

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

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

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

terrified by apparitions, and were closely connected with the shades of the dead shut up in the dark dwellings of the gloomy under-land. Of these there were ghosts, spectres, and vampires, the two former terrifying by their appearance only, while the third attacked men. Thus, in the Descent of Istar to the lower world, the goddess appeals to the guardian of its gate to open to her:

“Guardian, open thy gate that I may enter. If thou dost not I will assail and break it down. I will assail its bars. I will break its posts. I will make the dead come out to devour the living. I will give them power over the living.”

This comprises all we know as yet of the old Chaldæan Magic from the tablets, but the progress of decipherment will doubtless reveal much hereafter. What is thus known reveals a reign of miserable superstition. Life must have been a bondage to imaginary terrors, and hardly less so to the endless ceremonial details by which safety from evil spirits was to be secured. Thus an ailment of the head was to be cured by knotting a woman's turban to the right and arranging it smoothly in the form of a band to the left. It was to be divided into fourteen slips, and with these the forehead was to be encircled—and the hands and feet. The patient was then to sit on his bed and be sprinkled with holy water, and thus the ailment would be carried off into the skies like a strong wind, and would sink into the earth like spilt water. The power of numbers also played a great part in this strange pharmacy, but on this subject our information is very slight. But the special and chief power in expelling the demons of disease and misfortune lay in the secret and mysterious supreme name. It alone could stay the *maskim*. This great name, however, remained known to the god Ea alone, for any man who found it out would, by merely doing so, gain a power greater than that of the gods.

CUNNINGHAM GEIKIE.

---

#### ART. IV.—CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

##### III.

THERE are two tests by which all great institutions may be tried, viz., principles and results; and it is a happy thing to know that there is no reason to fear the application of either of these tests to the Church Missionary Society. As for results, we have the concurrent testimony of all classes, civilians, military men, clergy, bishops, governors, and governors-general. And as for principles, we may with the utmost confidence challenge the

most searching inquiry ; and whether they are tested by the Scripture or by the Church of England, we have not the least anxiety as to their being found perfectly sound. But, though there are these two tests of every institution, the test of principle is the only one on which we can always rely with reference to Missionary work, for in many of our most favoured Missions there has been a long period of patient waiting before any results have been developed. The principles therefore on which the work of this great Society has been steadily conducted since its foundation in the year 1799 shall be the one subject of the present paper.

And this is the more important because in many minds there is great confusion on the subject. I believe that there are two classes of persons who look coldly on the Society. Some appear to do so more from prejudice than conviction. They have no very definite idea respecting it ; they never read anything of its work ; and they would probably find it exceedingly difficult to write down the reason for their opinion. It is to them what Dr. Fell was to the old rhymester, who said,

The reason why I cannot tell—  
I do not like thee, Dr. Fell.

And thus, without any accurate information, they make up their minds that there is something amiss somewhere ; and so they decide, if not to oppose, at all events to stand aloof.

But there is another large class who really believe that the Society is defective in Churchmanship, and little better than a kind of semi-dissenting institution. Like the former class they would find it exceedingly difficult to give a reason for their opinion, but they have grown up in it, and they think there must be some foundation for it, though they do not exactly know how to describe it.

There is a curious illustration of the prevalence of this distrust in the monthly paper of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge for May last. Mr. Hutchinson, one of the secretaries of the Church Missionary Society, applied for a grant of maps for the Society's Schools in Palestine. The grant was liberally given, but the following apologetic clause was added :—" It was also gathered from the report that the teaching given was that of the Church." I should be sorry to imply that the secretary intended by that clause an intentional affront to the Church Missionary Society, but he ought to have known that there was no need of gathering from the report that the teaching in the Church Missionary Schools was the sound, sober, Scriptural teaching of the Church of England.

In the discussion held by the Eclectic Clerical Society referred to in my paper for October, it was resolved that "The Society

should be conducted upon those principles which they believed to be most in accordance with the Gospel of Christ, and the spirit of the reformed Church of England," and to that resolution the long succession of committees and secretaries have ever since steadily adhered. Believing that what are termed Evangelical principles are the principles not of the Bible only, but of the Prayer-book, they have acted not as Christians only, but as Churchmen; and they are not afraid of asking all those who stand aloof from them to study their reports as did the Committee of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, in the full conviction that they can gather nothing from them at variance with a loyal, consistent, and honest Churchmanship. Let us endeavour to submit its work to the two tests of doctrine and discipline.

(1.) *Doctrine.*—This is obviously by far the most important, inasmuch as the truth taught is of greater importance than the mode of teaching it. If we want to quench our thirst, it is better to have pure water in an ill-made glass than a poisoned draught in a beautiful work of art. Now, whatever we may think of the glass that holds it, we need never be afraid of subjecting the water supplied by the Church Missionary Society to the severest possible tests. I am aware that in the life of the late Bishop Selwyn it is said of the teaching of those noble men who at the most imminent risk of their lives carried the Gospel with heroic courage to the Cannibals of New Zealand, that "the people had accepted Christianity eagerly and sincerely, but an emotional system without a strict system of teaching had left them without backbone, moral or intellectual." Surely it is a matter most deeply to be regretted that the biographer of Bishop Selwyn should have put forth such a statement respecting one of the most heroic missionary enterprises ever known in Christendom. But as he has thrown down the gauntlet we are prepared to maintain against all comers that this emotional system without backbone is neither more nor less than the old-fashioned teaching of the Church of England as taught in the Scripture, as defined in the Articles, and as embodied in the Liturgy. If by the want of backbone is meant the absence of hierarchical claims, sacerdotal assumptions, and what are sometimes called "high Sacramental doctrines," then we readily admit that there is such a want in the work of the Society. But we must go a step further, and affirm that there is the same want in the Church of England, and higher still, in the Word of God itself. But none of these things form the backbone of either our Mission or our Church. It is the truth of God on which both one and the other must rely for strength. It is the truth of God that is the strength of the Church of England, and the same truth of God that is the strength of the Church Missionary

Society. That great Society is not afraid of the Thirty-nine Articles. It has no desire to omit, to alter, or to explain away, any one of them. It accepts them as they stand, and accepts them all; the sixth as teaching the sufficiency of Scripture as a rule of faith; the ninth, not omitting the words, "quam longissime," as descriptive of original sin; the eleventh as maintaining the great doctrine of justification by faith *only*; the seventeenth as teaching that "the consideration of our Predestination and our election in Christ, is full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort to godly persons;" the twenty-fifth and six following on the two Sacraments, concluding with the statement in the thirty-first, that "the sacrifices of masses in which it was commonly said that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." If there is no backbone in those Articles, then I freely admit there is no backbone in the work of the Church Missionary Society, for the principles of the one are the principles of the other, and there can be no question about the fact that the two must rise or fall together. As loyal members of the Church of England we are perfectly satisfied with its definitions of truth. We have no desire to go beyond them, and import from extraneous sources opinions which lie outside the limits of the Church's decisions; nor do we desire to fall short of them, or omit any one of the great truths to teach which the Church has entrusted her Ministers with her ministry; and, least of all, do we desire to employ men who shall say a word, or think a thought, at variance with that blessed Gospel to which since the days of the Reformation the Church of England has been so true, so faithful, and so unwavering a witness.

(2.) *Order and Discipline.*—While maintaining the fidelity of the Society to the doctrine of the Church of England, there is still room for enquiry whether it has been equally true to its discipline and order. In the discussion of this subject we fully admit that in foreign missions it is frequently altogether impossible to conduct Church work as we conduct it at home.

For example, in many cases it is utterly impossible to carry out our parochial system. Our parishes at home were created by state arrangement in order to secure religious teaching for the whole of our population, and when the whole population consists of one race speaking one language and living under the same circumstances, we are only too glad to reproduce it in our Mission Stations, as has been done in Sierra Leone. But when there are different races speaking different languages, any attempt at ecclesiastical fusion is certain to end in failure as it has done in Wales and Ireland, and as it did in the early days of Bishop Selwyn. There are many men who are invaluable

amongst the English, but who are perfectly useless in Missionary work amongst the natives; and so, on the other side, the great body of the native clergymen (and our great object is to raise up a native ministry) are altogether unfitted to minister in English to an English population. It is utterly impossible therefore to reproduce in such cases the English arrangement of parishes, and so long as God keeps the races distinct, there must be distinct organisations. But such adaptation to local circumstances involves no departure from the principles of consistent Churchmanship, and those principles have been steadily maintained throughout the eighty years of the Society's history.

It was the sound Churchmanship of the early Evangelical fathers that originally led to its foundation. If they had not been sound Churchmen, they would have saved themselves a vast amount of trouble by simply joining the London Missionary Society which had been established in the year 1795, on the basis of a union of all denominations. Towards that Society there was not the least hostility, but, on the contrary, so friendly a disposition that on hearing of the capture of the ship "Duff," the property of the London Missionary Society, the various members of the New Committee made a subscription amongst themselves, and on the 5th August, 1799, transmitted the sum of a hundred guineas to the treasurer of that Society. But, though thus friendly, they could not be satisfied to act themselves except as Churchmen, and therefore it was that they formed a distinct organization.<sup>1</sup>

So again when the original Committee laid their plans before the Archbishops and Bishops, and then for thirteen months awaited their decision, they proved at the outset of their work their loyal deference to ecclesiastical authority.

The same principles have been steadily maintained throughout their missions, but I shall not have space to trace it except in India, New Zealand, and Ceylon.

*India.*—There are at the present time as many as at least twenty-four different Missionary Institutions at work in India, but few of them are aware of the deep debt of gratitude which they owe to the Church Missionary Society as the principal instrument by which it pleased God to open the way for their efforts. It was not till the year 1813, that the right to carry on

---

<sup>1</sup> The incident may serve to illustrate the spirit that has characterized the whole of the subsequent conduct of the Society. It has always cultivated a friendly spirit of brotherly co-operation with all those who have been engaged in the same blessed work as itself, whether they were foreign Protestants, Nonconformists at home, or fellow members of their own Church, but it has at the same time held quietly on its own way, adhering consistently to its own principles, and carrying on its work as Church work within the limits of the Church's lines.

their labours within the British Dominions in India was secured to Missionaries by Parliament.<sup>1</sup>

As time advanced there were some devotedly Christian men in high office in India, through whose personal influence there was in some cases a practical relaxation of the exclusive regulations of the Company. But the system remained unchanged, and against this system Wilberforce carried on a noble struggle in the House of Commons. As the charter of the Company was to expire, and would require renewal, in the year 1813, the Church Missionary Committee called a special meeting of the Society on the 24th April, 1812, in order to pass resolutions, and to endeavour to arouse the country, on the subject. The meeting was enthusiastic, and the struggle began in earnest. Dr. Claudius Buchanan, at the request of the Committee, wrote a powerful treatise on the subject of Christianity in India. The Committee sent copies of it to about 800 members of both Houses of Parliament, and in other ways the press was employed in awakening the public to the spiritual interests of our Indian Empire. Petitions were sent to Parliament from different parts of the country; and a deputation had several conferences with his Majesty's ministers on the subject, till at length on the 22nd June, 1813, Lord Castlereagh introduced the subject in the House of Commons. Wilberforce made one of his most brilliant speeches, and carried the whole house before him; so that when the division was taken there was a majority of more than two to one in favour of the Bill, the terms of which almost exactly agreed with the resolutions proposed at the special meeting of the Church Missionary Society.

Closely connected with that great struggle for Christian liberty there was another effort made by the Committee, which is much less generally known, but which is of great importance in its bearing on the principles of the Society, I mean their effort for the establishment of Episcopacy in India. At that time very little had been done for the extension of Episcopacy in our Colonial Empire. Only two colonial bishoprics had been founded, Nova Scotia in 1787, and Quebec in 1793. People had not then learned how much may be accomplished if only men are prepared to make the attempt in the name of the Lord. Thus in India there were thirty-five chaplains, but no bishop. Dr. Buchanan and the Committee, foreseeing the great increase

---

<sup>1</sup> Thus, Mr. Carey not being allowed to sail for India in any of the Company's ships, was obliged to take a passage in a Danish vessel; and, when in India, to be first registered as an indigo planter; and ultimately compelled to take refuge in the Danish settlement of Serampore. So Judson was first driven from Calcutta, then forbidden to land at Madras, and at last literally hunted to Burmah as the only sphere where he could carry on his labours.

in the number of clergy that was likely to take place in consequence of the new clause in the charter, urged on the Government the importance of establishing Bishoprics for Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, and Ceylon. It is stated by Professor Watkins that the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge "was found joining with others in the attempt to establish Episcopacy in India." I do not know what part they took, but I can easily understand how thankful the Church Missionary Society Committee must have been for so influential an ally. But they were not content with India only. Dr. Buchanan's name is very little known now. He laboured, and others have entered into his labours, but he was the man who boldly struck out the idea of a vigorous extension of the Episcopate. His proposal was that there should be Bishops for the West Indies, Bengal, Madras, Bombay, Ceylon and Java, South Africa, and New South Wales. He also recommended Archdeacons for Java, Mauritius, West Africa, and Malta; and he urged the importance of such an extension of Episcopal superintendence, "in order to ordain natives on the spot; to dispense the ordinance of confirmation; to direct the labours of missionaries; to form and regulate the growing church; and to preserve as much as may be the unity of religion."

The greater part of Dr. Buchanan's scheme remained in abeyance till it was taken up by the powerful hand of Bishop Blomfield in the year 1841. But the Bishopric of Calcutta was founded at once, and in the month of April, 1814, it was announced by Mr. Macaulay, then the editor of the *Christian Observer*, "The Rev. Archdeacon Middleton has been appointed the first Bishop of India. May his appointment prove a source of blessing to the millions of Hindostan!"

*New Zealand.*—There are few missions more abounding in romantic interest than that in New Zealand, and few respecting which there are greater misconceptions. The fine, noble, enterprising character of Bishop Selwyn has won such enthusiastic admiration that in many eyes every one else is thrown into the shade, and he is constantly represented as the one prominent figure in the New Zealand mission. When he visited America the whole Synod of the Episcopal Church rose on his entering their hall, and the chairman received him as the Apostle of New Zealand. So I remember well a conversation with an eminent Member of Parliament who was filling at the time a high position in Her Majesty's Government, in which he expressed his amazement at the marvellous success of the Bishop, for that he had actually administered the Lord's Supper to more than 400 converts on the first Sunday after his arrival. It is almost impossible to imagine how such a person could have supposed that these 400 converts had been converted, baptised, confirmed, and

received as communicants, in the inside of a single week. But that sentiment of his was but a specimen of the profound ignorance of even intelligent men respecting the hard and life-sacrificing work that had been carried on for twenty-seven years before Bishop Selwyn set his foot on the island. The real Apostle of New Zealand was Samuel Marsden; the real first resident missionaries were John King and William Hall, two devoted laymen; and the real first landing of the messenger of the Cross was, not when Bishop Selwyn received an enthusiastic welcome from a large body of devoted missionaries surrounded by hundreds of convert communicants, but when these brave men stepped out of their boat on the Island, where the South Sea whalers were afraid to touch even for water, and, surrounded by savage cannibals, lay down under a spreading tree for their night's rest, and there slept peacefully, for they knew that God was with them. These men were the real Apostles of New Zealand, and they were the real founders of the mission.

But that is not the immediate subject of this Paper, the object of which is to exhibit the principles on which the mission was conducted. Any person reading Mr. Tucker's life of Bishop Selwyn would suppose that there was an unwillingness on the part of the Society to receive a visit from Bishop Broughton, and a desire to prevent the formation of the New Zealand Bishopric. He says:—

The idea of having a resident bishop among them was distasteful to the majority of the Church Missionary clergy, and was loudly condemned by the Secretary at home; but ultimately a grant of £600 per annum was voted by the Society towards the Bishop's income.

As Mr. Tucker gives no names, and no authority, it is impossible either to verify or dispute his statement. But those who were intimate with that great man, the Rev. H. Venn, know perfectly well that, if he was the secretary alluded to, Mr. Tucker is entirely mistaken in his fact. There was certainly nothing of the kind indicated in his Reports of the Society. In that for 1838 it was stated that the Committee had "opened a communication with the Bishop of Australia with a view to arrange for the mission such an increase of the Episcopal functions as the case would admit, and that the Bishop had most willingly complied with their request." This did not look as if the Committee were interposing obstacles to his Lordship's visit. In the Report for 1839 they express the full confidence that the communications then in hand may "lead to such an arrangement as may secure to the mission the advantages of the Episcopal office." In that for 1840 the confident hope is expressed that the Bishop of Australia's visit will lead to the planting of the Church of England in the full integrity of its system, "the im-

portance of which they deeply feel." In that for 1841 they announce the proposal of the New Zealand Bishopric, and add, "The Committee on principle, and from a deep conviction of the necessity of the measure for their missionaries in that island, have undertaken to aid largely in providing the endowment." And in that for 1842 it is said :—

The necessity for Episcopal superintendence has been long felt both by the missionaries and the Committee in the advanced state of the Mission. The Committee can now report that New Zealand has been erected into an Episcopal See, and that the full benefit of an Ecclesiastical Constitution has thus been provided for the infant Church of those Islands.

I am aware that these extracts may seem dull to some of the readers of *THE CHURCHMAN*, but they are important as showing the extreme ignorance of the facts that prevails even amongst those who ought to be acquainted with them.

If the biographer of Bishop Selwyn had only taken the trouble to examine the documents of the Society, he never could have written as he has done in his memoir. The real fact was that the time had come for the widespread extension of the native ministry. There were many congregations throughout the Island for which clergymen were urgently required, and many New Zealanders, whom the missionaries considered well qualified for the ministry, so that the urgent need of a Bishop was deeply felt by all parties. I cannot deny that a bitter disappointment was felt by the line adopted by Bishop Selwyn. He arrived in his new diocese full of zeal and self-denying energy, and he was thankfully welcomed by the whole missionary staff. But, as Mr. Tucker informs us, he went out with "his diagram complete," a diagram, formed not in New Zealand, but at Eton ; not from experience, but theory. The result was that he made the fatal mistake of hoping to fuse the races, and of deciding to ordain no natives till they had passed through his new college, and were qualified by a knowledge of either Greek or Hebrew to minister amongst the English settlers. The result was inexcessibly disastrous, for unhappily no less than nine years were permitted to pass before a single native was ordained. The scattered congregations were thus left through sheer necessity to the care of catechists, and therefore without the habitual enjoyment of the Sacraments. To what extent the dire calamities that subsequently befel the promising Church in the outbreak of the "Hau-hau" superstition were the consequence of that fatal mistake of the inexperienced Bishop, God only knows.

But, notwithstanding this bitter disappointment, the relationship between the Bishop and the Society was always of a friendly character. He entertained the highest theories of Episcopal pre-

rogative, but he was true to the Church of England, and they were so thoroughly sound in their Church principles, that through the twenty-five years of his bishopric there was no collision on ecclesiastical matters. Many of the missionaries were amongst his most beloved and most faithful friends; two of them were raised to the Episcopal office; and it is most satisfactory to the friends of the Church Missionary Society to know that the principles which the Committee had advocated from the beginning respecting the extension of the native Church, were adopted before the close of his career, so that his last act in New Zealand was to receive an address from the Synod in which it was said, "With respect to the Native Church, a Maori diocese has been constituted, and Maori Synods have been held, seventeen native clergy have ministered, or do minister faithfully and loyally in different parts of the country." That Maori diocese was founded through the action of the Church Missionary Society and is to this day chiefly maintained by it. Its first Bishop was the venerable Williams, one of the leading missionaries of the Society; and the whole transaction may serve to show how well men may act together even though they do not always see alike, and how remarkably the consistent maintenance of sound principles is sure in the long run to bring them to the front.

*Ceylon.*—I trust that through the wise intervention of the Archbishop of Canterbury the day may come, and that before very long, when there will be a similar result at Ceylon. Nor am I in the least afraid that when his Grace investigates the conduct of either the Missionaries or the Committee he will find anything at variance with a loyal, consistent, and intelligent fidelity to the great principles of the Church of England. It is, in fact, a zeal for these principles that has brought the missionaries into collision with their Bishop. If ever a difficulty arises between a clergyman and his Bishop, it is usually taken for granted that the clergyman alone is to blame, and that the Bishop is compelled in the painful discharge of duty to restrain the clergyman's irregularity. The result is that the majority of those who do not take the trouble to investigate, assume at once that the Bishop is right and the clergyman wrong. But it is just possible that when the case is examined it will be found that the clergyman has been standing steadily on the foundations of his Church, and that the real cause of offence is that he has firmly refused to acquiesce in irregularities, which have been introduced under the sanction of his Bishop. And this, I do not hesitate to say, has been the case in Ceylon. It has been the steady, sound, firm, English Churchmanship of the missionaries that has been the cause of the painful difficulty that has arisen between them and their Bishop.

A single example may be quoted in illustration, and as it is the one which has been made the occasion of the greatest reproach on the Society, it is the best that can be selected. It is also peculiarly adapted to the purpose of this Paper, as it will show the standpoint of the Society with reference to ritual, doctrine, and discipline. I allude to the objection entertained by the missionaries to receiving the Holy Communion in the Cathedral as administered with the usual Cathedral ritual.

*Ritual.*—When invited by the Bishop to attend a voluntary conference the missionaries in a quiet, calm, and most respectful letter requested to be excused attendance at the Lord's Supper in the Cathedral, as there were certain practices usually adopted there, to which they entertained a strong objection. Of these practices, three had been pronounced illegal (*viz.*, the cross on the table, the elevation of the elements, and the mixed chalice), and surely it was no want of loyal fidelity to Church principles that made them unwilling to take a part in that which the Church of England had condemned.

*Doctrine.*—That which ultimately became the turning point of the controversy was the eastward position, and this the Bishop said he could never surrender, because it was “of the highest value as an exponent of doctrine.” I respect the Bishop for his conscientious maintenance of what he believed to be the truth. But by so doing he placed the missionaries in a terrible difficulty; for if they had given way they would practically have admitted the doctrine of which the act was declared to be an exponent. I am sure, therefore, that those who love the principles of the Reformation will be thankful to God for the unwavering support with which the Committee upheld them in their objection. Their words were :—

The doctrine of which it is generally supposed to be an exponent, and which may be presumed to be that to which the Bishop refers, is the doctrine of a propitiatory sacrifice by a priest. If this be so, the Committee dare not advise a concession. They must rather maintain that the Bishop has placed the missionaries in a position in which they cannot possibly give way, but rather are bound by their duty to the truth of God, and to their ordination promises, to stand firm in their resistance to that which they believe to be opposed to the teaching of Holy Scripture, and to some of the fundamental principles of the Church of England which are drawn from it.”

Surely on reading that passage we may say, “Well done, good and faithful servants.”

*Discipline.*—The result of this correspondence has been that the Bishop has refused to license any new missionaries of the Society unless they will first submit to the test of receiving the Lord's Supper in the Cathedral. Against the imposition of such

a test the missionaries and the Committee most firmly protest; and, although three of their number have been refused licenses, and seven young men have been refused ordination, to the most grievous loss and injury of the Mission, they stand out perfectly firm, and as loyal Churchmen decline to submit. The principle involved is of the utmost possible importance. The Church of England requires certain guarantees as to faith and character from all who are admitted to her ministry, and if these guarantees are given no Bishop has a right to impose fresh tests of his own. Imagine for one moment what would become of the Church of England if any Bishop who was opposed to the Church Association were to refuse to license any curate unless he would first receive the Communion at St. Alban's, Holborn; or, if any Bishop who objected to the English Church Union were to license none who would not first receive the Lord's Supper in the evening at St. Mary's, Islington. A Church, if it is to enjoy stability, must be governed by its laws, and not by the arbitrary will of individual Bishops. So that firmly to resist the imposition of a new test of any kind is not only the right but the duty of all those who value the fixed principles and abiding testimony of the Church of England. If an individual Bishop may impose any test he pleases, there is an end of all constitutional discipline. And few who value principles can fail to admire the concluding paragraph of a long letter to the Bishop by the senior missionary. He writes :—

You speak of us as "men whom the Church cannot satisfy." . . . That statement shows how utterly you have misapprehended our position. It is because the Church of England *does* satisfy us that we continue what we have always sought to be, loyal clergy of her communion. . . . because it *does* satisfy us that we declined to be moved from the standpoint which we have hitherto occupied, or to take part in a ritual which, as I have shown, her reformers and divines repudiate.

Such have been the principles of this great Society during the whole of its honourable career. It has been faithful in doctrine, and loyal in Churchmanship. It has been true to the great truths of Scripture, and therefore true also to the exhibition of these truths in the Liturgy and Articles of the Church of England. It has shown no desire to explain away the Articles, and it has been firm in its determination not to Romanize the ritual. It has adhered stedfastly to its own principles of Episcopal Churchmanship, but has always cultivated a friendly relationship with those engaged in the same sacred service, even though they belong to other bodies. It has been ready on every occasion to enter on work amongst the heathen wherever God has opened the door, but it has never intruded on the work of others. Such it has been for the last eighty years, and such, I trust, it

will be to the end of its history ; upheld by the mercy of God ; supported by the people of God ; employed to do the work of God ; encouraged by the blessing of God ; and in all that it does, all at home, and all abroad, guided and accompanied by the Spirit of God.

EDWARD HOARE.

---

ART. V.—LIFE OF BISHOP WILBERFORCE.

*Life of the Right Rev. Samuel Wilberforce, D.D., Lord Bishop of Oxford, and afterwards of Winchester. With Selections from his Diaries and Correspondence.* By A. R. ASHWELL, M.A., late Canon of the Cathedral and Principal of the Theological College, Chichester. In three Vols. Vol. I. Portrait. Pp. 550. Murray, 1880.

IN the present notice of this volume we confine ourselves to a mention of the main incidents in the "Life," with a few extracts from the earlier letters. Canon Ashwell's Introduction is brief, and Mr. R. G. Wilberforce's Preface consists of a few lines. For the next two volumes, it appears, some letters have been arranged, and notes made, but nothing written.

"Samuel Wilberforce, the third son of William Wilberforce, and his wife Barbara Ann, eldest daughter of Isaac Spooner, Esq., of Elmdon Hall, in the county of Warwick, was born at Clapham Common," on September 7th, 1805. It is somewhat singular that while the Wilberforce lineage and ancestry can be traced back so far as the days of Henry II., no Wilberfoss, or Wilberforce, as the name has been spelt from the time of his great-grandfather, is found to have entered Holy Orders until the time of Samuel Wilberforce and his two brothers Robert and Henry. The career and character of William Wilberforce "have left their mark upon English life and English society, and they have been vividly set forth in the well-known Biography" of which a revised and condensed edition was sent forth in the year 1868. One feature in his character is beautifully portrayed in the opening pages of the volume before us. From the beginning of the year 1817, when Samuel Wilberforce was in his twelfth year, the father's devotion to his son is exhibited by a "series of not fewer than 600 letters, which are still extant, all carefully numbered and noted in the handwriting of Samuel Wilberforce's maturer years." The biographer remarks that these letters "must have exercised the most powerful influence on the