

Reviews.

First Principles of the Reformation; or, the Ninety-five Theses, and the Three Primary Works of Dr. Martin Luther, translated into English. Edited, with theological and historical introductions, by HENRY WACE, D.D., and C. A. BUCHHEIM, Ph.D. With a portrait. Pp. 240. John Murray. 1883.

THIS is an appropriate, though somewhat late, contribution to the efforts recently made to commemorate the fourth centenary of the birth of Martin Luther. It is likely, however, from its nature to prove of more real service than any, because it embodies in a popular and permanent form some of the most important and representative of the Reformer's own works; and in this way Dr. Wace and his coadjutor have conferred a benefit upon the English public, as well as added a wreath to Luther's memory.

It was not a little interesting to those who could penetrate beneath the surface to see how deeply the Romanists were stirred by the Luther agitation. It became at once the signal for letting loose some of the most virulent and extravagant language against the Reformer and his doctrines, and showed, in fact, that it is impossible to arouse interest in the fifteenth century struggle without awakening at the same time the strongest and most fiery of human passions on the opposite side. In short, the Reformation itself, and still more the name of Luther, is the touchstone of principle. And when a man is brought face to face with either in such a way as to be obliged to declare himself, he finds questions suggested that refuse to be dealt with by compromise. As long as the issues really involved can be concealed or disguised, it is easy to dilate upon the advantages of brotherly love, the good that is to be found everywhere, and the like; but it is impossible to look closely into the history of the times in which Luther flourished, and not feel that we must range ourselves definitely on one side or the other, and that to attempt to be friends of both is inconsistent with hearty attachment to the interests of either. And yet, as we read the ever famous and ever memorable ninety-five theses, it is astonishing to find how moderate and mild they are. The light broke gently and gradually upon Luther's mind, and it was not till he found compromise impossible that he became the fierce and fiery opponent he so often was.

It is a great advantage to the English student to have these famous axioms and propositions made readily accessible to him as they are made now, and that our readers may judge for themselves how tame and innocuous many of them are, we transcribe the following:

"9. The Holy Spirit acting in the Pope does well for us, in that, in his decrees, he always makes exception of the articles of death and of necessity.

"30. No man is sure of the reality of his own contrition, much less of the attainment of plenary remission.

"31. Rare as is a true penitent, so rare is one who truly buys indulgences—that is to say, most rare.

"38. The remission imparted by the Pope is by no means to be despised, since it is, as I have said, a declaration of the Divine remission.

"46. Christians should be taught that, unless they have superfluous wealth, they are bound to keep what is necessary for the use of their own households, and by no means to lavish it on pardons.

"65. The treasures of the Gospel are nets wherewith of old they fished for the men of riches.

"66. The treasures of indulgences are nets wherewith they now fish for the riches of men,

"77. The saying that, even if St. Peter were now Pope, he could grant no greater graces, is blasphemy against St. Peter and the Pope.

"78. We affirm, on the contrary, that both he and any other Pope has greater graces to grant; namely, the Gospel, powers, gifts of healing, etc. (1 Cor. xii. 9.)"

The three treatises, which seem, with the exception of the second, "Concerning Christian Liberty," to be now given to the English public for the first time are—I. "An Address to the Christian nobility of the German nation respecting the reformation of the Christian estate," with a dedicatory letter to his friend Amsdorf, Licentiate and Canon of Wittenburg, and a special ascription to his "most serene and mighty imperial Majesty," Charles the Fifth. In this he attacks what he calls the three walls of the Romanists; which are, first, the assertion that the spiritual power is above the temporal, and secondly, the assertion that the Pope is the only sufficient interpreter of Scripture, and thirdly, the assertion, if they are threatened with a council, that no one may call a council but the Pope. II. "A Treatise concerning Christian Liberty," with a dedication to Leo X. This is by far the most representative and distinctively Lutheran of the three, and it is especially valuable for its full and clear-toned assertion of the true nature and functions of faith. III. "On the Babylonish Captivity of the Church," with a salutation of his friend Hermann Tullichius. In this he treats of the seven sacraments, and with particular fullness of that of the Lord's Supper. These are recognised in Germany as "The Three Great Reformation Treatises" of Luther: and as such they contain unquestionably the first principles of the Reformation, as he gave the impetus to it; as such, also, they are of primary importance in the present day, because the questions which are most importunate are not those in which the Church of England defines her attitude in relation to other Reformed Churches, but those in which she resolutely maintains her entire independence of Rome, and her deliberate adoption of a contrariant and adverse position. It is useless attempting to slur over this fact. The Church of England has no right to separate from the Church of Rome unless on the score of the false and dangerous doctrines cherished and taught by the latter against which she protests; according, therefore, as the Church of England declines the attitude of a Protestant Church, however little she may take to the *word*, she fails to justify her position as a separating Church. The treatises of Luther show very plainly what the primary principles of the Reformation were, and it is only too manifest that as long as these principles are tenaciously held in their simplicity, union with Rome is impossible. The difference is one of incompatible principles, and therefore of irreconcilable antagonism. It was because Luther saw this so plainly that he, after the manner of his time, did not hesitate to indulge in unmeasured and violent language, which in an age of greater external softness and culture redounds very often to his discredit. He is accused of want of balance, of a tendency to unguarded statements, intemperate propositions, onesidedness, and the like; whereas the truth is, that in his position, had he spoken otherwise, he would have incurred the malediction denounced against those who do the work of the Lord deceitfully. It was only by the sharpest possible contrasts that the full enormity of the Church of Rome could be perceived, or the full peril of her false and pernicious teaching be exposed. Luther set himself face to face with Rome in the full front of the truths which she had corrupted and denied, and was concerned only to utter those truths freely, fully, and fearlessly. And in so doing he did not care, for he had no present need,

to see that other correlative and supplemental truths had their full recognition. It was not these that were at stake; the others were. It is this that to many persons makes Luther's earnestness, thoroughness, and depth of conviction seem like extravagance, exaggeration, and onesidedness. The truth is, he could not have done the work he had to do had he weighed his statements with greater nicety, balanced his sentences with more regard to propriety, or counted the cost of his audacity with less indifference; and certainly all generations of mankind will have reason to bless Luther for his magnificent enunciation of the Gospel doctrine of faith. For the first time since the Epistles to Rome and Galatia left their master's hand, this doctrine was inculcated in all its purity and sublimity as the very message and Gospel of God. Of course, it struck many persons—nay, all whom it did not persuade and convict—as paradoxical, irrational, and absurd—nay, more, as impious and essentially immoral. But then so did the Epistles of St. Paul strike those against whom they were written; and so, for that matter, setting aside the prescription which hedges them as the expressions of inspired orthodoxy, they do now those who read them without bias, and who think that in his zeal to defend one position he went to the very verge of truth and propriety in so doing. In both cases the only consideration that could weigh with either was the question that St. Paul asked, "Do I now persuade men or God, or do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ." It is impossible to state the doctrine of faith and not offend those who have no experience of its blessed nature and its mighty power as a cleansing agent. Nay, more, it is impossible to enforce rightly the claims and the character of faith, and not incur, as St. Paul himself did the charge of Antinomian rashness; but for all that, faith is, and will continue to be, the gift and the work of God, and, as always, Wisdom will still be justified of all her children.

The treatise on Christian liberty, which is ostensibly written on the two-fold thesis that "a Christian man is the most free lord of all, and subject to none: a Christian man is the most dutiful servant of all, and subject to every one," deserves to be widely read, not only for the intrinsic value of its teaching, but also because it is a very adequate expression of Luther's real principles. We are greatly mistaken if the sympathetic reader, in perusing this treatise, will not note many a passage and sentence that he will be glad to recall, and often refer to, with pleasure and gratitude.

On the whole, there can be no doubt that this recent publication of Mr. Murray will supply a want that must have been often felt, and will put the ordinary English reader in possession of information he had previously no ready access to, however much for theological or historic purposes he may have desired it. But over and beyond this we may hope that a fresh impulse will be given by it to the first principles of the Reformation, which are somewhat in danger of being *crowded out* in the present day by questions and disputes of very subordinate weight. It is as well that we should be reminded of what that Church and system against which the Reformation protested really was, for it is essentially unalterable. We are not absolutely committed to every act or speech of extravagance which the reaction against Rome may have produced, but we must not be blinded to the fact that the question is one of elemental principle. No one before Luther revealed and enforced the principle so clearly as he, and it is not too much to say that the principles he inculcated are fatal to the system and pretensions of Rome, and for this reason are more than ever of importance now. There is good cause to believe that many of the essential principles of the Romish Church have not only been disseminated, but received unconsciously, in the Church of England of recent years. It is right, therefore, that the counter-prin-

ciples should be equally diffused, that the two may be seen in more direct contrast, and then there will be an opportunity of choosing between them. It is impossible for the two to co-exist, for they are mutually destructive, and it is not a little remarkable that the Spirit of God seems to have foreseen and foretold no less, by embodying in the apostolic letter to the Roman Church these very principles of faith which are surely destined to undermine and to overthrow its power.

The first principles of the Reformation, as asserted in these treatises, and in the excellent introduction of the chief editor, are first the supremacy of the Divine Word, as that to which even Popes are subject, and which even councils may not contravene. This touches the whole question of Church authority. It anticipates and forestalls the dilemma of the perplexing question whether the Church made the Bible or the Bible made the Church, by maintaining the antecedent truth that God is the author of both, and that neither can be worth anything unless He is ; but that if so, the Church must be subject to the Word of God, which has called her into being, and cannot be permitted by any device or subterfuge to set it aside. Luther maintained the objective reality of the Word of God, and in that respect is no less opposed to the subjective and disintegrating theories of the present day, than to the perversions and corruptions of unauthorised tradition. To the antecedent question, Whence is it that the Bible has this authority ? he has perhaps not provided an answer. It may not have suggested itself to him. He bowed before the authority of the Word of God, which awed him as a living thing with hands and feet, and in submitting to its authority he found the truest and the noblest freedom. To the question why the Light was Light, he had perhaps no answer, or cared to give none : it was enough for him that in God's light he saw light, and knew that it was light he saw, as he knew it was the light of God by which alone he saw it ; and it may well be doubted whether in our own day, or in any other, it has been, or ever will be, possible to go beyond this point.

The second primary truth of the Reformation enforced in these treatises is the essential character of the priesthood. After referring to the statements of St. Peter and St. John, that Christians are a "royal priesthood" and "kings and priests," Luther says in his address to the nobility, and says truly (p. 21) :

If we had not a higher consecration in us than Pope or Bishop can give, no priest could ever be made by the consecration of Pope or Bishop ; nor could we say the mass, or preach, or absolve. Therefore, the Bishop's consecration is just as if in the name of the whole congregation he took one person out of the community, each member of which has equal power, and commanded him to exercise this power for the rest. That is why, in cases of necessity, every man can baptize and absolve, which would not be possible if we were not all priests. This great grace and virtue of baptism and of the Christian Estate, they have almost destroyed and made us forget by their ecclesiastical law. In this way the Christians used to choose their Bishops and priests out of the community ; these being afterwards confirmed by other Bishops, without the pomp that we have now. So was it that St. Augustine, Ambrose, Cyprian, were Bishops.

Most assuredly, if an ordinary Christian "in cases of necessity" can baptise and absolve, it must be because these functions are the prerogatives of the body to which he belongs, and not the exclusive privilege of a section of the body. As Dr. Wace puts it (p. xxviii.) : "Luther urges that all Christians possess virtually the capacities which, as a matter of order, are commonly restricted to the clergy. Whether that restriction is purposely dependent upon regular devolution from Apostolic authority, or whether the ministerial commission can be sufficiently conferred by appointment from the Christian community or congregation as a whole, becomes, on this principle, a secondary point. Luther pronounced with

the utmost decision in favour of the latter alternative ; but the essential element of his teaching is independent of this question. By whatever right the exercise of the ministry may be restricted to a particular body of men, what he asserted was that the functions of the clergy are simply ministerial, and that they do but exercise, on behalf of all, powers which all virtually possess." This, according to Luther, is the principle of the Reformation as opposed to the Church of Rome, which made the *secondary point* prior to the first, as do so many in the Church of England at the present day. It seems, however, that logically and philosophically Dr. Wace is perfectly right, for, granting whatever importance may be due, and justly due, to that which he calls the "secondary point," it stands to reason, and seems to be the true teaching of Scripture, that the thing restricted must be of higher and greater concern than the form or conditions restricting it. These exist for the sake of that, not that for the sake of these.

The third fundamental principle, which is last only in point of order and not in importance, is the true nature and prerogative of faith. We are unwilling to diminish or dilute in any way the simplicity and force of the Lutheran statements on this supreme subject. As Coleridge said, no one, since the Apostles and Apostolic men, has ever preached the Gospel as Luther preached it, and well would it be for all Churches and for all preachers if they could steal fire and life from this first of un-inspired evangelists. The treatise on Christian liberty is a precious and inexhaustible treasury of such Gospel life and energy, and we are thankful to have it within our reach, and earnestly hope that its salutary teaching may have free course and be glorified among us, for in the truth it inculcates, if anywhere, is to be discovered the *articulus aut stantis aut cadentis ecclesie*.

We are obliged by space to take leave of this subject, and we cannot do so more fittingly than in the words of Dr. Wace himself : "It is but "recognising an historical fact to designate the truths asserted in these "treatises as 'First Principles of the Reformation.' From them, and by "means of them, the whole of the subsequent movement was worked "out. They were applied in different countries in different ways ; and "we are justly proud in this country of the wisdom and moderation "exhibited by our Reformers. But it ought never to be forgotten that, "for the assertion of the principles themselves, we, like the rest of "Europe, are indebted to the genius and the courage of Luther. All of "these principles—Justification by Faith, Christian Liberty, the spiritual "rights and powers of the Laity, the true character of the Sacraments, "the Supremacy of the Holy Scriptures as the supreme standard of "belief and practice—were asserted by the Reformer, as the Treatises in "this volume bear testimony, almost simultaneously in the latter half "of the year 1520. At the time he asserted them, the Roman Church "was still in full power ; and the year after he had to face the whole "authority of the Papacy and of the Empire, and to decide whether, at "the risk of a fate like that of Huss, he would stand by these truths. "These were the truths—the cardinal principles of the whole subsequent "Reformation, which he was called on to abandon at Worms ; and his "refusal to act against his conscience at once translated them into vivid "action and reality. It was one thing for Englishmen, several decades "after 1520, to apply these principles with the wisdom and moderation "of which we are proud. It was another thing to be the Horatius of "that vital struggle. These grand facts speak for themselves, and need "only to be understood in order to justify the unprecedented honours "now being paid to the Reformer's memory" (p. xxxiv.).

STANLEY LEATHES, D.D.

"*When ye Pray;*" or, *Lessons on Prayer.* By C. H. WALLER, M.A., M'Neile Biblical Professor in the London College of Divinity, St. John's Hall, Highbury; Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Liverpool. John F. Shaw and Co. Pp. 192.

This work is so characteristic of its author, that we have had some doubt whether the reader unacquainted with his personality may not be at some disadvantage in its perusal. But we have been reassured by feeling, at every page, how the written letter preserves and reflects the qualities which have won our admiration and love in the living teacher. None can fail to recognise the combination of sound learning and intimate knowledge of the sacred text with singular ingenuity, and even quaintness, in its exposition and illustration, but all informed and animated with the spirit of pure devotion, inviting a spiritual response in the reader. Whatever else we may see of the author, one thing is plain, "Behold he prayeth," and he teaches us to pray. And as the material of prayer is furnished by the Word of God, so here we have the Lord's Prayer treated as the groundwork of Evangelical truth; the whole doctrine of man's salvation and the Christian life is presented to us in the most attractive form of direct communion with our God and Saviour. Thus the book has impressed us with its fitness to supply, especially to the young, an inviting epitome of doctrine, that they may feel, as well as know, "the certainty of the things wherein they have been instructed."

The framework of the book is the LORD'S PRAYER, regarded, as the title implies, both as a prayer and a pattern, and especially from the latter point of view. It is easy to use, or to deceive ourselves with the belief that we are using, that sacred form, sometimes in states of mind when all other words and thoughts fail us; sometimes, alas! when the "vain repetitions" are as unmeaning as the Pater Noster beads on a rosary. But that comprehensive brevity, which forbids the thought of its being an exclusive form of prayer, marks it as an inclusive pattern, which must be diligently studied, if we are to find in it the chiefest use for which it was first given—the response and satisfaction of the yearning desire of every true disciple, "Lord, teach us to pray."

Mr. Waller's method and style often remind us of those glass geometrical solids cut with many facets, which, placed so as to receive the pure rays of the sun, cast on the walls around us the varied colours, all of which are derived from the source of light, though not always free from some distortions and shades due to the imperfect medium. To follow him through his seventeen chapters would be impossible within our limits, nor would we forestall the reader's pleasure in the book itself. We must be content to mark certain salient points. One of these is the strange fallacy that the Lord's Prayer belongs to the old dispensation rather than the new; for it is a mere *cento* of Jewish petitions, which are preserved in the Talmud; it was given before the Pentecostal outpouring of the Holy Ghost, nor is it offered in the name of Christ. Seventeen years have not obliterated the sensation produced by a certain article on the Talmud, which many did not know to have been written by a Jew, and few could say with Lord Beaconsfield, "It is not so strange to me, for I read Lightfoot in my youth."¹ Now Mr. Waller reminds his readers of the simple fact, that the *Talmudical writers are more modern than the New Testament*; and, further, Delitzsch has clearly proved how directly they were indebted to the New Testament. To the second objection, which would apply equally to every word spoken by our Lord, and so would

¹ We can vouch for the fact, which struck us the more from having had a like experience. But in these days of contempt for "ancient history," some may even need a warning against confusing the living Bishop of Durham with the author, at least equally learned, of the "*Horæ Talmudicæ*" in the seventeenth century.

make all His teaching Jewish rather than Christian, Mr. Waller replies that "although the words of Christ were spoken before Pentecost, *they were not written till after Pentecost.* And they were written in obedience to the order recorded by St. Matthew, that the disciples should teach all nations *to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded them.* Therefore they wrote the Gospels." And when it is asked, If we can only come to God through Jesus Christ, how is it that the name of Jesus is not mentioned in the Lord's Prayer?—the answer is, not only that the prayer He taught must needs be offered through Him, but also that His intercession is implied in every one of its clauses, from the opening address to the closing attestation. "We can only call God 'our Father' through Jesus Christ; or, as one has said, 'Through the Brotherhood of Jesus we rise to the Fatherhood of God.'" Not to pursue the argument clause by clause, we see the mediation of Christ in the prayer for the forgiveness of sin, the remission of that "debt" which only His atoning sacrifice can cancel; the last petition, "*Deliver us from evil,*" recalls the name of the Deliverer; and the "*Amen*" is the very name which our Lord has taken to Himself: "'These things saith the *Amen*, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the Creation of God.'" In view of this fact, who can say that the Lord's Prayer is not offered in the name of Jesus? *Its closing word is His Name.*" Indeed, the whole exposition of that closing word, in its etymological significance, its use in Holy Scripture and in Jewish worship, and its practical application, furnishes a happy example of Mr. Waller's method and style. We can only find room for the last point:

"When we say *Amen*, we bind ourselves to support our prayers by our efforts, to the full extent of the power which God gives us. We have 'spoken with our mouth,' we must 'fulfil it with our hand' also, as far as it lies in us to be 'fellow-workers with God.' We bind ourselves by that *Amen* to *live as we pray.*"

In the whole structure of the prayer, Mr. Waller finds a recognition of the Holy Trinity; and his *arrangement* of it is a conspicuous example of his sacred ingenuity. In that part which relates to God, and which preponderates so greatly over what concerns ourselves, we have the Holy Name and the Everlasting Kingdom of the *Father*; the Kingdom of the *Son*, which *comes* in His dispensation, but is to be delivered up to the *Father for ever*,¹ when "the end cometh," and the Power (the *Ability*, *δύναμις*) of Him who is able to save to the uttermost; the Will of God wrought through the *Holy Spirit*, Who reveals His Glory. And in the petitions which concern our own daily wants and trials, it is the special attribute of the *Father* to give us both our daily bread and the bread that cometh down from Heaven; of the *Son* to make satisfaction for the hopeless debt of sin; of the *Holy Spirit* to keep us from temptation and deliver us from evil. How each of these points is worked out in the several chapters can only be seen by the perusal which the book will well reward.

Though full of the rich fruit of sacred learning—we may mention, in passing, an example in the appendix discussing the words used for prayer in the New Testament—its prevailing character is so pre-eminently devotional, that verbal criticism sounds a jarring note. But unhappily that note has been sounded throughout the Church by those who ought to have known better, and it is not Mr. Waller's fault or ours that silence will no longer still the mischief that is done. Accordingly, we have more than one reference to the unhappy distortion and mutilation of these most sacred words of our Lord in that performance which was meant to

¹ We can only glance, in passing, at Mr. Waller's admirable discussion of the *æons*, about which we have lately had so much unprofitable and dangerous speculation.

be, and was *bound* to be, a "Revised Version," but the Revisers were "led into the temptation" of making it something entirely different. We insist on the right, nay the duty, of stating the case thus, as all the pleas urged in the Bishop of Gloucester's preface leave untouched the original limitation under which the Revisers accepted their commission from Convocation. For that was no arbitrary commission; but the deliberate expression of the public feeling and desire. We believe that no *new translation* was demanded even by those Christian bodies in which a certain tendency to innovation is perhaps reflected in the work of the Revisers; but it is beyond all doubt that the opinion of our own Church against such an attempt was faithfully represented by the plain and stringent rule laid down by Convocation. The revision was meant to be a practical work, for daily use in public and private; and the practical question for the myriads of British Christians is this—whether this most sacred and familiar form of their daily prayer was infected by such "*plain and clear errors*" as to require the omission of the Doxology, the unscriptural recognition of the personal "evil one" as the *one evil* from which we are alone to ask deliverance, and the remarkable mutilation of the prayer as given by St. Luke. The *jarring note* of "bring" for "lead" evidently cannot come under the rule; and it stands as one of a multitude of examples of *irritating* changes, which are something worse than merely irritating in the solemn utterance of prayer in our Lord's own words.¹

This formal restriction does not of course apply to the liberty which a commentator has to exercise his own independent judgment; and while we gladly welcome Mr. Waller's brief, but very able and decisive, vindication of the Doxology, we cannot but regret the partial concession which he has made to the alteration, "Deliver us from the *evil one*." True, he hits the blot, far more serious than might seem at first sight, involved in the Revisers' uniform toning-down of "the *wicked one*" (for ὁ πονηρός) into "the *evil one*," which seems only explicable on their unfortunate principle of "alterations by *consequence*." To assimilate other passages to their rendering of this one, they have always, except in the one passage where Satan is *not* referred to (1 Cor. v. 13), obliterated the distinction which the Latin Versions and Fathers express by the use of "*malus*" and "*malignus*." But when Mr. Waller goes on to say that "*Deliver us from evil*" and "*Redeem us from the wicked one*" are both equally correct versions of the petition," we cannot but think that his desire for a comprehensive sense has betrayed him into one of those truisms which, the moment that *prima facie* character is stripped off, stand revealed as clear fallacies. For, not to stay to discuss the translation of ῥῶσαι by "*redeem*," of course the *bare words* τοῦ πονηροῦ may be either masculine or neuter; but this same simple fact of grammar assures us that *both* cannot be "equally correct versions" in one and the same sentence; nor do we think the argument improved by the large place which Mr. Waller seems disposed to assign to Satanic agency in physical as well as moral evil. When he says that "the Revisers would have materially strengthened their position if they had translated the sentence thus, 'Deliver us from the *wicked one*,'" we ask him to go a step further, and apply the test proposed by Stier: "In a plain outspoken way at any time, even in the most joyous festival of the Church, nay, at the Lord's Supper, try to wind up your prayer with the outcry of anguish, '*Deliver us from the devil*.'" Is this to be the daily prayer of those recovered from the snare

¹ A similar example, happily not allowable in the public worship of our Church, is that substitution of "who" for "which," which aggravates the offence by betraying ignorance of the grammar which it affects to mend.

in which they were taken before their redemption?—of those who *have overcome* the wicked one?—taught by Him who, in His victorious conflict, once for all saw Satan fall as lightning from heaven? Are the ransomed sharers of His kingdom still to agonize for redemption from the yoke of the Prince of this World as *the one sole evil* from which they ask deliverance, repeated and renewed from day to day? Against such a law of life as this we may well plead, with double emphasis, "Stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." No! The true prayer of the Christian and the Church is expressed in the simple comprehensive language of the Ethiopic version, "Deliver us from ALL EVIL," "comprehending" (as St. Cyprian says) "*all adverse things which the enemy in this world devises against us; wherefrom*" (*a quibus*, not *a quo*) "we have a faithful firm protection, if God deliver us and grant us His aid to our entreaties and complaints;" or, to sum up all in the comprehensive phrase, which our Litany expands into some thirty distinct forms of danger that beset us daily, "From *all evil and mischief; from sin, from the crafts and assaults*" (not from the *power*) "of the devil, good Lord deliver us."

The critical argument to sustain this position would be out of place here, and our space is exhausted; but we may well be content to leave the discussion on what we venture to call the irrefragable ground established by Canon Cook.¹ Nor must we conclude without saying that the point is so slight and incidental a flaw in Mr. Waller's work, and so little affecting even his treatment of this petition, that our protest must not be regarded as any qualification of the confidence and pleasure with which we recommend it as a most beautiful and instructive guide "to pray with the Spirit, and to pray with the understanding also."

P. S.

The Golden Decade of a Favoured Town. Biographical Sketches and Personal Recollections of the Celebrated Characters who have been connected with Cheltenham from 1843 to 1853. By CONTEM IGNOTUS. Pp. 200. Elliot Stock, 1884.

Whoever may be the author of this book (and we know nothing about the authorship), he has written what many will deem a profitable as well as a very readable book. Those readers who have some knowledge of the "favoured town" will no doubt regard it with special favour; but for Churchmen by whom the names of Francis Close and Archibald Boyd are held in respect and regard, these "Memorials" will have a peculiar interest. The book is ably written, the tone is admirable, the suggestions are sensible, and a good impression is likely to be produced on unprejudiced minds. Where one differs from the author, one is pleased to admit that it is well to hear both sides of the matter.

Sixty pages of the work have been given to Dean Close, thirty to Dean Boyd, fifty to F. W. Robertson, and forty to the poet Sydney Dobell.

In regard to Francis Close, the author may well appeal to "those who knew the man and his ministry, whether we have not given a true and faithful portrait of him. In most respects he ever seemed to us the very model of what a pastor of the Reformed Church of England ought to be." An article in the *Morning Post*, "far more characterized by animus against Evangelicalism than by knowledge of its subject, Dean Close," is criticized with undeniable force; and the work which the honoured

¹ "Deliver us from Evil": a Second Letter to the Lord Bishop of London in answer to Three Letters of the Lord Bishop of Durham. By F. C. Cook, M.A., Canon of Exeter. John Murray.

Dean did for years in Carlisle is plainly shown. In addition to decanal work and church-building work, he laboured as the pastor of a city parish, visiting the sick and poor, and he took regularly a working men's Bible-class. Not till he was approaching his eightieth year, when his infirmities could sustain such an amount of extra labour no longer, did he resign "that preferment" (to quote the *Morning Post*). Neither as regards the church nor the cathedral had Dean Close "preached himself dry"! But the author of the book before us criticizes a "Dean Close" article in another morning paper. The *Standard*, endorsing the sketch in Mr. Mozley's "Reminiscences" of the High Church pastor "doing his best to make his people virtuous, while the Low Church pastor thought more of the views than of the virtues of his hearers," etc., etc., pointed the moral at the expense of Mr. Close, "the Vicar of Cheltenham, busy, earnest, zealous, plunged knee-deep in sermons, tracts," etc.

As to Mr. Close's sound Churchmanship, it is pointed out that at the beginning of his ministry in Cheltenham he published a volume of sermons on the Liturgy, aiming to extol it and exhibit its beauties. This deep attachment to the Prayer Book "characterized his ministry throughout its lengthened career even to the last . . . It is worse than unfair to say that Dean Close was 'no Churchman.' The truth is, that he was a far more true and real, and even attached and enthusiastic one than many of his slanderers." The same may be said of his two great contemporaries, Hugh M'Neile and Hugh Stowell. "In every legitimate sense of the word, M'Neile and Stowell were the most loyal and obedient of Churchmen."¹

Our author's remarks on Dean Boyd's ministry are sound and pertinent. "A very leading feature of Mr. Boyd's preaching was that it was remarkably edifying and instructive preaching. He was a thoroughly well-read theologian." Our author quotes, in connection with this, a passage from that ably written work "Romanism, Protestantism, and Anglicanism;" and in passing we are glad to repeat our recommendation of that book. Instances of Evangelical Bampton Lecturers and theological authors of eminence may well be quoted against the assertion that the clergy of the Evangelical School have been ighorant of theology. It is an absurd assertion, and scarcely worthy of even the slightest notice. We thoroughly agree with the author (referring to our dear friend the Rev. Edward Garbett), that "it is no honour to the powers that be that that brilliant Bampton Lecturer should be in his honoured old age nothing higher than an honorary Canon."

We must quote a little more about the Dean of Exeter; and, in passing, we may remark that the Dean contributed one article, and two or three reviews, to THE CHURCHMAN. Our author writes: "Dean Boyd's powers of conversation, when in congenial society, were both great and fascinating. We once had the pleasure of staying some time at one of the German baths where he was sojourning with the late Mrs. Boyd, and of meeting him daily at dinner at the *table d'hôte*, as well as occasionally having intercourse with him in other ways. His characteristics were very strikingly manifested at that *table d'hôte*. When surrounded by strangers, and especially by uncongenial people, he would be reserved almost to severity. But when near his friends, and specially if they were

¹ In a letter from Dean Close as to his friendly relations with Bishop Monk, while he himself was Incumbent of Cheltenham, we read: "I continued in 1826 what I found there, viz., prayers on Wednesdays and Fridays and on all Saints-Days . . . Monk once talked to me about giving the Sacrament by railfuls, and I asked him to come and give it himself. We had from 400 to 500. That settled it."

“thoroughly congenial people, his reserve would thaw into sunny and witty cheerfulness, and flow forth into the most entertaining conversation. Like Addison, of whom it has been written that ‘he was good company with his intimate friends, but in mixed company he preserved his dignity by a stiff and reserved silence.’ Some of the Dean’s good stories we have never forgotten, and two of them are so good that, as we have never elsewhere met with them, our readers will be pleased if we repeat them. The Dean did not expect that ‘a chiel was amang them takin’ notes, and faith he’d print it.’ Nevertheless, there can be no harm in the printing such stories as these. They are not like the extracts from luckless Bishop Wilberforce’s Diary, or from that of the equally luckless Thomas Carlyle : they will wound none, and they will amuse many. The first was an amusing story about Charles Simeon : ‘Simeon,’ said the Dean, ‘was once riding near Cambridge, when his horse—he was, as you know, very fond of riding—shied at something in the road and threw him. Simeon fell on to the hard road with such violence that he thought every bone in his body must be broken ; and for some time he was quite afraid to move a muscle, lest he should discover that he had sustained one or more most dreadful fractures. However, he at last ventured, slowly and cautiously, and one need not add fearfully, to stretch out one arm, and he felt he could do it. He then ventured slowly to stir the other arm, and he felt he could do it. But now it was more than likely that his hip was broken, and, very cautiously and slowly, he tried to stretch out his right leg, and to his joy he felt he could do it. Only one more limb was to be essayed, and so, with much hope and much fear, he tried to stretch out the left, and he felt he could do it. “Ah,” said Simeon, slowly gathering himself up on to his knees, “he keepeth *all* his bones, *not one* of them is broken !”

“The other story was as follows. A clergyman near the Dean—the English summer chaplain at Schwalbach—had been speaking of his own extraordinary experiences in the pulpit at Trinity Church, Margate, when preaching there as a stranger on behalf of the excellent sea-bathing infirmary in that place. There was at the back of that pulpit, he said, a sounding board, shaped and concaved like a large oyster or scallop shell. And the effect of his own voice on that shell and on his own ears was most peculiar and unpleasant. When he stood back in his preaching towards the shell, the boom in his ears was quite startling, and when he stood forward, his voice seemed diminished almost to inaudibility.

“That reminds me,” said the Dean, ‘of a very humbling experience of a friend of mine who was preaching in a pulpit with exactly such a sounding-board as you have described. He too was not the minister of the church, though he had preached there two or three times before. And that pulpit had such extraordinary acoustical peculiarities that it caught and reflected at peculiar angles, back upon the preacher, even whispers spoken at a long distance. My friend went up into the pulpit, and knelt down to say his private prayer. He then stood up and looked at the congregation, and, as he did so, he heard a voice, as it were from behind, say distinctly—“*Oh, that dreadful man again!*” And, remarked my friend drily, it was not encouraging.’”

The author’s remarks on Robertson of Brighton and of Cheltenham are well worth reading, as are his criticisms on the Life of Robertson, by Mr. Brooke.

Of Mr. Money, at one time the congenial curate of Mr. Close, an anecdote is given. One Sunday evening, some juveniles returned from church with bright faces and a certain animation ; they had heard the new curate, and “Mr. Close was nothing to him !” Canon Money, how-

ever, has been more than a "popular preacher" and a diligent pastor; he has done good service to the Church in manifold ways.

On Dr. Boulton (whose death is announced even as we write), the author's remarks are just. "It is a rare thing in our day," he says, "to see Church dignities conferred on an Evangelical;" but, after all, Principal Boulton, one of the ablest divines of the day, was only a Prebendary, and this distinction was not conferred till he had reached the closing year of his laborious and most useful life.



Short Notices.



The Doctrine of the Lord's Supper as taught in Holy Scripture and by the Church of England. A Sermon preached in St. John's Church, Reading, on Monday, October 1, 1883, the evening before the Meeting of the Church Congress. By CHARLES PERRY, D.D., late Bishop of Melbourne. Hatchards: Church of England Book Society. 1884.

THAT such a sermon as this was preached at Reading, on the eve of the Church Congress there holden, is a fact to be rejoiced in; and the value of the fact is enhanced by the weight attaching to the preacher's office and reputation; being known, as he is, not only for attaining the highest University distinction, but as a Bishop of large experience and a theologian of ripe judgment. It is well that the utterances of so sound and judicious a prelate should now be brought within reach of all Churchmen.

The thought, the feeling, and the object of the sermon are all apparent in the first paragraph, which it is best to give as printed: "To preach upon the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, which I propose, in dependence upon the help of the Holy Spirit, to do this evening, is difficult; not, as it appears to me, from any obscurity in the language either of the Scriptures or of our own Church concerning it, but from the necessity of pointing out the errors which have prevailed in respect to it during a long course of years in other Churches, and which now prevail to a great extent in our own. Hence there needs great care on the part of a preacher that he does not, by any mistake he may commit, impair the force of his argument, or, by any expression into which he may be betrayed, give just cause of offence to those who differ from him; and I am well aware of the responsibility upon me to use such care on the present occasion." Excellently said, both as to clearness and as to charity; and fully is this indication followed to the end. With a mathematician's instinct for reasoning, all side-issues and secondary points are avoided, and the argument is led along the highway of main facts to a conclusion which is a demonstration. First, what the Holy Scriptures declare; second, what the Formularies of our Church teach; to these the whole attention is given; and no excursion is taken into the debatable land of Christian writings, ancient or modern: in fact, so to travel away from the Bible and the Prayer-book is to give opponents all room for finding somewhere anything they wish to discover. Quotations from Fathers and Anglican Divines can be culled by collectors of most opposite opinions; but all such passages leave the controversy where it was. "What saith the Scripture?" and, next to that, "What saith our Reformed Church?" must be our position if we would convince gainsayers. Keeping to the lines laid down, the Bishop proves how untenable is the