

ineffectual, and while the Prayer Book was in the course of revision by the bishops, without formal authority, the book was submitted by the King to the two Convocations, in the same terms, in effect, as the terms of the Savoy Commission, and that Lord Clarendon has told us, in his "Own Life," that "it" (meaning the *revised* book) "was necessarily to be presented to the Convocation [singular], which is the national synod of the Church;"¹ but the circumstances of the case, to be presently stated, will clearly show that this presentation was a mere after-thought, to gain time to finish the episcopal revision then in progress, and that Lord Clarendon's notion of the necessity of the presentation was an after-thought also, which occurred to his mind when he was writing his "Own Life," at a later period.

R. D. CRAIG.

(To be continued.)

Short Notices.

Thirty-seventh Report of the Thames Church Mission Society.
31, New Bridge Street, E.C.

WE gladly invite attention to this pamphlet, just issued—the thirty-seventh report of an excellent society. It contains an account of the proceedings at the Annual Public Meeting at Exeter Hall, April 26, 1882, the statement of the Committee, selections from the Journals of the chaplains and missionaries, a summary of the work done since 1866, with other interesting information. The "selections" are readable and instructive. Among the speakers at the Annual Meeting were the Marquis of Cholmondeley, in the chair, the Earl of Northbrook, and Henry Green, Esq. The noble Marquis said:—"The Report speaks of the loss of "friends. Two dear friends whom the Society has lost, Admiral Baillie Hamilton and Mr. Woolloton, spoke, as some of you may remember, "at our Meeting last year. There is another to whom I would allude "for a moment—Mr. Charles Bevan. That dear friend of mine was "one of the earliest supporters of the Society, and always helped to "sustain it in times of difficulty. He was most anxious for the success "of the work, and he was always coming forward, not only with a warm "heart, but with a liberal hand, to render assistance. From what I knew "of him in private, I may say that no man could be more anxious than "he was to promote the glory of that dear Saviour whom he loved. "The loss of such a man to this Society is a very great one, but we "hope that the Lord will be pleased to raise up some one to fill his place." Mention was also made, in the Report, of Admiral Sir James Hope, K.C.B., a true and valued friend of the Society. We observe that the Committee tender their grateful thanks to the following clergymen:—

To the Rev. Richard Allen, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Gipsy Hill; the Rev. Lewis Borrett White, M.A., Rector of St. Mary Aldermary; the Rev.

¹ Vol. ii. p. 118, edition of 1827.

Richard Whittington, M.A., Rector of St. Peter-upon-Cornhill; the Rev. John Blomfield, M.A., Rector of All Saints' Church, Knightsbridge; the Hon. and Rev. R. Henley, M.A., Vicar of Putney; the Rev. Nevile Sherbrooke, Incumbent of Portman Chapel; the Rev. Sholto D. C. Douglas, M.A., Rector of All Souls' Church, Langham Place; and the Rev. Canon McConnell Hussey, D.D., Vicar of Christ Church, North Brixton, for kindly allowing the use of their pulpits for the purpose of advocating the claims of the Thames Church Mission.

The Committee, we read, "are most thankful to those kind ladies who "have so warmly taken up the labour of making Sailors' Library Bags, "and in many cases filling them with useful and interesting books, magazines, and illustrated papers." Kind gifts of thick woollen cuffs and comforters knitted by ladies ashore are in great request. Parcels of bags, books, cuffs, &c., &c., should be addressed, *carriage paid*, to the Secretary, Thames Church Mission, 31, New Bridge Street, Ludgate Circus, E.C.

The Scottish Sanctuary as it Was and as it Is. Recent Changes in the Public Worship of the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland. By the Rev. ANDREW DUNCAN, Senior Minister of the United Presbyterian Congregation, Mid-Calder. Pp. 192. Edinburgh: A. Elliott, 17, Princes Street.

For those who take an interest in the wave of change which is passing over the Presbyterianism of Scotland, in regard to preaching, public prayer, and praise, and in general the worship of the "Sanctuary," will find this devout and thoughtful work a readable instructor. For ourselves, we have read the greater portion of it, and we hope, at leisure, to complete it. Whether we agree or disagree with the author, his observations at least command respect. Many of his quotations are pleasing and full of interest. He quotes *THE CHURCHMAN*, we observe, more than once. An anecdote about the late Principal Cunningham, reminds us of a discourse we heard him preach, some twenty years ago, in Fife; the discourse was not unworthy of that good man's reputation as a sound and learned divine; but it was, we thought, heavy and dry. The anecdote is this:—Hugh Miller said, as he left the College Church one day after hearing its minister, "Oh, that Cunningham would preach a speech! If his sermons had been like his speeches, the church would have been crammed to the door." Mr Duncan thinks that the Episcopalian custom of "presenting" the alms and oblations is not likely to find favour in Presbyterian communions; but he remarks that the thought is good. From his observations on "collections" we make a quotation:—

A Doctor of Divinity, lately deceased, once remarked that the mode of expression usually employed by ministers when proceeding to give out the first psalm from the pulpit, namely, "Let us begin the public worship of God," was not correct, for the public worship of God commenced at the door or in the lobby of the church. In saying so, he referred to the depositing by the people of their weekly offerings in the plates or basins placed for receiving them at the entrance of the sanctuary; and the remark is founded on a right view of pecuniary contribution, which, however, it is to be feared, is not always or often realized as it ought to be by the members of the church. To the Israelites it was said, with reference to their great convocations for Divine worship, "None shall appear before the Lord empty: every man shall give as he is able;" and this law was to continue in force under the Christian dispensation. In one of the Psalms, which evidently refers to the times of the Gospel, it is said, "Give unto the Lord, O ye kindreds of the people, the glory due unto His name; bring an offering, and come into His courts;" and, accordingly, as contribution of worldly substance for the support and extension of the Gospel, and the supply of the temporal wants of brethren, is one of the sacrifices or oblations expressly required from Christians, so it is mentioned, by the name of "the fellowship," as a stated part of the ordinary worship of the church at Jerusalem; and the

same view of it is given in the apostolic order to some of the churches of the Gentiles "concerning the collection for the saints" in Judea (1 Cor. xvi. 2), "the first day of the week" being specified as the proper time for making the collection, because it was the season of their regular assembling of themselves together for the worship of God. Christians are thus taught to regard their contributions as acts of religious service. But the members of our churches are apt to forget this when observing the usual mode in which their contributions are given. This may be said to have come down to us from the Old Testament times (2 Kings xii.; Luke xxi. 1-4). It is not, however, universally practised. In some Presbyterian congregations in Scotland, the mode observed in the English Church is followed. The collection is taken after the sermon, or immediately before the benediction, by means of *ladles*, or small wooden basins or boxes, which, having long handles attached to them, are thereby passed along before the worshippers in their several pews. This mode, while it possesses the advantage of direct application being made to each individual,¹ is also more in conformity with the principle of contribution being, as truly as praise or prayer, a religious observance.

Voices from the Lakes, and other Poems. By the Rev. C. D. BELL, D.D.
Nisbet.

This is a new edition of Canon Bell's poems, which we have much pleasure in commending to our readers. It is not given to every poet to live amid such poetical surroundings as our author has enjoyed. His brother bards might almost envy Canon Bell his lifelong familiarity with Rydal and Ambleside and the thousand charms of Wordsworth's country. In this volume he shows how he could appreciate such classic ground. The very spirit of the region breathes in his graceful blank verse poems of "Wilfred Ray" and "Ellen." It may be mentioned that Longfellow did Canon Bell the honour of inserting some of his pieces in his "Poems on Places." There is also an interesting note attached to one of the poems in "Voices of the Lakes," called "Dying Words," referring to Lady Augusta Stanley's desire—"When I am dead, think of me as in the next room; only one is to the back and the other to the front." Dean Stanley informed the author that "The poem faithfully expressed the spirit of those last words and last days." The commendation of two such men as Longfellow and Dean Stanley is alone sufficient to prove the high merit of this volume, which contains poems on a great variety of subjects all marked by the true love of Nature and the cheering light of Evangelical truth.

There are one or two sonnets on St. Mary's Church, Ambleside, which are particularly pleasing, and the longer poem, "The Dream of Pilate's Wife," may be mentioned as a good example of Canon Bell's power of imagination and expression.

The Epistle to the Hebrews. With Introduction and Notes by A. B. DAVIDSON, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Hebrew, &c., in the New College, Edinburgh. Pp. 254. T and T. Clark.

This is one of the series of Messrs. Clark's "Handbooks for Bible Classes," and it is a good specimen. Dr. Davidson's Notes, so far as we have examined, are sound and scholarly.

Hymns for the Church Catholic. Pp. 510. Hodder and Stoughton.

This new Hymn Book is compiled and edited, as we learn from a prefatory note, by the Rev. J. B. Whiting, the well-known Vicar of St.

¹ This, however, may be thought liable to an objection, which is stated by Vinet, in his "Pastoral Theology," part iii. sect. 1. "It will be well for the pastor," he says, "not to allow the plate to circulate. The sound is ungenial, and it may force people to give. It would be better to place some receptacle at each door."

Luke's, Ramsgate. The collection seems to us a really good one; we find a large number of the best hymns; and out of the 510 hymns which the book contains, there are few which are poor or unsuitable. The arrangement has been made, to a great extent, according to the Church's year and the language of the Prayer Book: Advent, Epiphany (with Missions), Lent, Easter, Ascension Day, Whitsuntide, and Trinity; afterwards Grace, Love, and Fellowship, Creation and Preservation, Blessings of this Life (with Harvest), Redemption, the Means of Grace, the Hope of Glory; then—

Praise.
Service.
Holiness and Righteousness.
The Christian Life.
Faith and Love.
The Holy Catholic Church.
The Communion of Saints.
The Forgiveness of Sins.
Death and the Resurrection.
The Life Everlasting.

As to the way in which the hymns in any selection are arranged, there will inevitably be differences of opinion. We have before us only a cheap edition of "Hymns for the Church Catholic," and it contains no allusion to alterations or additions which have been made in the case of certain hymns. We cannot say we like the new verse of S. F. Adams' "Nearer, my God, to Thee," which runs thus:—

And when my Lord again
Glorious shall come,
Mine be a dwelling-place
In Thy bright home,
There evermore to be
Nearer, my God, to Thee.

The fifth verse of the original hymn, "Or if on joyful wing," has been omitted. The tone of a selection made by Mr. Whiting, we need scarcely say, is deeply devout, while the precious truths concerning Christ's Gospel are clearly and fully set forth.

The Parallel New Testament. Cambridge Warehouse,
17, Paternoster Row, 1882.

This volume contains, in parallel columns, the two English Versions, 1611 and 1881. The left hand column contains the Authorized Version with its marginal notes, and this version has been reproduced substantially as it was first given to the public; a few changes have been made. The right hand column contains the Revised Version with its marginal notes. The Revisers' Preface and the American readings and renderings are given.

With regard to type and paper this well bound volume is delightful.

The changes which have been made with the "Parallel New Testament" in hand are seen at a glance. Some readers will mark the multitude of changes, great and small, with a feeling akin to anger or dismay; others, again, will patiently compare passage with passage, and inquire what reason may be alleged for this or that alteration, while at the same time they note with satisfaction the many undeniable improvements. With a very large proportion of students, probably, the conclusion arrived at will be that the revision, if judiciously revised, may be accepted as the Victorian Version with almost universal approbation. The question of readings, with many, is even more important than that of renderings; and the debate about the Greek text is of itself

enough to prevent the Revised Version from becoming an "authorized" Version. But all devout and thoughtful readers no doubt will regard this "Parallel New Testament" as supplying valuable material for study among the laity as well as among the teachers and pastors of the English-speaking world. For ourselves, having studied carefully, and as we think impartially, the great proportion of the various criticisms on the Revised Version which have appeared, we must confess we see no reason to be dissatisfied with the opinions which we expressed in the four numbers of the *CHURCHMAN* which followed the publication of the work.

The Religious Topography of England. By S. R. PATTISON.
The Religious Tract Society.

This work, so far as it goes, is good. One might well, of course, give many more places and add a little to the biographical sketches; but then the book, now of a convenient size, would be both bigger and dearer. Baxter, we were told in the hamlet of Rowton, was born there, in the parish of High-Ercall; but it is quite true that he spent his childhood in the parish of Eaton Constantine.

At ye Grene Griffin. A Tale of the 15th Century. By EMILY SARAH HOLT. J. F. Shaw & Co.

We always gladly welcome a new story by Miss Holt. Such a series as her "Tales of English Life in the Olden Time" deserves to be known even better than it is. The present work, "At ye Grene Griffin; or, Mrs. Treadwell's Cook," though somewhat slight, is not unworthy of "Joyce Morell's Harvest," "Earl Hubert's Daughter," and other admirable tales. In a merely literary aspect it deserves no small praise; but in the best of all senses the book is really excellent and profitable. The Lady Anne and poor Mrs. Treadwell are sketched with skill.

Electric Lighting. Translated from the French, by ROBERT ROUTLEDGE, B.Sc. (Lond.), F.C.S., author of "A Popular History of Science," &c., with seventy-six illustrations, pp. 318. G. Routledge & Sons, 1882.

This book is a translation of the second edition of the Comte du Moncel's *L'Eclairage Electrique*, published at Paris in 1880. Those who are interested in this subject will find the translation very readable, and the illustrations are a great help.

Canon LIDDON has published the sermon, *The Recovery of St. Thomas* (Rivingtons), which he preached in St. Paul's three days after the death of Mr. Darwin. He has added a prefatory note, and this many will read with interest; it contains the most striking passages from Mr. Darwin's writings with reference to belief in God. We cannot regard some passages quoted, together with Canon Liddon's apologetic comments upon them, as at all satisfactory. For example. If it should be granted, *a.g.*, that "the first man had for his mother an anthropomorphous ape" (to quote Dr. Liddon), if it should be granted again, with regard to the words of Holy Scripture, "the Lord God formed man . . . that this *formation* was not a momentary act, but a process of development continued through a long series of ages" (again to quote Dr. Liddon), surely we make new difficulties. If the *formation* of Adam was "a process of development," what are we to say about the "making a help-meet for" Adam? Had Eve for her mother "an anthropomorphous ape?" Some of Canon Liddon's remarks we have read with regret. We quote an interesting passage:—

"It is right to make an observation for the sake of those persons who "may not have read Mr. Darwin for themselves, namely, that his books

"show him to have been a believer in Almighty God. To go no further than 'The Descent of Man'—the work which has perhaps on the whole occasioned the largest amount of anxiety and misgiving—he there twice speaks of belief in God, as 'ennobling.'¹ No serious writer would so speak of any belief, much less of the tremendous 'belief in the existence of an Omnipotent God,'² unless he himself held it to be a true belief. No superstition ever did or could 'ennoble' the man who held it; and when Mr. Darwin says that the question, 'whether there exists a Creator and Ruler of the universe,' has been answered in the affirmative by the highest intellects that have ever lived,³ he at least implies that he does not dissent from their judgment.

"That Mr. Darwin's doctrine of the origin of species by natural selection is not of itself opposed to faith in God's relation to the material universe as its Maker and ever-present Upholder and Ruler, need not be insisted on. Mr. Darwin has taught many readers how to think of God working in Nature during long periods of time, not how to think of Nature as excluding God. On this subject Dr. Pusey has written, with the high authority which always belongs to him:—

The question as to "species," of what variations the animal world is capable, whether the species be more or fewer, whether accidental variations may become hereditary, whether the "struggle for existence" may have occasioned animals which once existed to disappear, whether, *e.g.*, the animals ranged under the tribe of *felis* or *canis* were each originally variations of some common progenitor, and the like, naturally fall under the province of science. In all these questions Mr. Darwin's careful observations gained for him a deserved approbation and confidence. These questions have no bearing whatever upon Theology.⁴

"And he quotes, with approbation, Professor Reusch, of Bonn, as saying:—

A relationship of race between more nearly related types of the animal and vegetable kingdom, even when one extends this relationship very far, has theologically nothing about it which we need apprehend.⁵

"It must, however, be admitted that in his work on the 'Descent of Man,' Mr. Darwin does something towards inviting a modification of this judgment by such a passage as the following:—

If I have erred in giving to Natural Selection great power, which I am very far from admitting, or in having exaggerated its power, which is in itself probable, I have at least, as I hope, done good service in aiding to overthrow the dogma of separate creations.⁶

We quote two other sentences.

"Certainly an injustice is done to Mr. Darwin," says Dr. Liddon, further on, "if his mind is interpreted by the crude and consistent Atheism of Haeckel and other writers, who make the very assumption which Mr. Darwin's belief in God led him to reject. It is impossible not to wish that he had vigorously repudiated an unbelief which claimed to understand him better than he understood himself."

Dr. GEIKIE has sent forth another volume of his *Hours with the Bible* (Hodder & Stoughton), a valuable work, displaying the highest literary

¹ "Descent of Man," vol. i. pp. 65, 106.

² *Ibid.*, p. 106.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

⁴ "Unscience, not Science, adverse to Faith," by the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., 1878, 2nd edition, p. 52, notes.

⁵ "Bibel und Natur," p. 373, qu. by Dr. Pusey, *ubi sup.*, p. 52.

⁶ "Descent of Man," qu. by Dr. Pusey, "Unscience," &c., p. 54, 2nd edition.

and theological excellence. In his preface he writes strongly concerning the tone and style of Dr. Robertson Smith's unhappy book. He says :—

“It was inevitable that a controversy respecting the origin and structure of the Pentateuch should one day arise; but that it should have been opened by a gentleman of such ultra opinions as Dr. Smith is a misfortune. . . . Years and wider study will teach Dr. Smith to be less confident and contemptuous.

“He tells us repeatedly that ‘there is no doubt,’ that ‘it is quite certain,’ that ‘the plain fact is,’ that ‘the conclusion is inevitable,’ when he gives forth an opinion. No faintest perfume of modesty flavours his superciliousness. His Sir Oracle tone never leaves him. The world must accept him as a Daniel come to judgment. No dog of a ‘traditionalist’ must bark when he opens his mouth.

“It is nevertheless beyond question that his theory of the origin of the middle books of the Pentateuch after the Exile, is rejected by all but the Jacobins of Biblical criticism. He has simply adopted the teaching of the school of Kuenen and Wellhausen, who in this follow Graf, George, and Vatke. There is no tincture of originality in any single page of his book. He forgets to tell the audiences who listened to his lectures that his theory as to Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, was opposed to those of De Wette, Ewald, Von Lengerke, Knobel, Bleek, Dillmann, Riehm, Kleinert and others, compared with whom Kuenen and Wellhausen are very minute authorities indeed.”

The Rev. NORMAN L. WALKER'S *Scottish Church History* (T. & T. Clark) is a well-written little volume, and it contains—in a compact form—a good deal of interesting information. Mr. Walker is a staunch Presbyterian; but he strives to be historically impartial and accurate. Many of his Scottish readers who are loyal to the Presbyterian Establishment will question some of his remarks. Stating that the United Presbyterian Church has “nearly 180,000 communicants,” and the Free Church “about 300,000,” he adds that the claims of the Established Church to have “over 500,000” is a mistake, “an over-estimate.” Episcopacy, he says, has gathered strength and is “growingly influential.” He rightly remarks that “the whole constitutional framework of Presbyterianism is democratic.” Herein, to a great extent, has been the strength of the Kirk. While high views are held of “the Church” as a Divine institution, high views have also been held of the position occupied by each individual member. The Church of England, we have always felt, is not “democratic” enough.

From Messrs. Seeley & Co. we have received *Augustine* and *Chrysostom*, two volumes of a new series entitled “Church Lamps.” On the title-page appears the Revised Version rendering of St. John, v. 36, “The lamp that burneth and shineth.” Such a series as “Church Lamps,” “thoughts on divine things” selected from the greatest writers, many will warmly welcome. But, in regard to the Sacraments, the selections seem to us not all judicious. Nor do we like the foot-note (*Chrysostom*, p. 34) about Monasticism; such passages about what Ritualists and Romanists term “the Religious life” should not—in so small a book—have been quoted. The tiny volumes are tastefully got up.

Another volume of the “Cambridge Bible for Schools” series, *Micah*, with *Notes and Introduction*, has been published (Cambridge Warehouse, 17, Paternoster Row), the work of Mr. CHEYNE, late Lecturer of Balliol, now Rector of Tendring, Essex. The work is not unworthy of such a scholar. Here and there, in regard to prophecy, we should have been thankful to see—in a book “for Schools”—a firmer tone, and more guarded language.

Messrs. Routledge are publishing in their cheap and useful "Sixpenny Series" *Sir John Gilbert's Illustrated Shakespeare*. We have received parts ii. and iii.

In the *Quiver* (Cassell) appears an interesting article on Bristol as "a city of charities." *Little Folks* is charming as usual; the June number completes the volume, and fortunate will be the children who obtain it. To the *Sunday Home* the Rev. C. H. Adams contributes a paper on "Good King Robert."

From Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton we have received four charming little volumes, *The Coming of the Bridegroom*, and *The State of the Blessed Dead*, by DEAN ALFORD; *Who is He? or the Anxious Inquirer Answered*, by SARAH F. SMILEY; and *Friendship with God*, by Dr. STANFORD.

A good little book is Dr. SYMINGTON's *Life and Ministry of John the Baptist*. (R. T. S.) The language is sometimes rather "flowery" (as, e.g., when in saying that the damsel asked for the head in a charger, Dr. Symington says, "She simpered it"); but there is thought, earnestness, and power.

Old England (S. P. C. K.): a lecture by Bishop HARVEY GOODWIN, is a very interesting pamphlet. Pp. 48.

The fourth volume of "Talks with the People by Men of Mark" (*Home Words* Publishing Office), a capital series, is *Sir Wilfrid Lawson*; extracts from the Temperance speeches of the "hon. and amusing baronet."

The Queen has been graciously pleased to accept a copy of Mr. Mackeson's "Year Book of the Church."

We have received Part XXIX. of *Letts's Popular Atlas* (Letts & Co., 33, King William Street); the maps are excellent, and cheap.

On the Ecclesiastical Courts. By Canon TREVOR.

In the April CHURCHMAN we ventured to make some comments on this pamphlet. Apparently our review possessed some occult power to offend, which we had not detected; for although it occupied but a subordinate position in these pages, it excited heavy indignation in the *John Bull*, a journal which usually exhibits a nervously jealous regard for the reputation of Canon Trevor. Nor was the Canon content with the defence of the *John Bull*. In the June CHURCHMAN he delivers himself on our review. He is anxious that we should know the responsibility we have incurred by criticizing a pamphlet which, besides having been written by himself, has with regard to "its two leading suggestions," received the approval of the Lower House of York Convocation, has occasioned the writer to be examined before the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission, and has furnished materials for correspondence in the *John Bull*, *Guardian*, *Record*, and "even the *Nonconformist*." We have no defence to offer. For good or for ill we have committed ourselves to this audacious course, and we must make what stand we can against the attack which we have provoked. The learned doctor's guns are soon placed, but before opening fire he pays us a compliment on our manners. We have been ignorant, misled, foolishly blind; but, at any rate, we have been polite. Our satisfaction at having pleased Canon Trevor, in even so small a matter as this, is, however, a good deal mitigated by the surprise which it has excited in both our critics. Canon Trevor is "thankful," and *John Bull* is "glad"—both pleasant emotions; but why they should be simul-

taneously aroused by conduct which we trust is only our wont, we do not understand.

Canon Trevor's critique on our critique deals with three points—(1) our mistakes; (2) his suggestion to extend the jurisdiction of the bishops by a new canon; and (3) his proposed reform of the Final Court of Appeal.

As to the first he has given us very little to reply to. We have not even the consolation of confessing our faults. He anticipates the discovery by the candid reader of a "portentous mass of historical mistakes" in our review; but he does not point them out, and in truth the severity of Canon Trevor's judgment has apparently been increased by a mistaken impression that we had made a similar charge against him, which he thus meets, perhaps, more simply than effectually by a *tu quoque*. There is, indeed, one proposition of ours which causes our critic great discomfort. He describes it as "undisguised Erastianism," and appears extremely shocked that we could entertain such notions. We are, of course, indifferent judges of the thoughts and imaginations of Canon Trevor, but we are disposed to think that both in his horror at the idea of the State controlling the discipline of the Church, and in his repudiation of any "compact" between Church and State, he is the victim of his own misapprehension. We suspect Canon Trevor has not sufficiently considered the distinction between discipline and doctrine. It is the former that we maintained, and with deference to our learned critic, still maintain, is in the hands of the State; that is, the *maintenance* of the doctrines and ceremonies of the Church amongst its members, an obviously different matter to the *settlement* of those doctrines and ceremonies. This distinction between doctrine and discipline, between the making and the working of rules, between legislation and administration, is the key to our Church History ever since the Reformation. When it is grasped, facts, which otherwise seem contradictory, fall into their proper places, and the whole assumes a consistency and even symmetry which, if we neglect this consideration, are altogether absent. From this principle it follows that the Courts which carry out the discipline of the Church are tribunals owing their authority wholly and entirely to the State: hence they are called the King's Ecclesiastical Courts. Erastianism is a vague word, which has been so indiscriminately employed by a certain class of controversialists to stigmatize tenets utterly diverse in their nature, that it has lost its terrors.¹ We confess that we care not a straw for Canon Trevor's wordy anathema, so long as we feel our feet resting on the sober foundation of historical fact, which no tremendous adjective will ever shake. Canon Trevor challenges us to produce any canon, or statute, or standard writer, in favour of the proposition that the "power and jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical court are derived from the State," and without awaiting a reply, declares that none exists.

A complete answer to this question can only be given in an examination, of some minuteness, into the history and legislation of the last three centuries: But we do not desire to shirk the learned Canon's challenge, and in accepting it, we choose a statute, because, on the one hand, we do not think quite so much of canons as our critic, and because, on the other, the authority of a "standard writer," is always more or less, a matter of opinion. But we refer Canon Trevor to the preamble of 37 Henry VIII. ch. 17, a Reformation Statute, later in date, and therefore, if inconsistent, repealing the Statute of Appeals, and its supposed declarations of ecclesiastical independence, a Statute, moreover,

¹ We may venture, with the Editor's permission, to remind the readers of THE CHURCHMAN of Canon Saumarez Smith's papers on this subject (vol. iv.), which at the time we noticed were commended in the *Guardian*.

dealing with this very matter of the status of Church judges, or to quote Canon Trevor, "incontestably established for this purpose at the Reformation." The Papal Law had been abolished for some years, yet the Bishops, clinging to the traditions of the past, would only appoint celibates and clerics as their chancellors and judges. This Statute therefore was passed, by the State (be it remembered) to remedy the evil. What does it say? It recites that "Albeit the said decrees, ordinances, and constitutions . . . be utterly abolished . . . yet because the contrary thereunto, is not used, nor put in practice, by the Archbishops, Bishops, Archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical persons, *who have no manner of jurisdiction ecclesiastical, but by, under, and from your Royal Majesty.*" . . . Now it will not do for Canon Trevor to tell us that the ecclesiastical jurisdiction here spoken of is in contradistinction to "spiritual authority," for the Statute goes on to say that to the King is committed, "by Holy Scripture, all *authority* and power to hear and determine all manner of causes ecclesiastical;" and further enacts that any lay-man (D.C.L.), although married, may yet be appointed Chancellor, Vicar-General, &c., and may lawfully execute and exercise all manner of jurisdiction ecclesiastical, "and all *censures* and coercions, appertaining to the same." In other words, such a judge may deliver what Canon Trevor calls the "purely spiritual" sentences of suspension and excommunication, technically called censures. We find, therefore, in the Reformation Statutes, on which Canon Trevor takes his stand, the very same "undisguised Erastianism" of which we are accused. We do not pretend that this discovery vindicates our orthodoxy, but at any rate it answers with sufficient completeness our learned critic's confident challenge.

With regard to the expression "*compact of Establishment*," which we are told is imaginary, we admit the charge to a certain extent. No doubt this compact, as a matter of history, is imaginary, as completely as is the "*Reformation settlement*" of which Canon Trevor speaks so much. Both words imply a definite transaction which never occurred. Still, as a matter of convenience, we take leave to use both. All we mean by "*compact*" is that by a series of events the Church and State came to be in a certain relation towards one another, similar in many respects to that which might exist between two corporations as the result of mutual agreement. There are considerations moving to and from both sides, and there are duties and obligations on both sides. This relation with its conditions, we call, we venture to think, harmlessly, a compact. The principle is much the same as that known to the law as "*Lost Grant*." When individuals and their predecessors in title have for a certain length of time occupied a certain relation to one another, with regard to property, the law assumes this state of things to have originated in a deed of grant which has been lost, although no one concerned has the smallest belief that such a deed ever existed, nay, even although it is demonstrable that it never did exist.

We proceed to consider the other two points upon which Canon Trevor replies to our review. These are his own two suggested reforms. We endeavoured to deal with these suggestions, and we pointed out what seemed to us grave objections to their adoption. We have now re-read the Canon's pamphlet, and further consideration, with the aid of the author's own commentary, has not increased our respect for it. We give Canon Trevor credit for the best intentions; we warmly sympathize in his desire to see Church troubles appeased without sacrifice of those principles which ever since the Reformation have influenced our ecclesiastical history. But we repeat our conviction that what is proposed to be done is very ill-adapted to give effect to these good wishes, while the proposed manner of doing it is entirely unsound and dangerous.

Canon Trevor's first proposal is, that before any ecclesiastical litiga-

tion against a clergyman is permitted by the Bishop, he is to summon the parties before him personally, and with the aid of a Board of Assessors, to hear and endeavour to settle the dispute. This new process is to be enacted, not by Statute, but by a Canon of Convocation; and the clergyman, if he acquiesces in the decision, is to be exempted from consequences which his conduct might otherwise entail. Canon Trevor lays great stress upon two things—(1) he wants his new “canonical inquiry” to rest on Canon not on Statute, and (2) it is not to be a legal process. Surely its mere statement is enough to condemn this scheme.

There was once an Italian who invented and constructed an air-gun after a perfectly new pattern. It was quite unlike any other gun, and its conception displayed remarkable ingenuity, but the inventor forgot to provide a vent for the compressed air, the release of which furnished the propelling power. The consequence was that every engineer who examined the gun foresaw that if let off it must inevitably burst at a particular point. It is nearly two hundred years since that gun was made, but to this day no one has been found willing to pull its trigger—not even the inventor—and the weapon remains stored up in a museum in London, a monument of the ingenuity and the unpracticalness of the maker. Canon Trevor’s new tribunal which is not a court of justice, and his new process which is not a lawsuit, strongly resemble the Italian’s air-gun, except that if attempted to be used, the Canon’s invention will give way, not at one, but at every point. Surely the collection of canonical curiosities is sufficiently large and varied without our presenting posterity with what would no doubt be a unique addition. The failure of Canon Trevor’s device is certain, because he is attempting to combine in one scheme features absolutely contradictory. We do not desire to repeat what we said in our former review, but if our readers will refer to it they will see that we are far from undervaluing the private and fatherly counsel which it is no less the right of the Bishop to give, than the duty of his clergy to listen to. But what we object to is the attempt to combine the advantages of this private counsel with the binding effect of a formal legal sentence. It is admitted that the law as it stands recognizes the domestic jurisdiction of the Bishop, but this, it is urged, is of no use, because the Church cannot allow its Bishops to receive spiritual authority from an Act of Parliament. We must have a Canon therefore. Now we cannot suppose Canon Trevor is altogether ignorant of the singular position which Canons of Convocation occupy in our legal system. They do not bind the laity at all, they only affect the clergy to a limited degree, and if they are contrary to the Statute or Common Law, they are absolutely null and void. Will our readers picture for themselves the sea of confusion into which Canon Trevor proposes to steer the already tempest-tossed vessel of our Church? Imagine the parishioners of a semi-Romish clergyman, who have lodged a complaint, being summoned to appear before the friendly and canonical Board. They would almost certainly decline to recognize the Canon, and would appeal to the Bishop, as a judge charged with the administration of the Queen’s ecclesiastical laws, to grant them justice. In so doing they would act within their undoubted rights. How would the Board act? If they persevered in their “friendly” arbitration *ex parte*, and against the will of the complainants, the whole affair would be a ridiculous and scandalous farce, and if they did not, and the suit proceeded in the Ecclesiastical Court, the clergyman would have some title to complain of a conflict between the Canon Law which he acknowledged, and the Statute law which he rejected.

Again, a clergyman who has been counselled in a “fatherly and brotherly” manner, according to the Canon, is to be protected against further attack. But how? His parishioners decline to be bound by the Canon,

and the clergyman will find it vain to plead its authority before the Judge, unless it has been ratified by Statute. We had gathered from certain "suggestions for a new Bill" appended to the pamphlet, that the sanction of the Legislature was to be procured; but this, it seems, is a mistake, for we are now told that the Legislature's sanction is one of the two drawbacks which have prevented the successful exercise of the Bishop's domestic jurisdiction under the present system. Here Dr. Trevor seems to lose himself in the confusion he has created. The authority of the new process is to rest solely on Canon, yet it is to have the "legal effect" of "protecting" those who obey the Bishop's monition from the penalties of the law." Moreover, the second main cause of failure at present is "that no sufficient provision exists for securing obedience to the domestic authority." Canon Trevor must be much less familiar with history than we believe him to be if he does not know that nothing but an Act of Parliament will give the "protection" and "security" he requires, yet he himself admits that if "enacted by Statute Law the reference to the Bishop" would be useless, because only "another stage in the litigation," and, we will take leave to add, another step in a litigation which already has much too many. Here we must leave the "friendly" arbitration scheme in the state of entanglement which we indicated in our former notice, and from which its inventor has in no degree rescued it by his recent letter.

Canon Trevor's second great reform is of the Court of Final Appeal. He desires to see the Upper House of Convocation installed as a sort of Court of Reference in questions of doctrine, and he strives to show that his suggestion is in accordance with the constitutional position of Convocation in time past. In our former review we warned the learned Canon to be careful about his "Court of Convocation." Disregarding our caution, however, and assuring us that we have been "misled by some modern judicial *dicta*" (we are absolutely in the dark as to these *dicta*: our only reference was to a well-known textbook) the eager doctor has plunged forward, and with very surprising results. The extraordinary use he makes of statutes, old and new, of historical facts, and, we must add, fictions, and the wonderful way in which the smallest reference to Convocation, whether really in his favour or not, is swept into his argument, are, so far as we know, without parallel in historical controversy. If audacity of statement could settle a discussion, Canon Trevor's dogmatism would certainly mark the close of this one. Take, for instance, the following sentence: "Before and *after* the Reformation the greater part of the questions now brought into the Ecclesiastical Courts with regard to ritual and doctrine were disposed of by the Ordinaries and *Synods*." In the pamphlet we find the same thing asserted. "These (questions of doctrine and ritual) were dealt with either in Convocation—the Supreme Court in questions of heresy after the suppression of the Papacy—or by the Ordinaries at their visitations, or by the Ecclesiastical Commissions," &c. But when we turn to the facts, we find that no single case is recorded of any dispute either of doctrine or ritual having been determined by Convocation since the Reformation, and this is admitted by Canon Trevor. "No cases of appeal from the Archbishop's Court to Convocation are found upon record since the Statute" (of Appeals). We confess to a feeling of despair in arguing with an antagonist who thus allows absolutely baseless assertion to stand in the place of historical evidence.

The most serious mistake into which Canon Trevor has been led is owing to the unaccountable manner in which he construes the Statute of Appeals (24 Henry VIII. ch. 12). That Act provided that no appeal in certain named matters should thereafter be carried to Rome, but that all such suits should be finally decided in the Archbishop's Court. The Act further provided that in a cause "touching the King," with regard

to any of the named matters, an appeal should lie to the Upper House of Convocation. Canon Trevor's inference from this enactment is, that there was, before the date of the Statute, an appeal to the Bishops in Convocation, so that the Act merely re-asserted the jurisdiction! It would be equally logical to infer from the language of the Coercion Act of last year a pre-existing power in the Government to imprison suspected persons without trial. The truth is, that the attempt to bolster up the "Court of Convocation" by reference to the Statute of Appeals is a simple blunder. This Statute erected one House of Convocation into a Court, in certain special matters, where the King was personally interested in the litigation. Whether that enactment is still in force or not may be an open question (the judges have decided that it is not), but it is absolutely irrelevant to the present inquiry. The case that is made in favour of the jurisdiction of Convocation is quite different. It is this: Prior to the Reformation persons accused of heresy were undoubtedly sometimes examined before the Archbishop in Synod (*i.e.*, both Houses), and it is said that that jurisdiction has never been taken away. On the other hand, it is argued that we know too little of the nature of this authority and the manner of its exercise to make it possible to invoke it now; that as a matter of fact it never has been invoked since the Reformation; that the Reformation Statutes, providing as they do a complete system of church judicature, in which this jurisdiction is not even referred to, have abolished it. In Queen Anne's reign the judges were divided in opinion, a majority being in favour of the jurisdiction; but we have every reason to believe that political reasons influenced the opinions then expressed; at any rate, modern authorities are almost unanimous against the supposed jurisdiction, and if Canon Trevor wants us to believe in his "Court of Convocation," he must accumulate a far more formidable array of evidence than he seems at present able to produce. He says indeed that he has shown the mysterious "modern judicial *dicta*" to which he refers, to be "against all established law down to the reign of Queen Anne," but having consulted both pamphlet and appendix, we fail to perceive where this feat is accomplished, and so both the "misleading *dicta*" and their refutation remain shrouded in mystery.

There only remains for us to deal with Canon Trevor's assurance that instead of "attacking the Judicial Committee (as the reviewer imagines), "I do not propose to touch it in any way as originally constituted." His plan is that the Archbishop's Official Principal and the Upper House of Convocation should settle disputes of doctrine and ritual between them, and that only in the event of a miscarriage of justice should there be an appeal to the Privy Council. Naturally, therefore, Canon Trevor does not see any need to make changes in the latter. He simply proposes to "Boycott" it, to leave it high and dry on the shelf, without the opportunity of exercising the functions for which it was framed. In denying that his proposal is revolutionary, Canon Trevor assumes, as a matter of certainty, a point which all who are acquainted with this subject know to be nothing of the sort. The Judicial Committee of Privy Council have the same jurisdiction as the old Court of Delegates, and the Statute setting up the latter allowed an appeal to it for "lack of justice" in the Archbishop's court. The meaning of these words, which custom has sanctioned for 300 years, and which Parliament and the judges have acted on for the same period, is that they make the Delegates, for all intents and purposes, the Court of Final Appeal in Church matters. On the other hand, it has been argued that the words "lack of justice" give the same sort of jurisdiction as the French appeal, "*comme d'abus*," "*tamquam abusu*," *i.e.*, an appeal when there has been some abuse of judicial power, or flagrant miscarriage of justice. Those masters of this controversy who oppose the Privy Council, such as Mr.

Gladstone, advocate this point tentatively and with due acknowledgment of all that can be said against it. Yet, throughout both his pamphlet and his letter, Canon Trevor assumes this (to say the least of it) doubtful interpretation as the true and recognized one, and no person whose knowledge of the subject was confined to what Canon Trevor is pleased to tell him, would suspect that the slightest doubt existed. We confess we feel repelled from a controversy so conducted, and we altogether fail to perceive either the wisdom or the justice of such a course. Those who already know the arguments *pro* and *con* will not be deceived, and those who do not, it should be our effort to instruct and not mislead. The truth is, that Canon Trevor's letter forms a striking illustration of the manner in which justice would be dispensed by a clerical tribunal like Convocation. With the most thorough desire to be honest and just, and with a great deal of information on the subject, Canon Trevor has yet contrived to present to us a view of well-known historical facts which is terribly one-sided and distorted. What would be the probable result if it were left to a large body of men, most of them equally biassed, but not so well informed, as Canon Trevor, to form a judgment on these facts, and then to apply it to a perhaps unpopular clergyman? We can imagine no arrangement less favourable for the display of even-handed justice. We venture to affirm that no real remedy for the present discontent will be discovered which does not leave the administration of ecclesiastical law in the hands of lawyers—ecclesiastical lawyers, we admit—but still lawyers and not clergymen.

THE MONTH.

THE condition of Ireland is a disgrace and danger to the Empire. It even waxes worse.¹ The *Record* says:—"Cardinal McCabe may strive to throw oil upon the troubled waters; but his efforts are scarcely seconded by such lieutenants as

¹ The *Guardian* of the 14th says:—"Nominally we are governing Ireland by a combination of concession and coercion; practically, there is little government at all for the greater part of the country beyond what the Lord Lieutenant, the Chief Secretary, and the Resident Magistrates have personal ability enough to extemporize. That this is absolutely inadequate for the protection of the lives of any but the criminals has again been proved by the murder of Mr. Walter Bourke. The fact is, we have failed to do anything to check the development of a political and social revolution which is now assuming the most serious proportions." The killing of a landlord involved that of his armed escort also. Mr. W. Bourke, a barrister from India, who had purchased an estate in county Galway, acquired much popularity through his exertions during the failures of the harvests; but recently his dealings with his tenants had rendered him unpopular. As he was returning to his house in a gig, accompanied by a soldier for his protection, he was shot dead by five men with rifles through a loop-holed wall. As usual, no clue to the assassins has been found. Other outrages induce Colonel Brackenbury, the new official who has to deal with criminal matters, to invite the attention of the Government to the similarity of crimes over a wide area, and to its simultaneous commission.