

of our Church. It found an eloquent expression in the writings even of the famous Puritan Dr. Owen who held against the Zwinglian debased interpretation of the words of our Lord—the doctrine of the reality of His presence in this His last gift to the Church. He shows with his usual beauty of illustration that it represents to us the threefold office of Christ as our prophet, priest, and king: “For the institution of this ordinance was in the close of His ministry, or prophetic office, on the earth, and in the entrance of the exercise of His priestly office, in offering Himself a sacrifice unto God for the sins of the Church. Between them both, and to render them both effectual unto us, He interposed an act of His kingly office in the institution of this ordinance.”¹ How greatly this threefold view of Christ in His last gift to mankind is darkened by the doctrine of a corporal presence, in which the visible priest is substituted for the invisible and a carnal for a spiritual communion must be obvious to every one who thinks seriously on the end and design of the institution and the reason for its perpetual obligation. Nor can we be too grateful to those who from the darkness and gloom of mediæval superstition kept the light of truth burning, and have handed down to us their testimony, often sealed with their martyrdom; among whom none has been more influential than Berengarius, whose name will ever find a place among the noblest of those who in every age have laboured “to vindicate truth from an ignominious bondage,” and like the prophets of the former Church, were as “a light that shineth in a dark place,” heralding the dawn of a brighter day.

ROBERT C. JENKINS.

ART. III.—THE SERVANT OF CHRIST.

X. LOYALTY.

THE warm-hearted, vigorous, and practical old Apostle who told us to “Honour the king,”² lived under one of the very worst and wickedest rulers who ever disgraced mankind. Nero was already stained with every kind of vice and infamy. Even the heathen world was ashamed of his enormous immorality. He had already poisoned his brother-in-law, the heir of the Roman empire. He had already murdered his mother. He had already had his wife put to death on a false charge of adultery. The year after St. Peter wrote these words, when the great fire took place which destroyed two-

¹ Sermons, fol. edit., 1721, p. 510.

² 1 Pet. ii. 17.

thirds of the city of Rome, he persecuted the Christians with extraordinary cruelty, lighting up his gardens with their burning bodies, which he had made inflammable in enveloping columns of tar and pitch. He pillaged the nobles and wealthy men right and left, and put anyone to death as the whim of the moment suggested. The next year he killed his second wife by a brutal kick given in a fit of passion. At length, after three years more, every day of which was darkened by cruelty, robbery, and every abomination, rebellion broke out in several parts of the Roman Empire. Nero was deserted by his paid guards, and died miserably by his own hand, in his thirty-first year only, five years after the probable date of St. Peter's Epistle. This is the monstrous tyrant of whom the Apostle, in giving a list of certain Christian duties, writes: "Honour the king."

It would be absurd to suppose that St. Peter, who in the later years of his life, when he had been driven from Jerusalem, was necessarily somewhat cosmopolitan—was one of those people who think that everything in their own country is so perfect that it must have been settled by the direct authority and plan of Almighty God Himself. If they live under a king or queen, these persons hold that no other form of government can compare with monarchy. If their ruler is an emperor, then they would say that every other nation was to be pitied if it was content with less. If they are governed by a republic with a president, then they believe that God meant them to have that model of constitution, and none else. But the fact is that not one of these ideals has God's sanction rather than another. The system to which He showed most favour was that when His people were willing to be governed by Him through His lawgivers, prophets, and judges, Moses and Joshua and Samuel, without any sign of authority which could be seen, but by the inward power of truth, justice, and the messages of His own mind and will. It was because men were not good enough and had not faith enough for this best of all systems that He allowed the different nations to establish their own laws and their own governments, and granted them His sanction so far as they were in accordance with the eternal principles of righteousness. He allowed Israel to have Saul for their king, governing with the advice of prophets and priests. He allowed the Egyptians, Assyrians, and Babylonians to have absolute monarchs. He allowed the Greeks and Romans to have republics. He has allowed the Swiss to flourish under a republic without a president. France and the United States of America prosper in different degrees under that kind of government, with the addition of a chief ruler. He has not yet interfered with the personal despotism

of Russia, though doubtless when the iniquities of a blind and helpless tyranny have become flagrant and intolerable there have come unmistakable warnings from the throne of His eternal justice. Austria and Germany He has allowed to have emperors who inquire the opinions of their subjects through national assemblies, but whose authority rests really on military strength. Our own country He has allowed to develop through many centuries of action and reaction, struggle and tranquillity, a limited constitutional monarchy, represented by a Sovereign governing through ministers whose influence depends on the goodwill of a Parliament partly hereditary, partly chosen by the mass of the people; and this form He has allowed to be imitated by Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Italy, and Greece. All these different systems are equally allowed by Almighty God on man's responsibility. Otherwise they would not exist at all. All the powers that be are alike ordained by God. All that we can be sure of is that those are more fully ordained of Him, those have a greater share of His sanction and blessing, those are most to be honoured by men, which secure to all classes of the people alike the greatest share of liberty, security, peace, prosperity, justice, and independence. All that we can be sure of is that no authority exists for its own sake, but only for the sake of the people to be governed. And it is the height of folly to condemn one form of government, such as an empire or a republic, because we do not like it ourselves or because to our needs it does not seem suited. It would be absurd, for example, for us to be so conceited and so steeped in prejudices as to have a feeling of condolence for the unhappy Germans and Austrians because they have not received the crowning mercy of a dominant popular assembly. It would be absurd pedantry for us to insist on forcing on all the dependencies of our ever-growing empire, with its infinite variety of conditions, our own representative institutions. What suits one country will assuredly not suit all; and that form is most likely to be favoured by God which is best adapted to the people concerned. To turn back to the Romans in the time of St. Peter. They needed the strong hands of a military empire to hold them together and keep their factions in check; and so, though Nero might be everything that was most hateful, St. Peter could sit down and write to his friends, "Honour the king."

We are ourselves so accustomed to the immense blessings of an authority that is settled not by the arbitrary and whimsical choice of each successive generation, but by the accumulated prestige of long and glorious centuries, of a law that is respected, and of a security which places every subject

of the realm in a position of equality before the magistrate and which ensures him the full right to enjoy the fruit of his own labours, that we do not consider how Divine a gift it is that we should have inherited so perfect a tranquillity, in which the Church of Christ can indeed serve Him in all godly quietness. But, when we remember what passions there are in men, what fiery ambitions, what bitter and fiendish jealousies, what overbearing pride, what unreasoning and vindictive spite, what overweening vanity and self-confidence, what abominable lusts, what tornadoes of mere brutal selfishness, what tempestuous violence, what monstrous untruthfulness, what stupendous infatuations, what heartless cruelty; when we imagine all these forces let loose without any strong hand of control; when we think what it would be to go in fear of our lives or of our property whenever we should leave our own doors, to have no safety for the virtue of our families or for the profits of our business; when we picture to ourselves what would be our state of mind if we did not dare to think, write, or say what we feel; if we fancy, in short, the strongest having their own way always, and the weakest always going in a frenzy of unavailing bitterness to the wall; then we are forced to confess with relief and gratitude how prodigiously we are indebted to any authority which saves us from these disasters. And when we remember that it was only a limited number of people at Rome whom the cruelties and wickedness of Nero affected, and that the great mass of the nations under the sway of his empire were living peacefully beneath the sanction of that great system of law, which, gradually developed, has become the model for all people of all ages, then, when St. Peter, writing at the very worst time of Nero's debaucheries, says "Honour the king," from our heart of hearts, and with unfeigned sincerity, we can answer, Amen!

Loyalty is in all cases a duty and a virtue. It is the application to institutions and to persons, to whom we are greatly indebted, of that spirit of generous and grateful devotion which the human heart is the more eager to pay in proportion to its own nobility. "The loyalty of a wise man to his country," said St. Augustine, "is in truth his greatest liberty." "Nothing is more noble, nothing more venerable than loyalty," wrote the Roman moralist, Cicero. "There is always safety," said St. Bernard, "in obedience to God, and loyalty to a ruler; to the one as our Creator, and to the other as our superior." "The most inviolable attachment to the laws of our country," wrote the sagacious Hume, "is everywhere acknowledged as a capital virtue; and where the people are not so happy to have any legislature but a single person, the strictest loyalty is in that case the truest patriotism." And Kossuth, the Hungarian

leader, said in the same way: "There are certain duties and loyalties toward our native country common to every citizen; and education must have such a direction as to enable every citizen to do his duty towards his fatherland." There are times when simplicity of thought, directness of ideal, and warmth of poetical and romantic feeling are the natural fibres of a people's heart; in such times the virtue of loyalty will be spontaneous and need no fostering or reflection. In an age of cynicism and criticism, such as the present, we need more than ever to remind our fellow-countrymen of the manifold loving-kindness of the Lord. They have to learn what treasures have been handed down to them by the wisdom of the past. They have to be warned how easily this heritage may be injured by light, wanton, and heedless hands. They greatly need our patient and attentive help in the removal of those vast fabrics of falsehood in which they are frequently enveloped by interested misrepresentation. Well would it be if amongst our vast masses of population even the limited authority of the Privy Council had always been followed, and the service for the accession of the sovereign made, after the example of primitive times, the opportunity for instruction in the memory and history of national blessings. That service was, indeed, initiated in its present form by a very foolish ruler, King James I.; it has its force only by proclamation, and not by either the Parliament or the Church; many of the expressions from the Psalms are mistaken in their application, and can literally be appropriated to no earthly monarch. But, nevertheless, the service, even such as it is, is a standing witness to the beautiful virtue of loyalty. Every true Christian Englishman, says a liturgical writer, who has a real sense of the dignity, greatness, and responsibility of the sovereign set over him by God, and a real interest in the welfare of the nation, must desire that the day which annually commemorates the perpetuity of our constitution should be marked with a special offering of praise and prayer; praise for the great mercies vouchsafed to our land, and prayer that princes and people alike, from the consideration of those mercies, may continually learn and practise better their own mutual duties. Greatly, therefore, is it to be wished that with the consent of the Crown a form were prepared by the assemblies of the Church and duly sanctioned by Parliament in which all could gladly and without scruple take part; a form which would be indeed at once the annual solemn confession by the Church on behalf of the people that by God alone kings reign and princes decree justice, and the annual witness to the old loyalty which jealously guards alike the Church and the throne.

There is a sense in which kings have a peculiar claim on

the sympathy of Christian people. I said just now that no authority exists for its own sake, but only for the sake of the people governed. The truth, indeed, is that, as far as the Christian character is concerned, a sovereign is in no enviable position. "All that is in the world," wrote St. John, "the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father but of the world. Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." Where does the world find its centre so vividly as in the ordinary court of a sovereign? Where else is it so necessary to reckon people by rank, power, wealth, and worldly advantages? Many ignorant and thoughtless persons even go so far in their worldliness as to maintain that the chief business of a sovereign is to encourage trade by bringing the splendour, magnificence, and attractions of the court to this or that great city of the kingdom. As if trade were the object of life! As if trade, looked at from this point of view, were anything else but that very worldliness so solemnly condemned by St. John! As if the sovereign had no greater, higher, and holier functions than to enrich trade by fostering the spirit of vulgar display! Where, again, but in the ordinary court or round the most usual type of sovereign is flattery so busy, or candour and truth so difficult? Where, unless the sovereign be of the very noblest type of character, are vice and loose manners so easy, and virtue so commendable? Where else are pomps and processions, and the vanity of flashing diamonds, and store of gold and silver so natural? How few there are whose hearts would not be lifted up with an unchristian pride and conceit in such a lofty and dazzling position as a throne; who would not console themselves by thinking that for the conduct of a king excuses might always be found! How few there are who would not become selfish and egotistical, thinking only of themselves, their own glory and greatness, their own pleasures and splendours, and regarding everything through the medium of their own interests! How vastly, in such circumstances, is increased the difficulty of leading the godly, righteous, and sober life of Christian humility!

A king is a person placed in a very trying place, with very distinct objects to fulfil. He has by his very existence to prevent the general scramble for power. He has to insure respect for the laws. He has, in his conduct and appearance, to represent the dignity and majesty of the nation. He is the one person in the kingdom who is above the sordid struggles for place and office, the malice, the jealousy, the passion, the prejudice, the lies which are inseparable from

party warfare. He is the one thread which carries on our history when one party and ministry are overturned, and the others have grasped the reins of power. He is the only person who can check the impulse of one set of politicians, and rouse the backwardness of another. He is the best channel for receiving the confidences of other nations, for understanding their objects and ambitions, for remembering their past policy and chicanery, and in the ever-shifting kaleidoscope of Government officials, to see that there is no misconception or avoidable error. He it is who, from his independent survey, can best understand the will and temper of the nation, put a curb on hasty impressions, and from time to time, as occasion arises, summon to his side the most influential and the most responsible counsellor. He it is who, from his illustrious authority, can make the proper beginnings and take the proper lead in plans for the welfare of the people, can give his sanction to schemes of improvement in art and science, and literature and education, in architecture, in every other useful branch of life and progress. He it is who, without bias on one side or the other, can give effect and distinction to the national appreciation of wise and good men in every part of the public service. Under him, and not without him, all can be free, all can move for whatever they wish, all can do whatever they think right, provided it does not interfere with the liberty of their fellow-subjects.

And when, in addition to all these qualities of a prudent constitutional monarch, the sovereign shows in person and family an example of the highest and purest domestic virtues; when, far from any reproach having ever been alleged against the sovereign's character, a long reign has, through fifty-six years of storm and sunshine, and through the various changes and chances of modern political and international life, borne unceasing and accumulated evidence to every excellence, to courage and wisdom, to calmness and prudence, to purity and simplicity, to family devotion and tender sympathy for others; when, far from the pomps and vanities of regal life being loved for their own sake, they are positively distasteful to the sovereign in comparison of quiet and retirement and less worldly habits; when, after the paralysing wrench of a life-long separation from the wise and blameless partner of every joy and every sorrow, the illustrious ruler whose armies have for half a century maintained the laws of God and the principles of freedom and justice in every quarter of the earth, feels display more irksome than ever, and, while every public duty is less punctually and loyally fulfilled, follows in private life with no less loyalty the spirit which St. Paul urges on those who are widows indeed; when religion is not a state ceremonial or a

respectable name, but a daily practice and an earnest reality; when, by the touching records of a family life full of sweetness, dignity, grace, purity, beauty, and light, we are let into the secrets of the sovereign's heart, and a motherly appeal is made to us to share the sovereign's happiness and sorrows: then the feeling of gratitude which might, with perfect justice, have been called out by the sway even of a Nero, is deepened into a warm sense of personal affection, and it is with no feigned devotion that we sink our individual pride, and let our cold reserve for once thaw, and cry, "God save the Queen!"

It was an anxious time for patriotic statesmen fifty-six years ago.¹ The blind passions excited by the French Revolution had not yet exhausted themselves. English institutions seemed by no means secure. King George III., however good-natured and domestic, had brought great troubles upon the country by his interference with parties and by his obstinacy and self-will; and in his old age he had roamed through his palace helplessly distraught by family sorrows. King George IV. was despised as a profligate sensualist. King William IV., notwithstanding his bluff good-humour, had shaken the reverence for the Crown by his undignified eccentricities. When, after the long struggle of the great Reform Bill, the sceptre of the empire of Great Britain came to the hand of a young, solitary, inexperienced girl of eighteen, men wondered how she would be able to weather the dark storms which were lowering about her country. Such was then the state of the world that, ten years after she had ascended the throne, not a capital of Europe, except our own, was without its revolution; not a crown but seemed to be falling from the head of its owner. He who died lately the mighty Emperor of Germany was himself a refugee in London. And there were grave elements of disturbance amongst ourselves. The populace of that day were still less educated than that of our own, and appeared to be ripe for every violence. The long wars which this country had to its eternal honour so nobly undertaken for the independence of Europe, had left us impoverished and overtaxed. The introduction of machinery had disturbed the balance of capital and labour, just as in these days it has been disturbed by the excess of population. The Chartists seemed ready to imitate the excesses of the French Revolution, and to destroy the whole time-honoured fabric of society in the wild hope that something better might emerge. How was it that amidst all these contending forces of disorder English institutions and the English throne only grew in stability, and became more and more firmly planted in the affections of the people as the years went by? It was because there

¹ Compare an article in the *Times*, June, 1887.

gradually came to be a feeling of calm certainty that, come what might, whatever might be the changing fortune of fluctuating party majorities and the fate of this or that minister, there was, at the helm of the State, at the central spring of the mighty machine of imperial government, a quiet and inexhaustible fund of good sense and high principle and unselfish devotion to duty, under the benign influence of which things would always come right. It gradually came to be known that the Queen, with unerring instinct, would always do what had to be done in the best way and at the best time, and would act with perfect good faith as a loyal constitutional Sovereign, who from her position must always have unrivalled and unbounded opportunities at hand for information and instruction in all the manifold intricacies of State and policy—unrivalled and unbounded materials for forming her judgment. And there grew up at the same time a conviction that the slight girlish maiden who had been called to so tremendous an exaltation was indeed a very noble woman, leading a pure, blameless, and unselfish life, growing into the most devoted of wives, the most careful of mothers, in the happiest of homes. This is how the whole tone of the people about the throne and the Crown came to be altered; and, in serene security as to their constitutional freedom, the British nation was able, as no other nation was able, to expand its hereditary energies and activities in every variety of progress, national, social, moral, and religious. And it was because it was brought home to them five years ago that it was to the modest and solid qualities of her who had for half a century given up her life with unswerving devotion to the public good, that the whole nation, usually so apathetic, was filled with an undying gratitude, and foreign peoples were sincere in their unanimous tribute of homage and admiration.

How does our loyalty show itself? It is in the power of each of us to make this reign still more happy and prosperous by increased devotion to the service of God and of His poor. "To be loyal to our country," it has been well said, "is the duty of every man; to be loyal to ourselves is the first trust of manhood; but the most essential of all loyalty is to be loyal to Him who created us." If we think of it, the whole kingdom is made up of plain and unimportant people like ourselves. If all could only do their duty more vigorously and cheerfully in God's sight the condition of all would be improved in a marvellous degree.

Further, it is our business as Christian subjects to do all that we possibly can to help forward and encourage the spirit of obedience to the laws. Christians, as such, know no politics in the poorer and more modern sense of the word; in whatever

form the supreme authority presents itself to us, we shall do our utmost that it may be respected, and advantageous to the good of the people. There is an infinite number of wise and good regulations passed; they only become dead letters by the ignorance and laziness of those whose duty it is to see them enforced. We ought all of us to take a more enlightened interest in public affairs, to study and understand the statutes, and to have the spirit, the courage and loyalty to follow them out. And however sorely we may be tempted by the evil spirits of individualism and disunion, we shall resolutely set our faces against its allurements in the strength of God and of His holy Word, and strive only for unity, peace, and concord. It is Christians, and Christians only, who by their self-denial and their spirit of love and brotherhood, bind classes together in mutual dependence and goodwill.

The last lesson is one of considerate sympathy with the Queen herself. Standing as she does, permanently at the centre of government, and passing on from minister to minister the traditions of public life, the more the empire grows the heavier become her responsibilities and cares. Her days are very laborious; she works from morning till night in reading despatches, writing letters of business, in giving audiences, and in informing herself of what is being done and thought in the world about her. Her health has had many trials; her sorrows have been more than fall to the lot of most; and at her age every year brings its own increasing burden. Think of the overwhelming weight of responsibility borne alone for nearly thirty years; the unutterable loneliness of the position where none must speak to her unless she speaks first; the wearing vexation and disappointment when party spirit sends things awry; the tragic deaths; the loss, one by one, of generation after generation of those who have been her wisest and best advisers; her own clear faith and courage in bearing all her burdens unshaken, and in labouring daily and hourly with increasing zeal and sympathy for the public good. It is right that we should have some sense of gratitude and love to the quiet, reserved, much-tried, much-enduring lady, great in heart, homely in her tastes, with her firm and strong sense of duty, her tender woman's sympathies, her strong determination, her keen sense of what is right, her lofty and self-denying character, her deep love of her people and her country, her plain good sense, her power of seeing the right thing at the right time and her capacity for doing it, her blameless life and her great example. After fifty-five years of zealous attention to their welfare, it would be only the thoughtless who could suppose that she will not of her own good will do all that her health and strength permit her to gratify their affectionate

loyalty. The single wish that is in all our hearts is surely this: that one so true and good may continue for long years to come to occupy that place which for more than half a century she has, to the great content of us all, so worthily filled; that unclouded happiness may be hers; and that the Almighty will reward her single-hearted consecration to the good of her people, by causing them even yet to sink all their party spirit, factions, and jealousies in united, unselfish labour for the peace and prosperity of every class of their fellow-subjects.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR.

ART. IV.—GALATIANS ii. 4.

διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους, κ. τ. λ.

I THINK the logical connection of this passage has been completely mistaken by commentators, neither has it been successfully disentangled even by the late Bishop Lightfoot. The question of the circumcision of Titus is generally treated as a leading factor in it, whereas I think I see indications that it never came on the tapis at all, but was prevented from doing so by Paul's policy.

Dr. Lightfoot writes: "But to satisfy, to disarm the false brethren, the traitorous spies of the Gospel.—At this point the connection of the sentence is snapped, and we are left to conjecture as to the conclusion. It seems as if St. Paul intended to add, 'the leading Apostles urged me to yield.' But instead of this a long parenthesis intervenes, in the course of which the main proposition of the sentence is lost sight of. It is again resumed in a different form: 'from those then that were held in repute,' verse 6. Then again it disappears in another parenthesis. Once more it is taken up and completed, transformed by this time into a general statement: 'well, they of reputation added nothing to me in conference.' The counsels of the Apostles of the circumcision are the hidden rock on which the grammar of the sentence is wrecked."

But suppose it can be shown, by a different method of taking the sentence, that there is no reason for thinking that St. Paul had any idea of "satisfying" or "disarming" the false brethren, that the connection of the sentence is not "snapped off," that he wrote all that he intended to write and exhibits no sign of having been counselled by the leading Apostles to yield, that the main subject of the sentence is not "lost sight of through a long parenthesis," and that the counsels of the Apostles of the circumcision are not the "hidden rock on which