suggestion that the allusion may be to the oleander, “a beautiful evergreen with bright red blossoms and dark green leaves, found now only in the valley of the Jordan.” Canon Cook observes in regard to this suggestion that the oleander is an indigenous tree, and not a tree which is “planted,” a word which, as the Editor very justly observes, is used of “the scion of a tree severed from its parent trunk and planted in a spot where it may be carefully tended.” The justice of this remark might be confirmed by reference to Ezekiel xvii. 22, where the same word is used of a young twig cut off from the highest branch of the high cedar and *planted* upon a high mountain. Its importance, in order to a just apprehension of the appropriateness of the comparison, will be apparent when the verse is viewed in connection with the beginning of that which follows: “The ungodly are not so,” and with other places as well in the Psalter, as elsewhere, where the same comparison is found. Thus, *e.g.*, in one of the passages.

to which Canon Cook refers—Jer. xvii. 5-8—the simile, as he observes, is “elaborately drawn out,” and a striking contrast is presented between the indigenous “heath in the desert,” to which the ungodly man is compared, and the “tree *planted* by the waters,” which is selected as the type of “the man that trusteth in the Lord.” We find a similar allusion in Psalm xxxvii. 35, where the beauty of the original is greatly obscured by the adoption of the rendering which we find in the text of the Authorized Version, “a green bay tree,” instead of the more correct marginal rendering, “a tree that groweth in his own soil.” The note of Canon Cook on this place is as follows:—“The margin brings out the true meaning of the Hebrew. The wicked man is described as spreading himself out with rank luxuriance, like an ‘indigenous tree,’ or rather ‘shrub,’ flourishing in its native soil.” The writer goes on to compare this passage with Psalm i. 3, and to suggest that the oleander, the tree to which Dean Stanley thought that the godly man was compared, may be the very tree which the Psalmist had in his mind as a type of the wicked man, inasmuch as it is a *native* shrub “with bright flowers but no fruit, abundance of leaves, but poisonous, growing wild, useless to men, and untended.” After directing the attention of his readers in the note on Psalm i. 3, to the fact that neither Dean Stanley nor Dr. Tristram appear to have observed that the words “that bringeth forth his *fruit* in his season” are singularly inappropriate to the oleander, Canon Cook proceeds thus:—

One evergreen, the palm-tree, carefully tended, still found in the gardens of Jerusalem of old, growing, as the Dean shows, on Olivet, giving probably its name to Bethany, “the house of dates,” and supplying branches for the Feast of Tabernacles (Zech. viii. 15), and for our Lord’s entrance into Jerusalem (John xii. 13), satisfies all the conditions of our text. It is conspicuous for its beauty; it indicates the presence of water; it bears precious fruit, and is a recognized emblem of the righteous man (see Ps. xcii. 12, 13, and compare Tristram “Nat. Hist.” B. p. 384).

Two short extracts from the Notes on the Psalm to which Canon Cook refers will add to the interest of the remarks to which reference has been already made. In the first Note on Psalm xcii. 12: “The righteous shall flourish like the palm tree”—we read as follows:—

The palm-tree of the Oasis is remarkable for its erect growth, notwithstanding the weight of its produce (*nittur in pondus palma*), its perpetual verdure, its power of putting forth young shoots even in old age, the quantity of the fruit which it bears, and the distance of its foliage from the earth. Growing as it does in places where no other tree is found, it is an image of life in the midst of surrounding death (see Delitzsch *in loc.*).

The Note on the following verse not only corroborates the justice of Canon Cook’s remarks on Psalm i. 3, but throws some light upon other passages of Scripture which have been thought to present considerable difficulty. The verse is as follows: “Those that be planted in the house of the Lord shall flourish in the courts of our God.” After noticing that the words may be rendered, “They are planted (or, being planted) in the house of Jehovah, they shall blossom,” &c., the writer continues thus: “Dean Stanley and others are of opinion that certain trees were planted in the courts of the temple. The prohibition of Deut. xvi. 21 seems to refer solely to idolatrous images. It appears also not improbable, considering the heat of the climate, that the court of the tabernacle, and afterwards the courts of the temple, were partially shaded by the foliage of trees. Nor are there wanting passages which seem to support this idea, as Job xxiv. 26, which speaks of the oak, or terebinth, by (or in) the *sanctuary* of the Lord, and Psalm lii. 8, where the Psalmist compares himself to a green olive-tree in the house of the Lord. The righteous

are like trees planted in a good soil ("trees of righteousness, the planting of Jehovah," Is. lxi. 3). The LXX render *shethulim* (*planted*) by *μεταφτευμένοι*; the other Greek Versions render it by *μεταφτευόμενες*, *transplanted*; St. Jerome, *transplantati*. The wicked man, on the contrary, is compared to a tree growing in its own soil. He is indigenous."

We must not conclude our notice of this volume without directing the attention of our readers to the Excursus upon Psalms xci.-c. which is found at the end of it. The object of that Excursus is to adduce some evidence of the coincidence of subject, style, and phraseology, between this series of Psalms and the earlier and later prophecies of Isaiah, more especially the later prophecies, and also to endeavour to determine approximately the date to which this series of Psalms must be assigned. Having alleged the reasons which appear to justify the conclusion that these Psalms must be assigned to a period previous to the dissolution of the monarchy, and that they may reasonably be ascribed to the time of the prophet Isaiah, the writer endeavours to show that if that prophet was not the author of this series of Psalms, there is much stronger ground for the belief that the Psalmist borrowed from the prophet than that a writer of such striking and characteristic originality as the prophet Isaiah borrowed so much of his style and phraseology from the Psalmist. The conclusion which is finally reached is, that if the above chain of reasoning be admitted to be sound, the modern theory of the "second Isaiah" or the "great unknown," which is accepted by many as one of the most clearly established results of the negative school of criticism, must be allowed to be devoid of all solid foundation.

We have already exhausted the space assigned to us for our remarks upon this valuable contribution to our Biblical literature. We can do no more than commend the volume to the perusal, not only of professed biblical students, but also of the large and ever-increasing number of those who are not content with the cursory reading of the Bible, but who desire to attain to an intelligent and comprehensive apprehension of its meaning. Such will find that, in addition to many valuable and important corrections of the renderings of the Authorized Version, and much independent research, a careful and laborious use has been made of the works of the best English and Continental expositors, and that the results of their investigations have been presented in an intelligible and concentrated form to readers who have neither the ability nor the disposition to consult the original authorities.

Short Notices.

Canonicity. A Collection of Early Testimonies to the Canonical Books of the New Testament. Based on Kirchofer's "Quellensammlung." By A. H. CHARTERIS, D.D., Professor of Biblical Criticism and Biblical Antiquities in the University of Edinburgh. Pp. 470. Wm. Blackwood & Sons.

A WORK of singular value, based on Kirchofer. It has so grown in the author's hands that it is substantially independent of the "Quellensammlung." With Dr. Charteris it has evidently been a labour of love. For ourselves, we only regret that from lack of space we are unable—at all events, at present—to notice the work as its great merits require. The learned Professor has made good use of all the helps possible; but his judgment and accuracy are as remarkable as his research. In several passages, we observe, he points out the weakness of that—at one time much puffed work—"Supernatural Religion." In

his preface, he pays a tribute to the great work of Lardner. "My admiration of Lardner (on whom Kirchofer almost exclusively relied) has been increased with increasing knowledge of parts of the wide field over which his splendid labours extended."

Memories of Troublous Times: being the History of Dame Alicia Chamberlayne. By EMMA MARSHALL. Seeleys.

This in our judgment is one of the very best books of the season. Mrs. Marshall is well known as an admirable writer, and this "History of Dame Alicia Chamberlayne" is not unworthy of her high reputation. By an inadvertence, which we regret, our notice of it has been delayed. A choice gift-book, well printed, and tastfully got up. We heartily recommend it. The brief preface we quote as follows:—

The story of Mary Prunington, as it occurs in the following narrative, is not fictitious, but is taken word for word from a genuine autobiography of the seventeenth century. A copy of the MS., made by an ancestor of my own in the year 1790, is now in my possession; whether the original MS. is still in existence I am unable to say. So far as I know, no part of it has ever before been printed. In weaving these extracts into the "History of Dame Alicia Chamberlayne" I have endeavoured to make the imaginary story and the real one harmonize with each other, but I do not profess to have followed with precision the literary style of 200 years ago. The historical facts relating to the Siege of Gloucester in 1643 are taken from the "Bibliotheca Gloucestrensis," first published during the Civil War, and edited and republished in 1825 by Mr. John Washbourne, of Gloucester, with an introduction by the Rev. John Webb. The illustrations are mainly taken from old engravings, but the view of Gloucester Cathedral and Matson House are from photographs by Mr. Billing, of Gloucester, and are copied with his permission.

A Library of Religious Poetry. A Collection of the best Poems of all Ages and Tongues. With Biographical and Literary Notes. Edited by PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D., and ARTHUR GELMAN, M.A. Pp. 1000. Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington. 1881.

In this handsome volume we have a very choice collection of sacred poetry. Some such "library" was, we had sometimes thought, really needed; and with this liberal, and on the whole judicious, selection, we are much pleased. For ourselves, we are glad to compare poems of the present with those of the past, and English poems with translations and paraphrases of various kinds. To lovers of sacred songs of every Christian "school," Dr. Schaff's treasure-house of "the best Poems of all ages and tongues" offers many pleasing and profitable hours of refreshment. A superb gift-book, in its way, this "Library of Religious Poetry" deserves to become widely known.

Churchmen and Dissenters. A Paper read at Leicester Church Congress, 1880. By JOHN CHARLES RYLE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Liverpool. W. Hunt & Co.

In a prefatory note we read that the Bishop publishes this Paper "in self-defence. I have been accused of 'narrowness,' for saying, on p. 11, that those Dissenters who use violent and intemperate language about the Church of England are a small and rabid minority. To that statement I adhere." Large extracts from his Lordship's Paper were given, our readers may remember, in *THE CHURCHMAN* for November, and, in particular, we quoted the very passage which a Nonconformist critic has since condemned. The Bishop, of course, adheres to his statement, and although he needs here no defence, it would be easy to prove, so far as such sayings can be substantiated, that it was perfectly correct. "To take only one point, and on an indirect line. If the Liberationist Society's

Annual Report be studied, it will be seen, from the number of subscribers, character of subscriptions, and the absence of representative ministerial names, that the sympathy of Nonconformists with the objects of that Society has been greatly overrated.

Growth of the Episcopate in England and Wales during Seventeen Centuries. By the Rev. CANON HUME, D.C.L., LL.D., Vicar of Vauxhall, Liverpool, and Honorary Secretary of the Liverpool Bishopric Committee. Printed for the Liverpool Clerical Society, before whom it was read, July 5, 1880.

On the title-page of this very interesting *brochure* appear the words "not published;" we conclude, therefore, that Canon Hume's Paper has been issued in a quiet way, solely for diocesan purposes. It is dedicated to the Lord Bishop of Liverpool. We quite agree with Canon Hume's conclusion, that the late Mr. Horsman really sought reform; and it is certain that many of the reforms which that right hon. gentleman advocated have since taken place. The statistical summary of Dr. Hume's arguments is as follows:—

A.D.		DIOCESSES OR BISHOPRICS
596	On the arrival of Augustine there were in England and Wales	6
1066	At the Norman Conquest	19
1517	At the commencement of the Reformation	21
1547	At the death of Henry VIII.	26
1880	At the present day	30
	In process of arrangement at present	3

By an inadvertence which we regret, a pamphlet (32 pages) by the Rev. FRANCIS STORR, M.A., Vicar of Brenchley, entitled *Advent and other Subjects*, was not noticed in our November impression. Mr. Storr is known as an able and suggestive preacher; his topics for sermons—eighteen courses on various subjects—will be found helpful by many. (W. Poole, 12A Paternoster Row.)

The Brides of Ardmore. A Story of Irish Life. By AGNES SMITH, Author of "Effie Maxwell," &c. Pp. 390. Elliot Stock. 1880.

This is a very readable, pleasing, and, withal, informing story. Ardmore, seven centuries ago, was an ecclesiastical colony, and in "The Brides of Ardmore" we are told all about it. A good deal of information about the Church of Ireland in the purer times, before the English conquest, is given, and the doctrines of St. Patrick are contrasted with those carried into Ireland by dignitaries who were subservient to the Church of Rome.

With the January number of *The Antiquary* we are much pleased. This new magazine, admirably printed, and got up with great taste, has won its way, we have observed, with signal success; and it seems likely to keep a really good position among ably-edited periodicals. The very interesting article on the recently-discovered Roman Villa near Brading, with photographic illustrations, is issued in a separate form by the publisher of *The Antiquary*, Mr. Stock.

A new work, entitled "Chapters from the History of Old St. Paul's," by Dr. W. SPARROW SIMPSON, editor of "Documents Illustrating the History of St. Paul's" (Camden Society), is in the press, and will be published by Mr. Elliot Stock.

We gladly call attention to an ably-written tract-treatise—the word "tract" is hardly suitable—entitled *The Holy Childhood*, a companion to *The Story of Christmas*, which was warmly commended in our last impression. Forty pages, printed on tinted paper, published by the

Religious Tract Society. Simple, suggestive, scholarly, deeply spiritual. *The Story of Passion Week* belongs to the same useful series, which, so far as we know, is unique.

From Messrs. T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, we have received the second volume of Hagenbach's *History of Doctrines*.

The Rev. Charles Bullock has published his Sheffield Church Congress Paper, *Popular Recreation* (Hand and Heart Office, 1, Paternoster Buildings, E.C.). In the same little volume appears an article on "The Theatre as it is," reprinted from *Hand and Heart*, and a faithful protest against the Ober-Ammergau Passion Play.

THE MONTH.

THE annual gathering of Evangelical clergymen at Islington took place on the 11th, the Vicar, Prebendary Wilson, in the chair. In the course of his opening address,¹ the Chairman referred to this Magazine. THE CHURCHMAN, he said, "is taking the place of the *Christian Observer* with great success. I have read with the greatest interest the various papers which have appeared in it from its first publication, and I do not hesitate to bear my warm testimony to the fidelity and ability with which it is conducted, and would urge upon my brethren to promote its wider circulation." The subject for consideration was "Ministerial Efficiency," and the first Paper—a very valuable one—was read by the Bishop of Rochester. We hope that all the Papers, with the impressive Address, will be published.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in a reply to the Memorial written by the Dean of St. Paul's, and signed by a large number of clergymen,² refers to a letter sent by his Grace to Canon Wilkinson. In this letter, dated December 31, we read:—

¹ Mr. Wilson spoke of the large body of faithful clergy, who set their face against "dangerous innovations. They are firmly attached to the Church of their fathers, they gladly obey the godly notions of those who are set over them in the Lord, and they alike resolutely oppose all sceptical views on the one hand, or Romanizing tendencies on the other. These are to my mind the great hope of the Church. The laity, as a body, are with them. Common sense is with them. Our Articles and Liturgy are with them. Above all, our Divine Master is in their midst. It is true that some among us are sorely tried by the pressure from without. Our younger friends are in danger, more especially, of yielding to the prevailing taste of the day. Still, I believe that the influence of Evangelical truth is gradually spreading in our midst."

² The Memorial deals first with "questions of ritual." The five Deans, (St. Paul's, Durham, Manchester, Worcester, and York) say:—"Having regard to the uncertainties which have been widely thought to surround some recent interpretations of ecclesiastical law, as well as to the equitable claims of congregations placed in the most dissimilar religious circumstances; we cannot but think that the recognized toleration of even wide diversities of ceremonial is alone consistent with the interests of true

It is a peculiarity of the present troubles that the clergymen who have fallen under the penalties of the law in a way we all much regret, have come under the authority of the Provincial Courts of Canterbury and York as the result of their having positively refused to conform to the admonition of their Bishops; and, indeed, so far as I know, no case of prosecution for ritual has (at least for many years past) been allowed to proceed in the case of any clergyman who was willing to comply with such admonition. It certainly may fairly be taken to show that there must be some exceptional difficulty in present arrangements when clergymen of otherwise unimpeachable character think it their duty to run the risk of having their usefulness in their parishes rudely interrupted by the authority of the law, rather than yield to those set over them in the Lord that degree of willing obedience which seems to most men to be enjoined alike by the traditions of their Church and by the written words of the Prayer-book (in the Preface "Concerning the Service of the Church") as well as by their promise of canonical obedience.

The Archbishop alludes, further, to the Report of the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury, appointed in 1877 "to consider the constitutional relations between the authorities ecclesiastical and civil in this realm, and the best method whereby common action may be taken by them in matters affecting the Church." His Grace adds:—

I have already . . . publicly alluded to this exhaustive and most carefully drawn report, and as soon as the forms of Convocation allow it I propose to call the attention of my brethren of the Upper House to the information it contains, and its suggestions for the improvement of our present laws. I can have no hesitation in assuring you that, while of course I cannot approve of much that has been said and written (often, I presume, under excitement) in the present controversy, and while I have been unable as yet to obtain any authoritative expression of united opinion as to what is wanted, still, I cannot but respect the evident earnestness of many who are disturbed as to the alleged grievances which attach to our present condition.

In commenting on the appeal for toleration in matter of ritual, the *Times* remarks:—

To do the Ritualists justice, they and their recognized leaders are perfectly frank in the matter. The colour of a vestment or the fashion of a ceremony are nothing to them save as they represent a definite Eucharistic doctrine. Of that doctrine it is sufficient to say that it is

religion, and with the well-being of the English Church at the present time."

The second point in this Memorial is ecclesiastical jurisdiction. "Our present troubles are likely to recur, unless the courts by which ecclesiastical causes are decided, in the first instance and on appeal, can be so constructed as to secure the conscientious obedience of clergymen who believe the constitution of the Church of Christ to be of Divine appointment; and who protest against the State's encroachment upon rights assured to the Church of England by solemn Acts of Parliament."

deeply repugnant to the vast majority of English Churchmen, and, therefore, it is idle to ask for toleration of the ritual which represents it, unless a like toleration is claimed for the doctrine itself. But to ask for a toleration of the Eucharistic doctrine involved in the service of the Mass, or in anything at all closely resembling it, is virtually to ask that the work of the Reformation in England should be undone. . . . The Ritualists, for whom toleration is now claimed, are, in fact, the chief disturbers of the recognized and long-established order of public worship. They act with a definite purpose, and that purpose they avow. To ask Englishmen at large to tolerate practices avowedly revived or invented for the furtherance of such a purpose is surely to exhibit a strange misconception of the whole spirit of their civil and ecclesiastical history.

The plea of the Memorial, in fact, says the *Times*, is either "superfluous, or we regret to have to say it, disingenuous."¹ It is worthy of note that the Rev. J. de la Bere, on whom sentence of deprivation has been pronounced (on the 8th), in a letter to the Primate remarks that the Ritualistic practices (for the sake of which he set at naught his Bishop and the Church Courts) "are not trivialities" to him. He writes:—"My practice in the introduction of any new point of ritual was fully to explain its value and its meaning."

On Saturday, the 15th, after five days' hearing, before Lords Justices James, Brett, and Cotton, in the "matter of the Rev. T. P. Dale's imprisonment for contumacy, under the Public Worship Act, and in a similar matter of the Rev. R. W.

¹ In a letter to the *Times* the Hon. and Rev. W. H. Fremantle says:—Though the memorial is vague, it is only the more calculated to do harm by fostering unreasonable discontent among the clergy. It assumes that "the State" has "encroached on rights assured to the Church of England by solemn Acts of Parliament." Where, I ask, are such Acts to be found? The preamble of the Statute of Appeals (24 Henry VIII., cap. 12), to which allusion is usually made by the advocates of clericalism, and to which alone, I suspect, allusion can be made, contains no such assurance, as may be seen by any one who will read that preamble by the light of the Act itself, and the supplementary Act of the next year (Submission of the Clergy and Restraint of Appeals, 25 Henry VIII., cap. 19). It is an assertion of the independence of the temporality and spirituality of England against the Court of Rome, but contains not a word which gives rights to the clergy as against Parliament. Still less does it distinguish, as the memorial does, between "the Church" and "the State." The real greatness of the English Church is, that it has, ever since England became one, been able to entwine itself with the nation so as to be indistinguishable from it. The mistake of a section of the clergy (for it is the clergy, not the Church, who profess to be aggrieved) has lain in their inability to perceive and trust loyally to this central fact. They have always wished to have a class power separate from or co-ordinate with that of the nation. This claim has always been resisted, and, I hope, always will be. It would, if allowed, do violence to a conviction, equally sincere and deep with that of the memorialists, and which is not that of some of the clergy and of the friends of clericalism, but that on which the Reformation settlement itself is grounded.

Enraght," judgment was given. A technical defect had been discovered,¹ and Messrs. Dale and Enraght were accordingly released from their imprisonment. The uncertainty of the law was thus once more exemplified, "at the cost of that common whipping-boy of statutory legislation, the Public Worship Regulation Act." The *Times* of the 17th summarizes as follows:—

When all the purely ecclesiastical questions had been disposed of adversely to the imprisoned incumbents, the rectors of St. Vedast and Bordesley suddenly have found themselves at liberty, ingloriously victorious. The two testifiers against the jurisdiction of a Parliamentary Court owe their momentary escape from its grasp to the sort of technical defect through which a fraudulent debtor might have eluded punishment.

The real point which the appellants were anxious to prove was, that they were the victims of a *parvenu* usurping Court which had disguised itself in the feathers of the venerable Court of Arches and Provincial Court of York. They might reluctantly allow that Lord Penzance is Dean of Arches and Official Principal of York, though how one who has not subscribed the Canons should hold those high dignities they cannot understand. But they will not be persuaded that, sitting to exercise jurisdiction under the Public Worship Act, he is not holding a new office, and disentitled, therefore, to avail himself of the old procedure. As Dean of Arches, if he be Dean of Arches, he might have issued his monitions; he might have followed his monitions by inhibitions, and enforced his inhibitions by *significavit* and writs *de contumace capiendo*. In the suits against Mr. Dale and Mr. Enraght he was acting under the Public Worship Act; the Public Worship Act, though it permits its Judge to admonish, and inhibit, and deprive, does not say it empowers, and therefore does not mean to empower him to compel submission to its orders by imprisonment for contumacy. Deprivation after three years' disobedience is, according to this argument, the instrument in the hands of the Public Worship Judge for guarding his jurisdiction. If the parishioners who have moved the Court against their clergyman desire to stop his interference meanwhile with the services, they may take their chance of proceeding against him as a stranger for the time being, and a brawler in church, by a summary statutory process before a police magistrate. This is the only part of the controversy which can be of substantial theoretical interest to the rebellious rectors. The whole of this position the Queen's Bench Division emphatically repudiated before Christmas. The Court of Appeal repudiates it still more vehemently.

¹ Lord Justice James said:—"By law a man is obliged to wear a particular vestment, and he is obliged to do it. By law the writ ought to be opened in a particular place, and before particular persons. If one law is to be obeyed, the other law is to be obeyed also, and I am of opinion that the writ was defectively issued from the Court of Queen's Bench after it had left the Petty Bag Office, and, that being so, that Mr. Dale is entitled to be discharged from that writ, that having been improperly issued, and the consequence will follow with respect to Mr. Enraght that he will be entitled to his rule for a *Habeas Corpus* in order that he may also be discharged."

The defendants, concludes the *Times*, have won a triumph, not over the Court and jurisdiction they detest, but over some lawyer, whom three legal sages pronounce to be all in the right and three others pronounce to be all in the wrong:—

Not a point has been decided in their favour which has the remotest bearing on the doctrines for which or against which they have been striving. Their obstinate resistance to Lord Penzance's decrees has ended in the affirmation of the powers they denied him by the High Court of Justice first, and now again by the Court of Appeal. If the success they have gained in the struggle on technicalities proves anything to the public mind, it is not that justice has been vindicated by the immunity for a day or a week of two recalcitrant clergymen from a penalty they have incurred, but that the threats and injunctions, of which they have shown how difficult it is to chastise the contempt, ought to be changed for sharper and swifter penalties. The practical lesson impressed by Saturday's absurd collapse is only that the existing process is so long as to multiply superfluously the chances of a weak link. For a tenderness of clerical consciences so excessive as to forbid obedience to a judicial decree of silence in church the proper remedy may be thought to be the severance of a tie which galls the necks of parishes, if not of their pastors.

We are not inclined to disagree with the *Guardian* in its remark (Jan. 19) that "the release of Mr. Dale and Mr. Enraght will be welcomed by most people as a temporary solution of a difficulty that was apparently almost insoluble." We were glad that Mr. Dale felt himself able to enjoy his Christmas holiday; and we sincerely trust that both these gentlemen will, to quote the *Guardian's* words, "reconsider their position calmly and dispassionately." The *Guardian* has no warrant for its assertion that the Evangelical school "has now thrown off the mask and openly avowed the design of driving the Ritualists and their friends out of the Church." The "design" of Evangelicals has been to drive out of the Church an illegal Ritualism. They have said that the Ritualists must submit to the law, and they say so still.

In regard to a reconstruction of our Ecclesiastical Courts, we are ready to discuss any sensible schemes come from whatsoever quarter they may.¹ But with regard to such "toleration" as shall legalize the ritual of the Mass, Evangelical Churchmen of every shade, we believe, will offer a resolute and unflinching opposition.

Several letters have appeared in the *Times* on Ritualistic lawlessness. Dr. Pusey has been answered on a matter of fact

¹ That any great improvement will be effected, or that the ultra-Church section will become satisfied, we have little hope. The statements of Dr. Blakeney, in his able Paper read at the Swansea Church Congress, have not yet been answered.

by the Secretary to the Church Association, on the Bennett case, by the Rev. Joseph Bardsley, Canons Hoare and Bell, and others, and in regard to Ritualistic clergy being urged on by their congregations by the Dean of Peterborough.¹

Parliament was opened on the 6th. The report on the Address was brought up on the 20th, after weary and fruitless debates. Never has obstruction in the House of Commons been so persistent and so pernicious. The condition of Ireland is truly terrible; and the Prime Minister seems bewildered in the presence of difficulties for which his rash rhetoric in no small degree is responsible. A vigorous and statesmanlike speech has been made by Lord Hartington.

¹ The Dean of Peterborough (Dr. Perowne) writes:—Dr. Pusey tells us that “all along those who have closely observed the ritual movement have seen that it has been especially the work of the laity. While the clergyman has been hesitating, his parishioners have often presented him with the vestments which they wished him to wear.” This, no doubt, is perfectly true, and this Dr. Pusey evidently considers a sufficient justification for any change in dress or ritual; it is for the people to say what they will have, it is for the priest to hearken to their voice. I will not stop to argue how far the clergyman may have begun the work by instilling into the minds of the laity what he is pleased to call “Catholic principles.” I will accept Dr. Pusey’s view. I will admit that it is a vulgar error to suppose that the priest leads the people, when as a matter of fact the people dictate to the priest. The history of all religions furnishes instances in point. But there is one memorable scene in history which Dr. Pusey ought not to have forgotten, and which would have furnished him with an admirable illustration of his position. More than 3,000 years ago a congregation was gathered at the foot of the awful mountain which their great Lawgiver had ascended in order that he might receive the commandments of God. Impatient at his delay, eager for some sensible representation of the Invisible Majesty, they accosted their priest in these words:—Up, make us gods which shall go before us; for as for this Moses, the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what has become of him.” It was then that the priest, yielding as has been generally believed unwillingly, “hesitating” as Dr. Pusey tells us the modern clergyman does when solicited to wear vestments, asked for the golden earrings of the people, which he fashioned into a calf, which became the object of the national idolatry. It was the people who cried when they beheld it, “These be thy gods, O Israel, which have brought thee up out of the land of Egypt.” It was the priest who when he heard them thus salute their deity built an altar before it; and doing his best to disguise the idolatry when he proclaimed a feast in its honour, said, “To-morrow is a feast to the Lord.” Need I draw out the parallel? I may leave so practised a theologian as Dr. Pusey to do it for himself. That he should appear as the advocate of a naked congregationalism is surprising enough; that he should think it sufficient excuse for any aberration in ritual, any extravagance in vestments, to say, “my people love to have it so,” may be evidence of that “charming simplicity” which, as Mr. Llewelyn Davies has shown in his admirable letter, makes him blind to the most indisputable facts of history, but it is certainly a strange surrender of his solemn responsibility as a religious teacher, and a disgraceful admission that popular clamour, not principle or truth, is to govern the worship of the Church.