

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

THE
CHURCHMAN

AUGUST, 1883.

ART. I.—SEVEN YEARS' PERSONAL RECOLLECTIONS
OF PAROCHIAL WORK IN CAMBRIDGE.

TO enjoy any place where fidelity to duty compels a clergyman, in charge of an overgrown and populous parish, to spend day after day amid parochial entanglements and distractions in almost endless variety, it is necessary that he should become altogether dissociated officially from the daily and hourly anxieties of that sphere of duty, and be released from his professional or parochial responsibilities. One has no time to come to himself, amid the perpetual hum and bustle of the living tide which constantly flows before him, while he occupies the important and onerous position of Vicar or Rector of an extensive and care-producing parish. It is only when such a man has ceased to be officially connected with it, and can calmly look back upon the scene of his former labours, or examine, without anxious thought, the existing condition of his former mission-field, that he can enjoy the retrospect of the past, and feel an honest and sanctified satisfaction in doing so. All happiness to be felt must be interrupted. In the midst of bewildering cares and crosses one has no time to realize the effect of parochial organization. The mind is hampered by the incessant demands arising from the exigencies and requirements of the hour. A feeling of constraint deprives a man of that ease and freedom which can hardly co-exist with a sense of official responsibility. There must be an interruption of the perpetual strain upon the mind in order to allow time for leisurely reflection.

The Duke of Wellington must have experienced greater gladness of heart on the occasion of his visit to the field of Waterloo a few years subsequent to the battle, than on the very day of the eventful fight, when the destiny of Europe lay

on the issue of the combat. It must have been a time of the gravest anxiety to him, and no wonder that his pent-up feelings should find utterance in the recorded saying, "Would that night or Blucher were come!" In hours of peaceful repose from the din of war and its varying fluctuations, as he looked upon the golden grain which then clothed the once red plain with waving abundance, he could calmly survey the episodes of that momentous struggle, and with the felt sense of freedom from every care of present duty, and from the pressure of anxious thought, point out to his distinguished visitors the scenes of those critical assaults which decided the fortune of that great day.

It is in this sense, comparing great things with small, that I propose to review the past period of parochial work in Cambridge, now that I am relieved from the ceaseless care and manifold variety of parochial distraction while Vicar of my old parish.

Many an overworked clergyman, in an overcrowded population, has to endure for years the daily wear and tear of body and mind, amid depressing scenes and surroundings which, though perhaps taken singly in themselves mere nothings, yet in the aggregate are most trying to the spirits and exhaustive of the nervous system. Such a man would do well to change his sphere of duty, rather than grow old before his time, and perhaps break down altogether. Take, for example, such a parish as that of St. Andrew-the-Less, in Cambridge, the scene of these personal recollections, and for many years the springing-ground of missionary hope and enterprise. Every Cambridge man knows the old familiar name of Barnwell. In 1862 I was selected by the Rev. Henry Venn and Canon Hoare to succeed the present Master of St. Catharine's College, who, for a few years, with singular ability, presided over the affairs of the parish, where he had endeared himself to everyone, and has left behind him a souvenir of deep and permanent impression.

Barnwell contained about 12,000 inhabitants at that time. There were two churches—one the Parish Church called Christ Church, and the other the Abbey Church, which had been restored by the Camden Society. It is the last relic of the old Monastery, whose former dimensions may still be faintly traced from the Newmarket road back to the river.

In the time of King Henry VIII. it was a grand foundation. His Majesty and suite—an expensive train—paid a visit to the Abbot, and judging from the records which have come down to us, they must have had what the Americans call "a good time" of it during the sojourn of the Court there. These old monks were well acquainted with the palpable truth that man

has a divided personality; and that one part of this mysterious union consists in the wonderful mechanism of a material body. These Anchorites thoroughly understood the convenient distinction drawn by the Japanese between the Mikado and the Tycoon, the one the king of the bodies, and the other the king of the souls of men. We see this sort of dual government at the present day among the Carthusian Monks, who are such famous distillers of the exquisitely flavoured liqueur, the Grande Chartreuse. This wonderful elixir is the prerogative of this famous "order," and it belongs to the department of good cheer adapted to the bodies of men. The abstinence and fasting and enforced silence on all but the monk who sells the liqueur are intended for the souls of men. The Barnwell monks were a prosperous community. No man of their day better understood the secrets of the culinary art. They could feast as well as fast, and the scanty details of the rejoicings and festivities on that occasion which have reached us, remind one of Moore's description of

"The O'Ruark's noble feast, which shall ne'er be forgot
By those who were there, or by those who were not."

The Abbey and all its imposing grandeur has long been a thing of the past. In my time some portion of the ancient edifice was ignominiously used for a cowshed; and some of the larger stones had been applied to the profane use of refitting an old stable. *Sic transit gloria mundi*. The little church which still bears the time-honoured name of "The Abbey" is the only remnant of the former monastic magnificence; and so far as it goes, it is a very useful as well as an ornamental piece of architecture. It is too small for practical purposes, as it can hardly accommodate 120 persons. This was the only place of worship for the inhabitants of Barnwell until Bishop Perry, with his usual energy, undertook the building of Christ Church, which afterwards became, and still continues to be, the Parish Church. It has accommodation for 1,400 persons. If the architecture is not imposing, there is a compensatory adjustment for that defect in the ample space and the convenient situation of the edifice. This was the second church which the Bishop was the means of erecting in Cambridge previous to his leaving England for his distant diocese of Melbourne. The mantle of Charles Simeon had fallen on him and others who were the Bishop's contemporaries, or nearly so. Evangelical religion by their means received active and practical support. They leavened the people with the truths of the simple Gospel—the old, old story of grace; and, as I can abundantly testify, the inhabitants of Barnwell to this day aer living demonstrations of the promise as to "bread cast upon the waters." Venn, Carus, Clayton, Birks, are names of some

of the Evangelical leaders in Cambridge. They did good work in their day, and the seed sown by them has taken root and spread beyond the narrow limits of their original parishes.

There is a shallow notion, and it is to be feared somewhat popular, that the Evangelical party are not favoured by the acquisition of men of high-class scholarship. This is not borne out by the facts with which we are confronted in the history of religious efforts in Cambridge. Bishop Perry, for example, was Senior Wrangler of his year; Henry Venn was Fellow of his College; Canon Clayton was a Double First; Canon Carus was also a Fellow; and Professor Birks was Second Wrangler. These men of note, and many others who bore the heat and burden of the day when Evangelical religion was at a very low ebb in the University, sufficiently demonstrate that, so far as intellectual vigour, high-class culture, and scientific attainments are concerned, the Evangelicals can point to men second to none in every department of successful literary enterprise.

Looking back from the present date to the period when I was instituted to Barnwell, it may be interesting, and perhaps instructive, if I give a brief description of the parish as I found it, and the outcome of the scheme for church extension inaugurated by the local efforts of men of almost every school of thought who were interested in the welfare of that parish. The name of Barnwell was not in the highest repute. It is a fact that when the small district post-office opposite the Vicarage was opened for the accommodation of the neighbourhood a year or two after my incumbency, the friends of my Barnwell parishioners, living at a distance, offered such an objection to the name "Barnwell" being stamped on the envelopes of their letters, that a remonstrance was made to me by several of the residents with the view of having it discontinued. Accordingly, I communicated with the late Mr. Anthony Trollope, with the view of carrying out the desired object. His reply was no doubt official, but very characteristic of the man. In a serio-comic vein he good-humouredly referred to the improved tone which the church extension scheme—to which I shall presently refer—had already produced in the locality, and "in a purified Barnwell (he says) we may hope that the name will ere long be looked upon as an honourable distinction!"

I do not know that I could mention any fact more strikingly suggestive of the ill-omened repute which the parish bore at that date. The townspeople seldom mentioned the word. It was referred to in ordinary society with a certain air of apologetic hesitancy. People understood from local associations that it was the abode of a surplus population of the most

heterogeneous description. Disreputable characters abounded in certain streets from which no honest man, and certainly no undergraduate not engaged in parish-work, could have emerged without the taint of suspicion. "Gas Lane," where now St. Matthew's Church stands, was the rendezvous for all the cinder-sifters in Cambridge, who made a precarious living by screening the cinders collected in the town, and selling the pulverized carbon for plants and other uses. Tribes of gipsies occupied the houses there. Petts, or Petch, the chief of a famous tribe, was the champion in a celebrated prize-fight that took place on Newmarket racecourse. He was a great man in that part of the parish. Mrs. Humphry, the wife of the eminent Professor of that name, painted his portrait. I have his photograph. He was a splendid-looking fellow, stood about six feet two inches, wild as a Red Indian in appearance, hair unkempt, his face bronzed from long exposure to the weather, about seventy years of age, and as straight as an arrow. He was the last King of the Gipsies in the Eastern Counties. The battle which he fought decided his fortune, and ever after he was regarded with high honour by all the wandering tribes. He began to attend the services of the Mission Church opposite his house, and he became a regular attendant at the services both on week-days and on Sundays. Any stranger who visited that neighbourhood at that time, would see more donkeys collected together in the neglected field where now the church stands than he ever saw in one spot before in all his life. A very motley group of human creatures would add to the wildness of the scene—gipsies, cinder-sifters, small costermongers, tinkers, hawkers of all kinds, cadgers on the tramp, those hiding from the police, *et hoc omne genus*. The fields in front of the houses were called, in the current phraseology of the place, "No man's land;" and the place itself was designated as "The end of the world," because it led nowhere. There were no roads, lanes, bypaths beyond. It was the *ultima thule* of Cambridge, the last boundary of municipal jurisdiction. Of all the wretched, heaven-forsaken haunts of men, I never saw anything more suggestive of degradation, and misery, than that part of Barnwell extending from Gas Lane to Nelson Street and Wellington Row. The former, from its vicious associations, was called "Devil's Row;" and as for Wellington Street, there was not an honest house from end to end of it. It was there that, after much deliberation, I decided to build a church. Were it not for the unwearied activity of one whose name I can never mention without "deep affection and recollection," I doubt very much if the church would ever have been built, at least not in my time. His sudden and untimely end not only deprived me of a valued friend, but the

parish of an unwearied worker. I never met his equal for unselfish, unostentatious, and self-denying labour in the cause of Christ. I refer to the Rev. W. J. Beamont, M.A., some time Senior Fellow of Trinity College. He was my intimate friend and constant companion in many a ramble together. No one knew him better, and I have never ceased to deplore his loss to myself as well as to the Church, both locally and generally. He was not what would be called *an* Evangelical, but he was in the truest and best sense of the term—Evangelical. If a total absence of self-seeking caution, an utter disregard for his own advancement in the Church, choosing rather to spend his time, his money, and his labours among the slums of Drury Lane in London, and in the poorest haunts of poverty and vice in Cambridge, than to enjoy the repose and comfort of College life; if a rigid self-denial of luxury and ease, and an unflagging devotion to the cause of church extension; if, in a word, unaffected piety and a humble, childlike trust in the merits of a crucified Redeemer—if these be some of the salient points of Evangelical religion, then my friend Beamont was an Evangelical of Evangelicals. But, then, he was not thought so. He did not adopt the nomenclature of a party. He talked very little, and he worked very much. He was the original founder of the Church Congress, and to some of the earlier ones I had the pleasure and the privilege of accompanying him, specially to Norwich, where the symptoms of that fatal malady which cut short his useful life suddenly attacked him, and I was obliged to hurry him as quickly as possible to Cambridge. Though enduring intense pain on his journey, he never uttered a single syllable indicative of suffering. He was the most unselfish and the most uncomplaining man I ever met. His manner was somewhat brusque and abrupt, but it was his manner only. The Church of Christ was divided into two classes in his estimation—the workers, and the non-workers. Everyone, of any school of thought, who belonged to the former class had a hearty welcome at Trinity Hostel. And what an extraordinary assemblage of persons from all parts of the world I met at his rooms! Tischendorf, the illustrious German scholar, and “Deerfoot,” the Red Indian—what extremes! Archimandrites of the Greek Church, and Jewish Rabbis from Syria. Christians and Jews, Sunday-school children, the literate and the illiterate, of all grades and classes, men and women and children of every variety of parochial administration, flocked round him. Such a mixture of persons I never saw in any man’s rooms before or since, and all these were attracted to him simply by the magnetic influence of his transparent good nature and disinterested labours of love.

St. Matthew’s Church was built mainly by his exertions.

Let any man this day go to visit that spot where in 1862 such a concourse of wretchedness and pauperism prevailed, and see the extraordinary, almost miraculous change which has come over the entire neighbourhood, and he will hardly be persuaded to believe that I am describing accurately its condition at that period. However, there are thousands of living witnesses who can certify that I have kept considerably within the truth. I fear that if I were to draw an accurate picture of the moral aspect of the place of that date, it might be a little too true to nature to be altogether edifying. Such a transformation scene has taken place since the church has been erected there, that no man even in the wildest incoherencies of a feverish dream could ever have imagined such an altered state of things. I myself had very little indeed to do with it. Beaumont was the prime mover who called the Committee together, consisting of Archdeacon Emery, Rev. John Martin, and other clergy in the town, and some of the laity, of whom Mr. Reynolds Rowe, the architect, was a leading man. Canon Leeke, now Chancellor of Lincoln, energetically continued the operations after my time, and the Rev. A. E. Humphreys, late Fellow of Trinity, has carried them on to their present effective completion. I received considerable aid, both personal and pecuniary, from my friend and Churchwarden, Mr. Bailey, whose efforts were unceasing in helping towards the building of the church.

I remember well the opposition I met with when I first mentioned the proposal to build a church in that out-of-the-way place. How I was discouraged by the concentrated wisdom of old residents both in the University and the town! "What!" (said one very influential member of the University)—"build a church there! You might just as well think of building a church on the Gog-Magog Hills. It is a useless expenditure of money. Your labours will be thrown away. You should build the church in the middle of Barnwell." I confess that I was perplexed. The opinion of more prudent men had weight with me, yet somehow I could not quite agree with them. One day, hearing that Bishop Perry was in Cambridge, I called on him to ask if he would kindly accompany me to Gas Lane. He did so, and after carefully examining the whole of the circumstances, and hearing from me the facts of the case, he said, in his own thoughtful way, "This is the spot for the church. The same excuses were made when I began to build Christ Church, and see what a population has sprung up around it! I have no doubt you will find a similar result here in due time." The Bishop was right. Already a large population of about 4,000 souls has sprung up in that neighbourhood, for whom additional church accommodation has been provided by

the energy of Mr. Humphreys, the present Incumbent. Land bought for £400 the acre was sold for exactly double the amount within a few months. A small town has started into existence as if by magic, and it is with difficulty that the old site can be recognised where the gipsies, and the cinder-sifters, and all that motley group with their herds of donkeys used formerly to hold high carnival.

The Barnwell of to-day is so unlike the Barnwell of a quarter of a century ago, that those who are ignorant of its antecedent history can form no adequate idea of the change that has taken place. If anyone were to visit the locality now, he could scarcely believe that where the well-cultivated and ornate Vicarage garden at present stands, with the effective church close by, a few years ago there resided an ignorant and almost barbarous population, whose Bohemian ways rendered it a work of no small difficulty to reduce them to anything like regularity either in social or religious life. The disreputable residences, where proctorial visits were of almost daily occurrence, have disappeared. A little church for special children's services has been built in Wellington Row, once the most infamous haunt of vice that could anywhere be found. The principle that if the people will not go to the church, the church must go to the people, was carried out to the letter. This was brought about by Canon Leeke.

It was no use to try to get these free-and-easy waifs and strays to go to the Parish Church. It was too orderly. The worshippers were too respectable for these uncivilized sinners. They had to be dealt with very tenderly—fed with milk, not with meat. There were men there who had never entered any place of worship, living in concubinage, unbaptized, as wild as the children of the forest and the prairie. It was not in human nature to expect such outcasts from society to take kindly, all at once, to the decent and orderly services of the Church, with which persons of educated and cultivated minds have been familiarized since childhood. A mission service had to be organized. The warm glow of sympathy had to be brought to bear upon them. The electrical influences of the human heart and face and voice had to precede any formal utterances of liturgical propriety. First of all, they had to learn that the parish clergy had no object in view but the welfare, both in body and soul, of these "publicans and sinners." They had to be "coaxed" to the mission-room. Little by little, line upon line, precept upon precept, they were to be led, one step at a time, to receive the love of the truth.

This process of missionary spoon-feeding was a necessary preliminary before getting them to enter into the spirit of the Church services. This work, requiring tact and temper, time

and patience, was efficiently conducted by the earnest-minded and painstaking men who kindly undertook this arduous mission, and who, from a devout love for the souls of these practical heathen, gave themselves up to this truly evangelistic work and labour of love. One who worked with painstaking conscientiousness, and who specially had charge of that district for a time—the Rev. F. C. Young—has long since entered into his rest. Others continued what he had begun, and the result was that on the opening day, when the church was consecrated by the present Bishop of Winchester, the people of that district cheerfully, if not intelligently, joined in the services and ceremony. Many of them looked on with wondering eyes. Some of them had never seen a Bishop in all their lives. The heads of houses in their robes, and the clergy in their canonicals, presented an imposing spectacle which deeply impressed the spectators.

From that day to this the sound of the church-going bell has been heard at their very doors. It was, and still continues to be, music to their ears. They were loud in grateful acknowledgment for what had been done for them, the best proof of which was their regular attendance every Sunday at the church. Let anyone go there to-day, and he will see that the church, which was then on the very outskirts of the parish—actually in the fields, not a single house beyond it anywhere—is now in the centre of a new town, which has sprung into existence all around, with a large population all astir—new schools, new mission-rooms, and all the newest forms of parochial machinery of every kind in active working order under the superintendence of the Incumbent, Mr. Humphreys.

When I visited the place in June last I was utterly bewildered. I found myself a complete stranger in Gas Lane—I could not find my way in a district where fifteen years ago there was not a single habitation of any kind, and where now there are upwards of 4,000 people newly added to the parish of St. Andrew-the-Less. The only mistake made in the matter of church extension has arisen from the inability of man to dip into the future. Were it possible to have anticipated the present development of Church work, undertaken in the first instance with so much hesitation, we should have erected a very much larger building, and of a more solid and enduring character than the existing one. Not that it is by any means defective; quite the contrary. So far as it goes it is a very well-constructed edifice, and I believe quite unique of its kind, modelled after a pattern which some of the Committee had seen in the south of France. It can comfortably accommodate 650 persons. The seats are all free and unap-

propriated for ever. There is a good parsonage-house, and an endowment from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners of £200 a year—an inadequate sum, considering local claims on the Vicar. Parochial machinery of every description is in full and vigorous action. Yet it is in the very midst of such missionary labours that "The Salvation Army" are at this moment erecting their headquarters, in order "to make an assault" upon the place. Surely there are parishes where, as yet, the masses are not reached by either church or chapel, and there such an organization might be valuable. But to enter into other men's lines of labour, after they have, amid many a toilsome step, succeeded in evangelizing the people, seems to me to be a departure from the original programme of "The Army," as it certainly is contrary to the principle of Apostolic precedent. To go where Christ has not been named, and to unfurl the standard of the Cross in districts where spiritual destitution abounds, would be more in accordance with the fitness of things, and, for my part, any such movement would have, as it has already had, my genuine sympathy. But to come in at the eleventh hour, after others have borne the heat and burden of the day, is not, as it seems to me, exactly coincident with the Pauline principle. It is calculated to promote confusion and unseemly conflict of opinion.

Some of the scenes which I have witnessed among the poor hawkers and cadgers in that district form amusing recollections of the curiosities of clerical experience. Let me select a single instance out of many. One night about twelve o'clock I was suddenly summoned to attend a poor hawker—a half-bred gipsy—in New Street. It was a lodging-house of a very humble description. On going upstairs I found myself in a small lobby with three or four bedrooms on one side of it. In the first of these lay the sick man. His wife, hearing my footsteps on the stairs, came out to meet me, and introduced me to her husband, who was evidently in great pain. I noticed some very well-executed artificial flower-screens in one part of the room. They were made by the man and his wife, and were hawked about for sale as a means of obtaining a livelihood. After spending about half an hour there I went away; but as I was descending the stairs a woman whom I knew well, and whom I was in the habit of relieving from time to time—for she and her husband were very poor, and occasionally were in want—accosted me and said, "If you please, Mr. Weldon, my husband and I have been out on the tramp for the last week, and we returned home about two or three hours ago; and we was going to have our supper when we heard you was a-coming to see the man in the next room, so we waited, thinking that you'd be a bit tired, and we hope you will not

think it a liberty if we were to ask you just to come in and have a cup o' tea."

I gladly accepted the hospitable offer. They lived in one room—a small one, very poorly furnished, but on this occasion there was a little "brushing up" in honour of my visit. There was a good fire, the table was covered with a rough but clean cloth, and to my surprise there was what I should call a very substantial supper, all laid out and ready. The man on my entrance into the room got off his seat and shook me warmly by the hand. "Glad to see you, sir, and you be that welcome—that you be. Sit down here near the fire, and the missus will make a start. Come, missus, up with the tea." The bill of fare was not by any means despicable. There was a small leg of mutton, which had been in pickle for about three or four days; a hot loaf of bread, round as Norval's shield and almost as large; plenty of good salt-butter; a large dish of watercresses; a very fine cauliflower; and last of all a dumpling, solid, fortifying, and studded plentifully with currants.

The entertainment began by the man putting on my plate two very substantial cuts of the mutton; then he handed me a large piece of the hot bread in the form of a triangle, having previously cut it in two and saturated it with butter. Everything indicated that I was to be honoured with Benjamin's mess! Knowing that true politeness in that rank of life consists in piling up one's plate with everything on the table, I began to feel somewhat uneasy at the quantity of the food so lavishly assigned to me. Just then the man cut the cauliflower in half, and bringing the dish over to me, he rolled off one of the halves with the knife on to my plate. Then, to crown all, came a lump of the dumpling, which completed the share of the feast intended for me. The woman then helped her husband to the same viands, but by no means so generously, and finished by doing the same kind office for herself. This done, the man said, "Now, sir, if you please, I hope you'll begin; and I only wish we had something better for you." I began certainly, but how to finish—that was the problem. There was no way of shirking, and I did not want to hurt the feelings of my kind host and hostess by not doing justice to their ample fare. But how to do it was the difficulty, as I was not very hungry. So I thought I could manage to engage them in conversation, and meanwhile to find some way out of the "mess."

But the woman began the talk, and on she went while the three of us were getting through the repast. "Maybe, sir, you think we lives always like this, but it isn't often we gets the chance. We have been for two days and more without having

a bit of victuals, and we came in luck's way by getting a good job yesterday, and earned a bit o' money. So we tries this way to make up for the bad days, by having a blow-out like this once in a way like. If the poor people didn't now and then have a little treat like this, they'd die right out—that they would, sir." Seeing that I had hardly touched the mutton, the man said, "You're not eatin' your share, sir; and you needn't fear the mutton, for it is real good. We got it from a gentleman near Newmarket, and thinking it wouldn't keep, we put it into salt. We often does that on the tramp." Here he laid hold of the dish of watercresses, and helped me plentifully to them; the woman adding, "They be right good, sir, those creases—that they are. We picked them ourselves, and they have been well washed, and passed through three waters."

I was getting on too slowly for the hospitable sympathies of my entertainers, for the man said that he had "a nice slice of the mutton waiting for me" when I had finished what I had on my plate. So I thought that, as no man is bound to the impossible, I would make a clean breast of it, and confess my inability to eat any more; that I had dined at eight o'clock, and that in spite of all my good intentions and grateful acknowledgments of their kindness, I was unable to do justice to their substantial supper. They were evidently disappointed, but we compromised matters by my taking the tea—as black as ink—some bread and butter, and the watercresses. And so, after about an hour and a half from the time we began, I left them, and got to the Vicarage at about two o'clock in the morning.

The stories which these two people told me of "hawker-life," and their "tramp" experience, were very amusing. What surprised me most was the tone of voice in which the woman spoke—so natural and pleasant, and all the more agreeable because both she and her husband possessed a keen sense of the ludicrous, after their fashion. Whenever she came to my door to beg, she always addressed me in that lugubrious whine so peculiar to persons of her class. At the supper there was no trace of melancholy, no doleful ditties. They were both quite "at home," easy, almost jocular, and natural. Seeing that I was interested in their "camping-out" experiences, they gratified my curiosity, whether by drawing on their imagination or not I could not tell. But whether it were fact or fancy, the stories were, if not true, remarkably "well found." The interest attaching to the whole affair arose from the entire absence of preparation for my coming. It was their supper, got ready for their own special benefit; and they merely delayed it to enable me to have an opportunity of joining them.

Barnwell had been peculiarly favoured by the labours of my predecessors, as well as of those who have succeeded me—Canon Leeke and Mr. Trotter. The influence exerted by Mrs. Trotter, by her Bible classes, is very great, and tells most effectively upon the people. Bishop Titcomb for fourteen years presided over the parish, and during that period he laboriously and successfully organized the parochial machinery, under more than ordinary difficulties, and moulded it into that condition of completion in which my immediate predecessor found it. The Master of St. Catharine's College—the Rev. Canon Robinson—succeeded Dr. Titcomb. He carried forward the improvements already set on foot, and after two years of incessant labour, during which he became most popular, he resigned his charge over the parish, on his election to the Mastership of his College.

There were two curates when I was appointed—one for the Abbey services, and another for Christ Church. The Church Pastoral Aid Society liberally allowed £250 a year to provide curates and a Scripture-reader. My friend Beamont, by his ceaseless perseverance and importunity, eventually succeeded in obtaining for the parish a grant of £300 a year from the University. More valuable still than money, he procured the assistance of able men. After a sermon preached by Dr. Vaughan, the present Master of the Temple, at Great St. Mary's, four Fellows of their Colleges nobly volunteered their services as curates. Among them was my friend the Rev. E. T. Leeke, my successor in Barnwell, but now Chancellor of Lincoln. There were seven of us, each as diverse in his religious views as the colours of the rainbow, but, like that crescent of hope, possessing a unity in variety which produced amongst us a symmetrical harmony. Our complementary colours blended beautifully into each other. Work was the grand aim of all—work, based on the story of Redemption. By this means there were six, and at times seven, curates working with all their might amongst the Barnwell poor—the Rev. C. Gray, Fellow of Trinity; the Rev. A. F. Torry, Fellow of St. John's; the Rev. J. Lang, Fellow of Caius, now of Corpus Christi, and others. Hard work—work of the hardest kind—was done by them, with palpable results. The plan of church extension became rapidly developed. A new church was built in Gas Lane, another in Wellington Row; a parish vestry was erected; the old church had a new porch; a workman's hall was built by the untiring assiduity of Miss Ellice Hopkins and her distinguished father, who was said to have made more Senior Wranglers than any man of his day. Altogether, for about seven or eight years, the work was such as to put a glow of gladness into the hearts of all true Churchmen. Archdeacon

Emery threw his wonted energy into the scale, by co-operating with Mr. Beamont, and between them all Barnwell passed through the several degrees of comparison, as a quaint fellow observed to me in June last: "It used to be Barn-well, it then became Barn-better, but now it is Barn-best."

I should like to make a few remarks upon the singularly successful work of Miss Hopkins. It was in many respects very remarkable. Here was a young, delicate-looking girl, apparently of a fragile frame, who resolved to go amongst the "navvies" and coprolite-diggers and all the lowest stratum of society in and around Cambridge. They were certainly a very demoralized set of men. In Timbuctoo or in the wilds of Arabia no wilder aborigines could be found—none more godless, reckless, or thoughtless. They never entered any place of worship, and hitherto the Church had not reached them. These were the men to whom she went preaching the simple Gospel. Some of the more orthodox divines shook their wise heads, and blandly asked for a precedent to justify a woman preaching after that fashion. She did not wait for an answer, but on she went in her own way, by the tacit if not actual consent of Dr. Robinson, my predecessor. When my turn came I was asked by several what course I intended to take in the matter. My answer to all was that "I did not feel disposed to take the lynch-pin out of a rolling waggon. I did not set it going, and I was not inclined to stop it." We made a sort of compromise. She was to have the use of the school-rooms, but the clergy, myself included, were not, as a rule, to appear on the platform with her. This accommodating arrangement arose from the fact that she scoured the country all round wherever wild men were to be found, regardless of parochial rights or dignity, and she assembled them in my parish. In deference to the sensibilities of my brother clergymen, I did not appear on the platform with her, but, out of regard to the social advantages of bringing souls to Christ, I placed every facility for her work at her disposal.

It had not originated with me. I merely continued what Dr. Robinson handed down to me. I had the pleasure of hearing Miss Hopkins now and then. She spoke with great power, and she exercised an influence over those incarnate devils which seemed almost like that of an enchantress. One fellow, called "the Devil of Barnwell," whom everyone dreaded on account of his ruffianism and desperate temper, she was the means of converting—and a wonderful conversion it was to see that rough man where he never had been before in all his life, at all events since childhood—*on his knees*. The converts were sent to me for examination after Miss Hopkins had them under her teaching, and if approved, they were admitted to

the Sacrament. The rule with me was that they should go to the Lord's Table in their respective parishes. Miss Hopkins in the first instance quarried the stones, and then she sent them back to the parochial clergy to be polished. The present Bishop of Winchester, then Bishop of Ely, when asked about this work, replied with his usual good sense: "An irregular disease may require an irregular remedy."

If the ordinary parochial machinery failed to deal efficiently with this class of heathen, I could see no harm in trying a remedy of an abnormal character. At all events, it succeeded so far as it was tried. To assemble those reckless characters regularly to hear the Gospel preached was a wonderful thing. Six hundred men would listen to that devoted "woman"—I use the word in its highest and most honourable sense—with intense interest. Tears rolled down many a cheek, which no blush of shame had tinged for many a long day. Consciences that had become almost seared were enlightened—hearts that had become as hard as the nether millstone were purified and softened. Wives, whose history had been one tale of woe by reason of their husbands' love of drink, bore witness to the happy and unlooked-for change in their domestic surroundings, and many a village church around Cambridge presented the spectacle of hitherto untamed and untameable men, like the demoniac in the Gospel, sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed with humility and self-abasement, and restored to their right minds. If those once desperate characters were not brought back to the Church, and united to its great Head after the orthodox fashion, I can only say so much the worse for orthodoxy. Of one thing I am morally certain, that had it not been for "the irregular remedy" applied by Miss Hopkins to the irregular lives of those half-savage tribes, they would probably have continued to this hour in that wilderness which, if such animals did not find, they would be sure to create.

It was amusing to me at times to hear the sapient criticism passed upon these men by some of the dignity folk. The new convert was hardly, if at all, able to speak his mother tongue correctly. Therefore, to be unable to give anything like an intelligent and coherent account of his "views" under his new experience would not be a very unpardonable sin. I have heard their motives questioned and their conversion doubted because they could not do so. Yet, no man of common-sense or practical acquaintance with such ignorant men could for a moment deny that a wonderful change had come over them. In their own way they proved the reality of the work wrought upon their souls, and, after all, there is no testimony more brilliant or more convincing than the fact contained in those few and simple words, "Whereas I was blind, I now see."

Many of these navvies ceased to do evil, and at the same time were learning to do well—a better argument for the reality of their conversion than if they “could speak with the tongue of men or of angels.”

In these personal recollections of a place where I spent some of the most eventful years of my parochial life, and where I resided long enough to become acquainted with very many both in the University and the town, I have carefully avoided anything that might seem to invade the sanctity of private life, or to violate the secrecy of privileged communications. My object has been to deal rather with the results of church extension and parochial organization in a locality which required missionary enterprise as much as the wilds of Africa or of Hindostan. I have not sought to amuse or entertain the reader with the homespun concerns of the everyday life of the inhabitants, nor the local gossip of “Town” or “Gown.” There is no spot on earth which has more attractions for me than Cambridge, and I am willing to confess that I should esteem it the greatest honour of my life to be permitted, by Divine Providence, to end my ministry among the poorest of the poor in my old parish. I never experienced anywhere such warmth of heart, such sympathy, such rough honesty of purpose, and such a genial, cordial welcome whenever I have visited—only too rarely—the scenes of my old associations. Although since 1868 I spent some thirteen or fourteen years in the West End of London, where I saw wealth and its surroundings, and social refinement and its proprieties, I candidly admit that after a just and thoughtful comparison between Barnwell and Belgravia, I should, speaking as a clergyman, without any hesitation, on the whole, prefer my old parishioners, who, if poor, are not living for appearances, and if in humble circumstances, have hearts unspoiled by the garish grandeur of the world, with all its hollow and unsatisfying delusions. I have many friends in both parishes, but, taking the people in their aggregate capacity, I should prefer the plain and homely views of religious life among my Cambridge parishioners.

During the fifteen years since I left Barnwell what experiences the world has opened up to me! I have been twice almost round the globe, my horizon of life has been considerably extended from higher and higher points of observation. Every day's experience has made me more tolerant of the opinions of others. The little cobwebs of prejudice and party feeling, and bigotry and littleness, have been swept away, and I have lived to look with regret on mistakes formerly committed from want of a more enlarged acquaintance with mankind. The recollection of infirmities and failures must occur to anyone

who takes a just and sober retrospect of the past. A chastened feeling naturally arises in the mind as the thought occurs to us that we might have done so much better than we did.

Few persons are at all aware of the pressure upon the mind of a clergyman in a populous parish. He has two lives, as it were, to lead: the life of a private citizen, with all its cares and crosses, and the life of a public minister of the Gospel, with all its entanglements and distractions. These things are sufficient to try the temper of the coolest head, and to test the powers of endurance of the strongest bodily frame. No one not in charge of an overgrown parish can form any adequate idea of what such a man has to encounter from "the craft and subtlety of the devil or man"—how his motives are often misinterpreted, and his good intentions repulsed—how much he has to face that is unpleasant, and how little he has to expect from those who are set against the truth. It is a warfare from which, while it lasts, there is no respite. Every day renews the conflict, and almost every night closes on some incident which calls for deep humiliation before Him to whom all hearts are open.

In Barnwell both politics and religion had keen partizans. From the first I never scrupled to declare my own principles when occasion demanded. In politics Conservative, in religion Evangelical; but in both liberal to the widest reasonable limits, and more liberal to-day than ever. No man could get along with the Barnwell people in those days if he had not individualism of opinion and independence of character. They might differ from him, but they gave him respect. There is nothing which strong natures imperfectly or inaccurately instructed resent more than *namby-pambyism*. Your anythingarian philosopher has no chance of success with such men. They like a fair stand-up fight for principles. They think strongly themselves, and they express themselves strongly, and they are all the better pleased to hear a man speak out boldly and manfully what he thinks. Humanly speaking, I attribute any measure of success among my Barnwell friends to the fact that they knew exactly where to find me, and that no paltry compromise of principle would lead me to seek for popularity at the expense of principle. It was very gratifying to me when leaving to find all parties—Radicals and Conservatives, Dissenters and Churchmen—ready to testify their goodwill and kindly feelings by presenting me with the only testimonial which I could accept, viz., a piece of parchment bearing the names of all who cared to sign it; and a curious document it is. The handwriting of the signatures is itself a study. To me it is a very pleasing reminiscence of old times and old friends.

What contests we used to have about rates and taxes, town councillors and churchwardens—everything almost! An election of a Member of Parliament could hardly have been more hotly fought out than an election of a churchwarden. Three days' polling on one occasion was necessary to decide who was to be the successful candidate. The usual excitement prevailed. My good friend JOHN WEBB, an honest and consistent Radical, was returned after a most arduous struggle, fairly fought. He was a capital churchwarden, and deservedly popular with all parties. I am happy to find that he has lately been honoured by being selected, quite unsolicited on his part, to fulfil the honourable position of Justice of the Peace in Cambridge.

The intuitive intelligence of the Cambridge people, more than any other people I ever knew, enables them to see through the transparency of a man's motives with marvellous penetration. They are wonderfully acute in the estimation of character, and they rather like to see a man—lay or cleric—stick to his colours and defend them. The people of Barnwell were to me a constant source of interest and humour. They were very natural, and easily dealt with if only they saw that you were in earnest. Of course, some of them gave me great annoyance, and offered all sorts of opposition to everything I might propose; but then others took my part, and by a fair balance of power things always came right at the last. We never kept up any unpleasant feeling. Many a hearty laugh I had last June during a week I spent in Cambridge when going over old associations with old friends, and I enjoyed my visit then, after that the smoke and noise of parochial battle had passed away.

Such is human experience—such the changes and chances of this mortal life. For my own part, all I can say is that in looking back upon my past recollections, I have done not what I wished to do exactly, but the best I could under the circumstances, and I heartily wish that it had been better.

G. W. WELDON.



ART. II.—THE WORD "OBLATIONS."

A REJOINDER TO THE DEAN OF CHESTER.

IN THE CHURCHMAN for May the Dean of Chester makes his "Reply" to my criticism in the June number of last year. I cannot surpass the kindness of his opening sentence, and I would not willingly fall short of it. Between the Dean, therefore, and myself, the courtesy of controversy may now, I think,

"go without saying;" and I proceed to examine his reply, taking the points in his own order.

His first remark is that I did "*not notice certain parts of his argument.*" So far as my space will permit, I shall endeavour now to leave out nothing that bears upon the point in debate between us. The Dean's contention is that "*the word 'oblations' cannot refer in whole or in part to the bread and wine.*" I maintain that "when there is a communion," it may refer to the bread and wine, and that it was intended to do so. He very truly says that "*in practice there is no difference between us;*" nor can there be, I will still hope, notwithstanding what, I trust, is a passing fancy (page 136) as to the time when "*the bread and wine are to be placed on the table by the priest.*"

But not only as to practice. I confess that from the way in which he spoke in his first paper,¹ of not thinking it worth while to answer a certain argument, and from the turn of a phrase here and there, I was under the impression that he was strongly opposed to the doctrine of oblation. Now, however, I find (page 141) that "*he writes with no doctrinal intention;*" and he explains that he "*has no animosity against the notion of an oblation of the unconsecrated elements,*" and that "*if there were such an oblation in the Prayer Book, he would very readily accept it.*" For myself, I claim no such judicial indifference. I have not, indeed, ever supposed that an intention to offer the creatures of bread and wine is necessary to the validity of the sacrament, but I am strongly of opinion that the purposed omission of such an oblation is a failure to do that which "our Lord and Saviour did and commanded to be done." He took the meat and drink offerings of the Passover and ordained them to higher and holier uses, Himself the true Pascal Lamb, and our only Sacrifice for sin.

But if the Dean's declaration of his loyalty to the spirit of our twentieth Article has done away with any suspicion that doctrinal as well as "*verbal and historical considerations*" had led him to oppose the understanding of the words of the Prayer Book, for which I contend, still his difference with me is not the less decided and precise. To his thinking (page 128) my "*inclusive theory*" is "*the most illogical of all utterly confused and confusing.*" The "*direct contradiction was clear enough,*" but I must suggest that my *distinguo*, whether clear or not, was at least as logical as the *nego* to which, he says, he was accustomed; and I can hardly be held responsible for any confusion it may have occasioned.

The Dean complains of "oblations" being "*taken in two*

¹ THE CHURCHMAN, January, 1882, p. 264; Reprint, p. 15.

different senses," and being "*expected to do double duty.*" He lays a stress on logic, but in applying it in this matter he would almost seem to lose sight of the difference between particular and universal. We are agreed that the gifts of money are oblations, but it by no means follows that all oblations must be gifts of money.

He goes on to argue (page 128) that if "oblations" in the oblatory words of the prayer had been intended to apply both to the oblation of the money given at the offertory, and the oblation of the bread and wine then placed on the Lord's table, "*it would have been extremely easy to have provided for two oblations.*"

But before considering this, it may help us to keep the question at issue more clearly before us, if I return to what I said in my first paper¹ as to the act of oblation being either manual or vocal—*manual* in the placing on the table, *vocal*, as in the words "we offer and present unto Thee"—the *esse* of the offering or oblation being in the *manual* act, the *bene esse* in the *words*, which declare and recognise, rather than constitute it.

Hence I conceive that the oblation, in the two cases contemplated in our existing book, was complete when the offerings were set on the table—as complete as any of the sacrifices of the old law, which were offered without any prescribed form of words. But when the Dean speaks of two oblations, I think we must understand him as meaning two several prayers for the acceptance of the gifts already offered. He says it would have been easy to have provided them, and we may allow this; but it would not be safe to argue that an intention did not exist because it might have been expressed more plainly, or in some other way. The question for us is, not why the Revisers did or did not make this or that possible alteration, but what was the intention of the alteration they did make? and I have to meet the arguments in the "Reply," so far as they controvert the conclusion which I endeavoured to establish in my "Criticism"—namely, that the Revisers brought back to our liturgy the manual and vocal oblation of the bread and wine.

The Dean next (page 128) gives what seems to be intended as a summary of his main argument: but before examining it in detail, I may remark that in elaborating a contrast between the aims of the congregation and the bread and wine for the communion, he is so impressed with his argument for the money given at the offertory being an oblation, that he would almost seem to argue that the bread and wine could not *also* be an oblation, if there were the slightest divergence in the

¹ THE CHURCHMAN, June, 1882, p. 224; Reprint, p. 4.

incidents of its previous provision or subsequent disposal. And now to consider his several "incongruities."

FIRST.—*The bread and wine are 'provided' beforehand as a matter of preliminary arrangement for the service; the 'oblations' (here the Dean begs the question; I interpolate "of money") "are the gift of the worshippers in the course of the service."* But where the incongruity in this preliminary provision? Is a gift less a gift, an oblation less an oblation, because it has previously been thought of and arranged for? The bread and the wine are indeed provided beforehand by the minister and churchwardens, acting for the parishioners in this behalf; but would not the worshippers also have to make previous provision, before coming to the service, of the wherewithal for their personal "alms and oblations"? SECOND.—*"The bread and wine are supplied by the parishioners, many of whom will not be present in the church; the 'oblations'" (as before, "of money") "come specially and exclusively from those who are actually present."* Granted. Many parishioners may not be present, but those who are present are for the time representative of the whole parish, and at any rate are a part of the parish, and have had their share in the previous supply. And here let me ask, were the daily morning and evening sacrifices, or the shew-bread, less the oblation of the people of Israel, because the whole people were not present at the act of oblation? THIRD.—*The bread and the wine are secured as the result of a legal order; the "oblations" (of money) are in the strictest sense voluntary.*—"Legal order" is the Dean's paraphrase for the rubric ordering that "the bread and wine for the communion shall be provided by the curate and the churchwardens at the charges of the parish." But what the legal order requires us to offer does not therefore cease to be our offering: witness, "The woman *must* offer accustomed offerings;" and witness, what is more than the law of our Church, "the law of the burnt offering, of the meat offering, and of the sin offering, and of the trespass offering, and of the consecrations; which the Lord commanded Moses in Mount Sinai, in the day that he commanded the children of Israel to offer their oblations unto the Lord" (Lev. vii. 37, 38). And as to "*voluntary.*" The church-rate, or other fund for the necessary expenses of the church, is as voluntary on the part of the parish as the occasional oblation of an individual parishioner. Or perhaps the Dean supposes that there is an incongruity in respect to the bread and wine, because they are not provided from some separate and exclusive fund. But were the stated sacrifices under the Mosaic Law less offerings before the Lord because they were provided from the half-shekel that was levied from the children of Israel "for the service of the taber-

nacle of the congregation"? Or, to take an illustration from the statutes of the realm, was Stratfieldsaye less a national gift to the Duke of Wellington, because the purchase was made out of the Consolidated Fund by virtue of an Act of Parliament? **FOURTH.**—The contrast is between *the sufficient quantity of the bread and wine, and the undefined amount of the money.* And here again I will ask from the Old Testament, Were the meat and drink offerings less offerings in those cases where the quantities were divinely prescribed? Or would the bread and wine be more an oblation, if more or less than enough? **FIFTH.**—*The bread and wine are 'placed' on the table at a separate time in reference to the coming communion; the oblations are reverently brought and humbly presented along with the alms, and this, too, whether there is a communion or not.*" As to the separate time, there is no more of separation than (with one pair of hands) is almost a physical necessity. The two placings upon the table come one after another in close and immediate succession. They are joined together in the interspace between the end of the offertory sentences and the beginning of the prayer; and are welded in one by the united prayer of priest and people for their acceptance. In saying that *"the oblations are brought along with the alms,"* the Dean seems to persist in begging the whole question, by implying that no other oblations can be meant than those in the basin; whereas the rubric, as if for the very purpose of preventing such an implication, had described the contents of the basin as "alms for the poor and other devotions of the people," and not as "alms and oblations," although the phrase had the stamp of authority, dating from King Edward's injunctions, and, except for this further consideration, would in this place have been of precisely the same significance. **SIXTH.**—*The bread and wine are laid on the table by the priest's hands quite irrespective of any action of the worshippers; the oblations are presented by them through him as an act of worship.*" This last I fully allow, but I hold it to be equally true of *all* the oblations, whereas the Dean would limit it to the oblations of money only. I cannot agree with him as to the bread and wine being laid on the table irrespective of any action of the worshippers. He says this in so many words, and implies that it is not an act of worship on their part; but the rubric does not contemplate a fortuitous collection of non-parishioners attracted by popular preaching or fancy ritual, but provides for the case of the inhabitants of a parish assembling in their parish church, where the provision of the bread and wine is their corporate act through the minister and churchwardens, and made at their personal cost. The very form of the prayer expresses the joint act of priest and people, "We beseech,"

"We offer." Happily the Church of England did not retain the "*ego*" and the "*offero*," and so forth, of the prayers interpolated in the ordinary of the Latin mass in the centuries immediately preceding the Reformation. SEVENTH.—*The oblations* (of money) are in the basin; *the bread and wine are not*.—Surely the Dean cannot mean that the being received in a decent basin is the logical difference of oblation; and as to the actual fact, the twentieth Canon requires "the wine to be brought to the communion table in a clean and sweet standing pot, or stoop of pewter, if not of purer metal,"—not that a canon is needed to prevent the bringing together in an alms-dish of the bread and wine. EIGHTH.—"*That which remains of the unconsecrated bread and wine is to be had by the curate to his own use, that which is collected at the offertory is to be applied to pious and charitable uses.*" Was the remnant of a loaf of bread or a measure of wine to be applied to charitable uses after consultation with the churchwardens, and possibly become the subject of solemn adjudication by the ordinary?¹

His summary ended, the Dean is overwhelming with logic and laughter. Going beyond Horace, he adds the *ridiculum* to the *acre*, and winds up with a manifold *reductio ad absurdum*. "Surely," he exults, "*it is very surprising that the common word 'oblations' should be inclusive of such incongruities.*" "*Such an argument cannot stand before even the slightest logical attack.*" And then triumphantly, "*I find fault with Canon Simmons for having placed those good Bishops and those painstaking Revisers in an absurd position.*"

This I must leave to our readers. To myself, I confess, I seem to have shown that no one of the "incongruities" is of any avail as an argument.

Next, page 129, as to the relation of the "offering days" of 1549-1604, and the "oblations" of 1662. I quite allow that the money offerings then customarily due, and recoverable at common law, might have been, and were rightly called oblations. But I cannot agree that "oblations" in the prayer was intended to apply to them, for now that the word was added, the rubric was struck out from before the prayer, although retained among those at the end of the service, as if to anticipate this explanation, and more entirely to keep distinct the offerings made directly to God.²

¹ So far from proving that the bread and wine were not intended as an oblation, it would seem as if by this very arrangement the Revisers desired to mark their oblatory character, and suggest the analogy of the unbloody sacrifice of the old dispensation: "The covenant of the meat-offering shall be Aaron's and his sons'" (Lev. ii. 3); "All the meat-offering . . . shall be the priests' that offereth it" (Lev. vii. 9).

² There were four offering days in the year, but by the 2 & 8 Edward VI. c. 13, s. 10, it was provided that, in default of the offerings being then paid, "the said offerings were to be paid at the Easter then next following."

The Dean, page 130, returns to the Scotch Book, and remarks that it, for the first time, made gifts (*of money*) an act of worship. But here he is accurate only as to the manual act of setting them on the holy table. It was then for the first time directed. Not so the vocal act of worship, for the prayer for the acceptance of the alms was verbatim the same as in the English Books of 1552 and 1559.

He then goes on to rally me very pleasantly, as if I had thought his argument from the Scotch Book too hot to venture upon. At all events I dealt with his argument against the "*placing of the bread and wine on the table being intended to be a solemn offering;*" and he has had the candour (page 131) to admit that he is "*in accord with me as to the adequacy of the word 'place' for the purpose in question.*" But "*the point he urged was this: That while our Revisers used very full and emphatic language to describe the reverence they wished to associate with the money offerings, they deviated and started aside from such language when they spoke of placing the elements for communion. Why, then, if this kind of language was adopted in the one case, was it avoided in the other?*" The act carried its own weight with it, and required no enhancement of word or phrase. But the Dean adds, "*It is contrast which constitutes here the point of the argument.*" I will ask him once more to look at the Scotch and English rubrics set side by side.¹ In the Scotch, which

¹ The question will be better understood by a comparison of the rubrics for the manual acts of oblation and the saying of the prayer.

SCOTCH BOOK, 1637.

While the Presbyter distinctly pronounces some or all of these Sentences for the Offertory, the Deacon or (if no such be present) one of the Churchwardens shall receive the devotions of the people there present, in a bason provided for that purpose. And *when all have offered*, he shall reverently bring the said bason with the oblations therein, and deliver it to the Presbyter, who shall humbly present it before the Lord, and set it upon the Holy Table.

And the Presbyter shall then *offer up*, and place the Bread and Wine *prepared* for the Sacrament upon the Lord's Table, that it may be ready for that service.

And then he shall say.

PRAYER BOOK, 1662.

¶ Whilst these Sentences are in reading, the Deacons, Churchwardens, or other fit person appointed for that purpose, shall receive the [*Alms for the Poor, and other*] devotions of the people, in a decent bason to be provided by the Parish for that purpose; and reverently bring it to the Priest, who shall humbly present and place it upon the Holy Table.

¶ And when there is a Communion, the Priest shall then place upon the Table *so much* Bread and Wine *as he shall think sufficient*.

¶ After which done, the Priest shall say.

does direct the oblation, he will find the same contrast as in the English—a fact which this pointed argument had failed to penetrate.

The Dean has a further argument from the Scotch rubric, "*That the 'oblations' are synonymous with the 'devotions' of the people; that they are collected from the congregation then present, and from them only; and they are received and presented in the basin, and that they are absolutely exclusive of the bread and wine.*" True; and our English Revisers made the precise alteration which does away with that absolute exclusion. If they had retained the rubric unaltered, and at the same time had inserted "oblations" in the prayer, where the Scotch Book makes mention only of "alms," that would have gone far to limit its meaning in the restricted sense of his contention. But the fact is, that they did not adopt the wording of the Scotch rubric. They inserted a clause as to "the alms for the poor, and other devotions of the people," and they struck out the words, "the said basin with the oblations therein." Surely this goes to prove that they did not intend to limit "oblations" in the prayer to the oblations in the basin.

But the Dean has another argument from the comparison of the rubrics. He is strong for the oblation of the money received in the basin, but contends, "*because the placing of the bread and wine is not allowed to be called an offering,*" that therefore it is not an oblation. If he will look at the rubrics again, he will see that our Revisers struck out the mention of "offering" from both rubrics; and therefore, that if his argument is worth anything as to the bread and wine, it is equally destructive of his oblation in the basin. I will not reiterate my arguments on this head. In my former paper, I suggested reasons why the Revisers struck out the "offer up" of the Scotch rubric, retaining the "place;" and I proved, and the Dean allows, that "place" was a *verbum sollemne*, and sufficient to direct the act of oblation.

There is still another alteration from the Scotch rubric, which I cannot but regard as an indication that the idea of oblation was present to the minds of the Bishops at Ely House. The Scotch rubric has "offer up" and "prepared," both words that to disaffected or prejudiced opponents suggested the Roman missal. If they had themselves scrupled at the notion of offering, they might have met this objection by a rubric for "the table being furnished"¹ from some Genevan ritual, or even from the Scottish Bishops' first draft of a national

¹ Rubric, "Middleburgh Prayer Book;" Hall's "Reliquiæ Liturgicæ," i. 59.

Prayer Book;¹ or they might have left the "bringing to the communion table" of the sacramental elements to be provided by the Canon as hitherto, and added no new rubric. So far from this, as they did intend to bring back the oblation, they took the old Latin form quoted in his "Christian Sacrifice" by Mede, a man who was known by them all, and had been in intimate personal relations with some of them, "*oblatus ponit tantas super altare, quantæ possunt populo sufficere in communionem*"—"place upon the table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient."²

This does not look much like intending oblations only of the money in the basin, but I must pass on to the Dean's next argument.³

On page 130 he returns to Cosin's "Consecration Service," in which, as there was none provided by authority, the Bishop felt at liberty to use his own discretion. In the rubrics he used "alms and oblations," of the offerings of money; and as the Dean truly says, "*it cannot be supposed that the word 'oblations' at this point includes the bread and wine.*" I have already remarked that "alms and oblations" is equivalent to "alms and other devotions" in the authorized rubric, and it was here used precisely as we use the phrase when there is not a communion. But the Dean is wrong when he says that "we find the word 'oblations' at no other point." The word is found in the prayer for the Church Militant, which was used as we use it. The Dean himself speaks of the Bishop offering bread and wine as virtually an oblation; and in the fact that Cosin, now that he was acting on his sole responsibility, used the word "offer," which he did not carry at Ely House, I cannot see that there is anything to disprove my remark that in that service "the bread and wine were included in the prayer for the Church Militant."⁴

¹ Sprott, "Scottish Liturgies," pp. 54, 102. The words in our present baptismal service, "in the name of this child," "until he come of age to perform it," were introduced from this source, although not inserted in the Scotch Book of 1637, as finally adopted, nor mentioned in Cosin's suggestions.

² Mede, "Christian Sacrifice," ed. 1648, p. 518; "Works," 1672, p. 374; "Mus. Ital.," ii. p. 46; cf. "Missale Chaldaicum" (Renaudot, ii. 59): "Totque oblatas in disco ponit, quot necessariæ sunt." Exodus xii. 2, "Every man according to his eating shall make your count for the lamb."

³ The Dean "claims for our Revisers a religious purpose and signal success in bringing about this concurrence;" but in this he seems to wrong the authors of Edward VI.'s injunctions as to the setting up of the poor man's chest for receiving the "oblation and alms" of the people at the offertory. This becomes "oblations and alms" in the Injunctions of 1559, and "alms and devotion" in the Canons of 1604, which probably suggested to the Revisers their precautionary modification of the Scotch rubric already referred to.

⁴ THE CHURCHMAN, June, 1882, p. 213; Reprint, p. 7.

As to what he says of the Abbey Dore Consecration Service of 1635, I must remind him that I did not refer to it as having any authority in explaining our present rubrics, but to prove that Bishop Wren having sanctioned the "offering" of the bread and wine in word and act, could not have been opposed to the doctrine of oblation, nor by consequence to the use of the word in this sense in our present Prayer Book; and it was mainly as evidence of the mind of the Bishops on this point, and therefore of their presumed intention in framing our present rubric, that I referred, or followed the Dean in referring, to Cosin's, and the Abbey Dore Consecration Service, and the Coronation Service of Charles II.

As to this last,¹ the Dean, page 134, thinks "*it makes against me*"—certainly not as to the fact that the Bishops were present, and that Wren "delivered unto the King the bread and wine which he then offered." I had remarked that the prayer for the acceptance of the "oblations" (*Sect. xvii.*) in the plural, referred not only to the sovereign's "second oblation, a purse of gold," but also to the bread and wine which had been "offered" immediately before. The Dean considers that "oblations" in the prayer refers only to this second oblation, and to "the first oblation" (*Sect. iii.*) "a pall and wedge of gold;" but as both the first oblation and a prayer for the "receiving these oblations" were made before "the beginning of the Communion Service" (*Heading of Sect. v.*), it would seem that the prayer in the Communion Service was not intended to include the first oblation. I may add that this use of the names "first" and "second" oblation in the rubric can

¹ The Dean "always suspects" a reference to this service, "for," he says, "this service was never sanctioned by Convocation: the basis on which it stands is thoroughly Erastian." There was no alteration at the revision, for which I am more thankful than the insertion of "Church and" in the form of Ordering of Priests—two words only, as in the prayer for the Church Militant—which freed the Church from a profession of Erastianism by every one of her priests, who had been ordained before that time, in having promised "so to minister the doctrine and discipline and sacraments of Christ, as this Realm had received the same." But the service, though Erastian in so far as it is prepared by the Primate for the time being, in furtherance of an Order in Council, has received the sanction of successive prelates of the highest rank, and, if on that account only, ought not to be made of such small account as in the Dean's estimate. I may add that it was to the Coronation Service of Charles II. that I especially referred; which was less open to the Dean's depreciatory epithet than the Prayer Book of that day. The book of 1559 was never submitted to the Convocations, and did not receive their sanction, even by a reference, until after 1604. It was imposed on the Church by an Act of Parliament, passed without the consent of a solitary Bishop, and bearing on its front the proof of this fact in the omission of the otherwise accustomed mention of "the Lords Spiritual."

hardly have been "*made expressly to exclude the bread and wine,*" inasmuch as these names were equally used before the service was translated into English, and at the Coronation of James II. As he was a Roman Catholic, there was not a communion; the second oblation was presented as usual, but as there was no oblation of the bread and wine, there was no prayer for the acceptance of oblations, though we have the usual prayer, before that service, after presenting the first oblation.

From the Coronation Service the Dean passes on, page 135, to the consideration of Church opinion at the Restoration, and admits as "*a fact of which there can be no doubt*" that "*there were many who desired to have an express oblation in the Communion Service.*" In my former paper, I quoted from Mede and others who wrote in this sense before the revision. I will add a few words from Archbishop Laud's defence of himself against the charge of popery in the Scotch Book: "There is as little said in the Liturgy of Scotland, which may import an oblation of an unbloody sacrifice" (*of the Body and Blood of Christ*), "as there is in the Book of England" (*of 1559-1604*). "As for the oblation of the elements, that's fit and proper; and I am sorry for my part, that it is not in the book of England."¹ Nor was it only that men advocated the bringing back of the oblation, but that, in default of any order in the Prayer Book, the ceremony was actually practised, as we learn from its being denounced as an "innovation in discipline" by the committee of divines appointed by the Lords in 1641: "11. By offering of bread and wine by the hand of the churchwardens, or others, before the consecration of the elements":—the innovation here denounced proving very markedly the existence in men's minds of the notion of a manual oblation.²

Now all this must have been very well known to the Revisers, at least to the Bishops on the Ely House Committee, who worded these particular alterations; and as they all, more or less, belonged to the "school of thought" of which the Dean speaks, it is very hard to conceive that just between the offering of the alms and the prayer for their acceptance,

¹ "History of Troubles and Tryal," p. 124.

² The Dean (p. 13, *note*) touches "the question of the necessity of any shelf or table for the elements before they are placed on the Holy Table." What was here denounced as an innovation was adopted after the revision by Bishop Bull, and doubtless by others at that time. It is now the rule in an increasing number of parish churches—and, I venture to think, far more in accordance with primitive usage than any shelf or table, which, though decided to be legal, is to English prejudice, especially under the name of credence, more suggestive of Italian poisonings than of the united homage of priest and people.

they should have thrust in the manual act of placing the elements on the table with the deliberate intention (which the Dean imputes to them) of shutting out any oblation of the bread and wine.

The Dean brings forward two "*counter-testimonies to the existence of opinion of a contrary kind.*" First, he claims Dean Comber as "*not contemplating 'oblations' in any other sense than that which he advocates.*" Most certainly when he is exhorting to liberality in the matter of oblations of money he does not do so; but he hardly agrees with him, notwithstanding. In the very next line to our Dean's first extract he refers to Mede's "Christian Altar" in laudatory terms;¹ in the next page (p. 59) he cites an explanation of oblations as bread and wine, which I had used in my former paper as showing the earlier use of the word; further on (p. 76) he quotes the *τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν* from the liturgy of St. Chrysostom; and (p. 77), though he does not call the bread and wine oblations, he refers to them as a sacrifice: "For this cause" (setting forth of that sacrifice) "our communion office in the rubric before this prayer appoints the bread and wine to be set on the table first, and then stirs us all up with that solemn, *Let us pray for the whole estate of Christ's Church, etc.*" The second counter-testimony is equally far from proving Dr. Bennet's agreement with the Dean. In reference to the offertory sentences he speaks of the "oblations" then collected, but as to the sense in which he takes "oblations" in the prayer, he says nothing one way or the other.

The Dean's next point (pp. 136-141) is the meaning of "then" in the rubric. In his former paper he explained it as "*indicating the part of the service when the bread and wine were to be placed on the table.*" Now he is inclined to accept an opinion that "*the placing of the bread and wine on the table is no part of the sacramental service at all;*" and he supports it by an argument extending to two or three pages, which he has adopted from a recent work on Durel's Latin Prayer Book. For myself, I think his learned friend at Cambridge did him a very ill service; and, most certainly, the Messrs. Marshall are no help to him. To me it seems anything but "*natural to infer that in the rubric before us the word 'then' simply refers to the preceding phrase 'when there is a Communion,' or, as it is given in Durel's Latin version, 'Quoties Sacra Communio celebrabitur.'*"

The Dean speaks of this argument as "new," which does

¹ The Dean of Chester quotes from the third edition of Comber's "Companion to the Altar" (*not Temple*), 1681. I happen to have the fourth, 1685, and refer to that.

not add to the cogency of the plea of the Messrs. Marshall for its being the *expositio contemporanea*; but in fact it had been urged in the early part of the last century, and this was the reception which it then received:

If Dr. Hancock had consulted these liturgies [of 1549 and 1552] he would never have been so far transported as to say that by *then* in the rubric which orders the Priest to place the Bread and Wine on the Lord's Table we are to understand *when there is a Communion*.¹

The Dean, in his zeal for the brief he was holding for opponents of the oblation rather than for himself, may have concentrated his reflections on the wording of this one rubric in connection with its being explained, or translated, as "*furnishing a new argument of very great force for removing the bread and wine at the communion altogether out of the range of what is included in the term 'oblations.'*" But if, controversy apart, he will consider its literal meaning in connection with the preceding rubrics, he cannot but return to his "original view." He must see that this "*then*" is one of a whole series of *thens*: "*THEN the Curate shall declare unto the people what Holy-days,*" etc.; "*THEN shall follow the Sermon,*" etc.; "*THEN shall the Priest return to the Lord's Table, and begin the Offertory,*" etc. In the next rubric the *then* of the Book 1552-1604 ("*THEN shall the churchwardens . . . gather,*" etc.) is omitted, but our present rubric is equally a direction as to time: "*Whilst these sentences are in reading, the churchwardens . . . shall receive,*" etc.; and next we come to the rubric before us, which is cast in very much the same form: "*And when there is a Communion, the Priest shall THEN place,*" etc. And is not this last *then* of the series as much a note of time as the others, answering, as it were, the inquiry, And what is to be done next? and then? If there were always a communion it might have been, *Then the Priest shall place*; but as the case of there not being a communion had to be provided for, the necessary limitation was prefixed, precisely as it might have been inserted in a parenthesis.

It must be evident that these consecutive rubrics command consecutive acts; and it is incredible that the Revisers, arranging the rubrics with the care and foresight they did, could have added the rubric where it is, if they had intended to leave it an open question, as they found it, when the bread and wine were to be placed on the table. If further proof were needed that these rubrics are to be read continuously as directions in the order of time, the argument is clinched by the rubric immediately following, "*After which done, the Priest*

¹ Johnson, Prefatory Epistle, "Unbloody Sacrifice," second ed., 1724, p. 53.

shall say." And what can "after which done" mean but that after the priest has done what the preceding rubric had ordered—that is, after placing the bread and wine on the table—done *then* at the prescribed time, in the orderly course of the Communion Service, according to the unbroken sequence of the rubrics, and not done at some indefinite time, and "no part of the sacramental service at all."¹

I might have said something about translators and translations, relied on by the Dean. I fear my verdict must in this instance have justified the proverb "*traduttori traditori*," but my argument does not seem to require it; and in any case my space forbids.

With this exception we have gone through the Reply, and I cannot close my Rejoinder without thanking the Dean for his last sentences. I can only say what I felt of his first, that they have a kindness in them which I know to be genuine, and I for myself very sincerely value. If his conclusiveness had been equal to his courtesy and his candour, I could not have persevered in my contention; as it is, I have found nothing in his argument to modify my opinion. The pious wish of Mede was realized, though he did not live to know it. The "set ceremony" is in the rubric; the "form of words" is in the prayer; but I do not assert that the vocal and manual oblations

¹ With reference to the rubric in the Baptismal Service, the "*analogy*" does not seem to help the Dean's present theory. The words are—not the font shall be full of pure water, which the Dean's argument would require if "the filling of the font is no part of the sacramental service," but "shall then be filled;" and so it has been filled in several churches, within my own knowledge, immediately after the second lesson, according to old standing custom. The reason of the alteration of 1662 is not far to seek. Before the Reformation there was the service of blessing the fonts on Easter Eve and at Whitsuntide, and, as a rule, they were filled only at those times. This gave rise to a number of minute regulations, the first in the Ebor Manual being the following distich:

"Infans in fontem si stercoret, ejice lympham :
Si tantum mingat, non moveatur aqua."

All this was altered in 1549, when it was ordered that "the water in the font shall be changed every month, once at the least; and afore any child is baptized in the water so changed, the priest shall say" a prayer for its sanctification. This was left out in the Book of 1552, as well as the order as to changing the water. The Scotch Book directed it to be changed "twice in the month at least," and provided a prayer when it was changed; whilst by our present rubric the font is newly filled, and the prayer for the sanctification of the water is used at every baptism. I do not claim an argument from analogy for myself; but so far as the Baptismal Service bears upon the point in issue, it seems natural to conclude that the men who inserted a prayer for the sanctification of the element of water, would not have ignored the oblation of the elements in the other sacrament.

are so plainly set forth, as that denial must be adjudged depravation of the Prayer Book.

And now a final word. What I wrote a year ago, I continue to maintain. I believe, and I am thankful to believe, that eucharistic truths—long without place in our liturgy—were brought back by our Revisers. Unheard by some, still like Pindar's¹ shafts, which then I made bold to shoot with, they have a voice for understanding ears, though to the general they need interpreters.

T. F. SIMMONS.



ART. III.—LACORDAIRE AND LA MENNAIS.

A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.²

IT is a curious and interesting study to trace the character of the various reactionary movements which, like the groundswell after a great storm, follow a period of marked and violent political or religious convulsions.

Notably was this the case in France, after the restoration of the Bourbons. At first, Absolutism and Jesuitism were in the ascendant; then came a reaction of strong revolutionary feeling, accompanied generally by a bitter hatred, not only of the Church of Rome, but of all revealed religions. Unbelief was again rife, as it had been at the outbreak of 1789. But in the midst of this second reaction, a few gifted and eminent men stand forth as representatives of two principles, generally regarded as incompatible—namely, ardent liberalism and desire for progress and free institutions in politics, combined with a firm faith, not only in Christianity, but in Ultramontane-Romanism. A more incongruous union at first sight could hardly be imagined; for in all ages and countries it is the *Protestant* element which has gone hand-in-hand with political liberty and progress, and Romanism has generally been found united with absolutism and adherence to old abuses. At the time we speak of, however, several Frenchmen of high character, and rare intellectual powers and attainments, came forward as champions at once of Rome and political liberty; and a glance at the history of one or two of these may not be unprofitable.

¹ "Olymp.," ii, 149-153.

² The chief authorities consulted have been the "Lettres de Maurice du Guérin," by G. S. Trebutien, with a notice by M. de St. Beuve; the "Life of Lacordaire," by Dora Greenwell; the "Lettres Inédites" of La Mennais, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* of the current year, and one or two other reviews in French papers.

The first we shall notice was the celebrated Jean Henri Baptiste Lacordaire, whose fame as a preacher was at one time almost European. He was the son of a country doctor in Burgundy, and was born in 1802. Left early fatherless, he was brought up by an excellent mother, and as a child was under deep religious impressions, which, however, were for a time nearly effaced by the freethinking influences of the College of Dijon, at which he was educated; but at the age of twenty-two, such a change came over him as Protestant Christians would denominate conversion, and from his description it is impossible not to recognise a real work of divine grace in the soul. It took, however, naturally, the type of the only form of Christianity with which he was acquainted experimentally; and he was thus led to enter on the only life which *he* could conceive as affording opportunities of entire consecration to God—namely, the priesthood of his own Church. Believing this to be the leading of God for him, he did not hesitate; he gave up brilliant prospects at the Bar, entered a theological seminary, and was duly ordained a priest. His power as a speaker was soon perceived and appreciated; and his success was such as would have intoxicated a weaker head.

From this danger, however, he was preserved, not only by a remarkable singleness of aim and spirit of self-abnegation, but also by the ardent and intense desire for political and social liberty, which never left him through life. Not long before his death he said, "I die a penitent Catholic, an *impenitent* Liberal."

Feeling himself fettered on every side in his longing for freedom of speech, he had resolved to emigrate to America and carry on spiritual work there; he had actually obtained the consent of his superiors, and was making preparations for the voyage, when he was arrested by a summons from one of his friends to join him in a work which at once enlisted his warmest sympathies.

This was the publication of a journal, entitled the *Avenir*, which was to be the exponent of the views so dear to his heart, and those of his chief friends—Liberal and national in politics, the organ of social freedom and progress, and at the same time devoted to the interests of the Roman Catholic Church.

Several distinguished young men flocked to the standard. The Count de Montalembert, whose early connection with England had given him opportunities of watching the working of free institutions in this country, was one of the chief leaders in the movement. The summons to aid in the *Avenir* found him in Ireland, whence he hastened to France to take his share in the enterprise. Long afterwards he recalled with

melancholy pleasure and affectionate remembrance those happy days of united labour and high enthusiastic hope. "It is difficult," he wrote, "for the present generation even to form an idea of the strong and generous passions which then inflamed all hearts."

It was while engaged in this work that Montalembert and Lacordaire formed a friendship which lasted with unabated warmth, tenderness, and constancy through their joint lives.

To the minds of these ardent champions, the Church of Rome appeared as a suffering and oppressed body, undergoing a kind of martyrdom in the cause of humanity and religion from the tyranny of an infidel Government. To Protestant minds this idea appears almost ludicrously incongruous; but it is fair to keep in mind that the tide was at that time, as has been observed, in the direction of utter unbelief, and the prejudice against all religion as such had led to much oppression and interference on the part of the Government. Still, we must remember that even here the Church was reaping what she had sown, and paying the price of centuries of tyranny and injustice. She had cast out from the country the vast body of intelligent and industrious Protestants, who, even from her point of view, would have served as a breakwater against infidel and Jacobin reaction. She had then thrust out the Jansenists, saintly Christian men, who (strange as it seems to us) desired to remain within her pale; she had persecuted individuals in her own communion for no crime but wishing to promote the spiritual good of their fellows. After thus deliberately stripping herself of all that was noblest and purest, it was no wonder if the public had learned to connect the idea of religion with all they most despised and disliked, and to see in the Church the representative of past tyranny. In this, the unbelieving French public was clearer-sighted than the gifted editors of the *Avenir*, who persisted in regarding that Church as the fountain of all mercy and purity. Yet hopeless as their task seems to our eyes, and exaggerated and intemperate as was often the manner in which they endeavoured to carry out their objects, it can hardly be doubted that real good was effected. It was something that the voice raised to defend freedom, and humanity, and justice, should also uphold the fear of God, and vindicate Christianity from the accusation of being the parent of servility.

The most powerful and widely renowned of the leaders of this movement was one whose name will long be remembered with melancholy interest—the Abbé de La Mennais, author of "Paroles d'un Croisant."

Félicité Robert de La Mennais was a Breton by birth, and (to quote the words of one who appreciated him fully) "along

with the faith, the sincerity, the impetuous integrity of his people, shared in that which makes the Breton character strong, yet narrow and unprogressive, even though full of poetic devotion to the past, and inclined to throw a veil over its errors, while those of the present day are brought out into full, unpitiful relief."

From his earliest years young La Mennais was remarkable for his intelligence and habits of observing nature in its minutest details. At the age of seven, these habits were already apparent; at twelve, he had read the Bible, Rousseau, Plutarch, and Bossuet: his was a mind to be deeply imbued with the books he had studied, and even at that age a struggle had already commenced in his mind between the influence of the rationalist and the heathen writer on the one hand, and those of Christianity on the other.

In the early stages of youth, the unbelieving influence was in the ascendant. He is described by a reviewer as being at that time "an *esprit fort*, with occasional phases of mystical tendencies;" but the affectionate persuasions of a pious elder brother, already in orders, overcame this state of mind. He embraced the Roman Catholic faith in all its entirety, entered the College of St. Sulpice, and finally was consecrated as a priest.

Unlike Lacordaire, La Mennais had been led to this step by the urgent entreaties of his friends, but he took it reluctantly. His director, the Abbé Peyssière, wrote to him at the time: "You are going to ordination like a victim to the sacrifice." He himself acknowledged to his brother that it had cost him a tremendous effort. He had no vocation, and did not even fancy he had one, for the priesthood; but his confessor, who was in full possession of his sentiments, advised him to *conceal* them! and the poor young man thought it his duty to obey. What his mental struggles were, after his ordination, none but himself and the Searcher of Hearts can have known; that he must have at first suffered cruelly, can hardly be doubted; but the result of the conflict was a curiously vehement reaction of almost fanatical Romanist convictions. At thirty-three, he was a priest whose great powers were employed as a determined adversary of what is termed Gallicanism—*i.e.*, the freedom of the French branch of the Roman Catholic Church from dependence on the See of Rome. The former freethinker was now not only a Romanist, but a vehement partizan and defender of the Papacy.

But his fate was like that of many men endowed with exceptional force of character and impetuosity. His zeal was too much for the Church he was defending. He desired to separate her entirely from the State in order to promote her freedom of

action. He had in his mind a brilliant ideal of the Church of Rome as the "nursing mother of humanity," sacrificing herself for her erring and suffering children.

The reality was very different from his imagination, but for a time he was not only able to win public attention by his eloquent pleadings, but was regarded as one of the most revered as well as admired of French priests.

His celebrated "Essay on Indifference" had raised him to the position of restorer and defender of the Romish faith; the then Pope, Leo XII., actually kept his picture as the sole ornament of his private sitting-room, received him warmly at the Vatican, and offered him a cardinal's hat.

But the Breton priest did not aspire to any such promotion. His sturdy independence of character could not bend to accept any dignity which might compromise his liberty of action. The only present he brought back from his visit to Rome was a privilege which he had solicited, and obtained without difficulty, but which greatly scandalized his clerical friends—a dispensation from the obligation of reading the breviary through daily.

"He thought," his nephew tells us, "that he could employ his time more usefully in writing books than in reciting Psalms." Most Protestant readers will agree with him.

He now took up his abode at his family residence of La Chenaie, a retired country house in his native Bretagne. In this quiet retreat he gathered round him a small circle of four or five young men of talent and promise, who pursued their studies under his direction, and regarded him with affectionate veneration both as their tutor and spiritual director.

His eccentricities and unconventionality of manner and habits did not prevent his being still regarded as an ornament of the Romish Church in France, and his character was one to exercise a powerful influence over those near him. The charm of his conversation is described as being great; and while at times liable to bursts of impetuosity and violence which one of his friends describes by quoting Buffon's expression in speaking of animals of prey, as "a soul full of rage" (*une âme de colère*) he was at other times gentle and tender enough to win the heart of a little child, and seems to have inspired his pupils with the most intense love, admiration, and reverence.

The most notable among these pupils, all more or less distinguished, was the gifted Maurice du Guérin, whose literary career, full of the highest promise, was cut short by early death, and whose journals and letters, as well as those of his no less highly gifted sister, Eugénie, are well known to all acquainted with modern French literature.

Maurice du Guérin was the son of an impoverished but

ancient and noble family in Languedoc; he early manifested talents of no common order, and having completed his course of study at the Collège Stanislas in Paris, he came to La Chenaie to enjoy the benefit of the instructions and companionship of La Mennais.

The account he gives in his letters to his sister and friends, of the quiet, studious life under the tuition of "*M. Féli*" (the playful diminutive of La Mennais' first name by which his pupils loved to call him) is exceedingly pleasing and characteristic, and his pictures of La Chenaie itself most graphic.

We seem to see the country villa, with its pointed roof and white front shining through the thick forests which surround it in all directions; the large garden, with its gravel-walks and terrace planted with pollard lime-trees; the little chapel where the pupils met at five o'clock in the morning for early service; the daily strolls taken by the whole party, with their preceptor walking at their head, his small slight figure clad in most unclerical coarse grey cloth, and a well-worn straw hat on his head in place of the priest's "*tricorné*."

The pupils were made to work in right earnest, and the solitude, in which scarce a sound was heard but the wind whistling through the trees, was conducive to regular and uninterrupted study. "*M. Féli*" set young Du Guérin on a course of modern languages, beginning with Italian (now, unfortunately, so little generally studied), and adding the history of philosophy—"Catholic philosophy"—and Greek. The hours were early: dinner at noon, supper at eight; and the meals were seasoned with plenty of lively sallies, in which the preceptor took the lead. After supper all gathered into the common sitting-room, and Du Guérin gives a lively picture of "our man," as he enthusiastically calls his tutor, throwing himself on a large, old-fashioned crimson velvet sofa, in whose recesses he is so well concealed that only the head, with its eyes "gleaming like carbuncles," is visible; while from this resting-place he pours forth a full tide of varied conversation: philosophy, politics, travels, anecdotes, playful witticisms, and sometimes poetical parables and illustrations—for he "has eminently the poetic gift," observes his pupil.

An early observer of nature (as before mentioned), he had collected an endless store of information from which he drew the similes which imparted grace and life to his discourse. His moral teaching is described as full of references to Scripture. "He loves us," continues Du Guérin, "as a father, always calling us his sons. . . 'Our little family increases,' he said joyfully, when the last of our party arrived. . . One learns more from his conversation than from books. . . His words elevate and warm the soul. . ." and again: "*M. Féli*

has forced me to forget his fame by his paternal kindness and gentleness." He goes on to dilate on his confidence that his illustrious tutor would mould him into something great, as a sculptor moulds his clay. Alas! these happy days were too soon to pass away for ever.

In the midst of this peaceful life of tuition and study "M. Féli" was carrying on at the same time a life-work totally different, in his capacity of editor of *L'Avenir*, and regenerator of France through the medium of the Roman Catholic Church, as he conceived her.

It is hardly possible to imagine a contrast more sharply defined than that between the loving and beloved tutor in the midst of his little circle in the Breton country house, and the vehement, determined disputant carrying on a double war with the "retrograde" political party in the Church on one side, and the irreligious friends of liberty on the other.

The *Avenir* was a work which could not hold its course without encountering storms. In 1831 the struggle was brought to a climax by Louis Philippe availing himself of the prerogative granted by the Roman Concordat, to nominate three Bishops by his own independent act and deed. This nomination was considered by the editors of the *Avenir* as an attempt on the part of the State to usurp the functions of the Church, and their expressions of disapproval were so strong and so unguarded as to bring them into collision with the Government. They were summoned before the Court of Assizes for contempt of law. La Mennais employed a legal friend to plead for him, but Lacordaire undertook his own cause, and his lofty eloquence gained a complete acquittal.

The next act of the editors was to endeavour to secure liberty of public instruction. Hearing that a free school at Lyons had been broken up by the agent of the university, they proceeded to open a similar one, under Lacordaire's direction, in Paris. The next day the commissary came to the school and desired the children to disperse. Lacordaire, on his part, ordered them to remain, in the name of their parents, who had confided them to his care. They all declared for their teacher, but the school was at once cleared by the police. Montalembert and Lacordaire were tried and condemned to pay a small fine. This, in fact, did their cause more good than harm; but the *Avenir* had more formidable enemies to encounter.

The great bulk of the clergy were against it, on account of its Liberalism; the Government, on account of its Ultramontanism. Grave suspicions were awakened as to its orthodoxy; and at last, seeing opposition rife on every side, the three chief leaders, Lacordaire, Montalembert, and La Mennais, resolved on

undertaking a joint pilgrimage to Rome, to refer the whole matter to the Holy See, and in 1832 they accordingly repaired there together.

Four hundred years before, a Carmelite had gone to Rome to endeavour to reform the Bishops and Cardinals, and been there burnt as a heretic. The days of burning were over, but Rome was not a whit more favourable to reform, even by the hands of her devoted supporters, than she had been in those earlier days. She did not need such zealous champions; they were too uncompromising for her policy, and they were treated accordingly. No open opposition was offered; they were received with civility, but with icy coldness and utter want of sympathy. The Pope met them with outward courtesy, but avoided making the slightest allusion to the object of their journey; and Cardinal Pacca put them off with vague promises from week to week and month to month.

At last they were given plainly, though not in words, to understand that the Holy See would have nothing to say to their undertaking, and that, if they would continue in obedience to the Church, the scheme must be renounced then and there. The disappointment must have been most deeply felt by all three. Open hostility would have been easier to encounter than this cold and contemptuous silence. But the trial was met by each of the friends in a very different manner. For Lacordaire, great as it was, there was not a moment's hesitation. The voice of the Church of Rome was to him the voice of God. He was a Christian from conviction, and to his mind Christianity and Romanism were one. He never abandoned his Liberal views, but he renounced their expression in the publication of the *Avenir*, and yielded an entire, unconditional submission to the implied decrees of the Roman See. In his mind all light, truth, and perfection were centred in the Church, and if this Church slew him, he must trust and submit. He at once returned to Paris, and quietly taking up his abode in a small house in an obscure part of the city, led for three years a life of prayer, work, and solitude.

Montalembert, accustomed to more independence of action, had a much harder struggle; but, after long wavering, he yielded to Lacordaire's pressing instances, and gave up his beloved project.

With La Mennais it was different. To him to yield was impossible. He remained silent for a time; but he ultimately declared his intention of resuming the publication of the *Avenir*, which in his position amounted to an act of absolute defiance to the Church. But he did not immediately take up the position of antagonism to Rome; he returned to La Chenaie, and resumed his labours among his young friends, who

gave him their fullest sympathy in the trial of feeling himself misunderstood and thwarted in his lofty aspirations. He had of course much opposition and even persecution to encounter from those who regarded any attempt to oppose the Papacy as an unpardonable crime in a "good Catholic."

For a time La Mennais bore these attacks in dignified silence. There were moments, however, when pain got the upper hand, and the "fire" being "kindled," he "spake with his tongue." One day, early in 1833, while seated under the tall pine-trees which sheltered his little chapel, he traced with his walking-stick the boundary of a grave on the turf beside him, observing to one of his pupils who was near: "It is there I should wish to be laid; but no memorial stone—only a mound of turf over me. Oh, how well I shall be there!"

The time was now approaching when the peaceful days he had spent with that little band of loving disciples were to close. His position became daily more painful, and in September, 1833, he himself announced to them that he now felt that the persecutions which were raised against him must constrain him to separate himself from all associations with others, for the sake of not compromising, or perhaps entailing injury on them; and that for their own sake he must request them to leave La Chenaie.

Maurice du Guérin dwells sadly on the last parting. On the 7th of September, he says, he went to "M. Féli's" room to take leave of him, and the "gates of the little paradise of La Chenaie closed on him." And so the whole of that happy band was dispersed, and their leader remained alone to brave the storm. He was doubly alone, for Lacordaire felt it his duty to declare publicly that he had separated from his old friend on this point. To those who spoke to him in private he declared that the only point of division between them was that M. La Mennais wished to carry his line of action into politics, while M. Lacordaire limited his own sphere entirely to religious matters. In the main they seem at this time to have agreed, except on this point of entire submission to the Roman See.

But the current was to carry the friends farther apart. At this moment they were, in the language of Jean Ingelow's graceful little poem, separated only by a narrow rivulet across which they could yet hold intercourse; but gradually it was to swell into a broad river, on each side of which their paths would soon pass far out of each other's ken.

And the separation was not from Lacordaire alone. Du Guérin removed to Paris, where he devoted himself to literary work; in a year or two the influence of La Mennais was so far weakened that he could declare he was "not the disciple of

any man." He seems for a time to have been in some degree carried away by the freethinking spirit of the times; but the influence of his excellent sister and other friends was doubtless instrumental in leading him back to Christianity, though in the form of ardent Romanism; and in that faith he died in the summer of 1839, at the age of twenty-nine, in the midst of his family, leaving a young wife to mourn his loss.

Lacordaire, as had been observed, spent the first three years after leaving Rome in retirement at Paris. It was here that his mother joined him, and passed the short remainder of her life near her beloved son. During this time he became acquainted with Madame de Swetchine, a distinguished Russian lady, who had been led, by a process which does not seem very clear to Protestant readers, to leave the Greek Church for that of Rome, but who preserved a wonderful largeness of heart and delicate and profound religious insight and feeling, which even the influence of her Church could not destroy. Her friendship was most beneficial to Lacordaire.

His life, however, was destined again to become a public one. Towards the close of 1833 he was requested to give a series of lectures at the Collège Stanislas. At first the Liberal political views he manifested offended the Government; his lectures were for the time suspended: but eventually he was not only invited to resume them, but called on to do so on a wider and more conspicuous stage. The celebrated Frederic Ozanam, another of those eminent men who had contributed to the revival of religious feeling in France after the Restoration, a man of distinguished attainments and powers, and of most exemplary private character, had begun a series of lectures at Notre Dame for the instruction of the young.

Lacordaire was asked to continue these; his reputation as a preacher had preceded him, and his success was brilliant. He soon became known as the most eminent preacher in France; but in the midst of these intoxicating triumphs he suddenly broke away from all, returned to Rome, and joined the Order of Dominican Friars. The step was one which to Protestant readers appears not only strange, but deeply to be regretted. Even apart from the evils we see in monastic life, the connection of the Order of St. Dominic with the Inquisition and the cruel persecutions in the South of France, naturally makes us shrink from the thought of a benevolent and noble-minded man giving such an Order his support and even his obedience. But it seems clear that he was able to put away from his mind all such considerations, and that the idea of improving and developing the religious Orders in his Church was one which had taken a very strong hold of his mind.

He entered on his novitiate in the convent of La Quercia, near Viterbo; and there he gathered round him a circle of like-minded compatriots. Several of these friends are described as highly gifted as to talents and tastes—they were no less eminent for piety and virtue; and much as we may regret the direction it took, it is impossible not to respect and admire their entire self-devotion and singleness of purpose.¹ The majority of these interesting young companions of Lacordaire were carried off by early death—to the deep sorrow of their friend and guide. Lacordaire's own monastic career did not interfere with his work as a preacher. His conferences at Notre Dame were continued with unabated vigour; and for many years his life was divided between the pulpit and the cloister; but at the age of fifty he retired in a great measure from pulpit ministrations, and devoted himself to the superintendence of the Ancient National College of Sorèze, a place of public instruction in France, where a wider range of study was permitted than in most academical courses at that time.

The influence of Lacordaire over the young was very great, and for the last ten years of his life he was mainly employed among the students of this college. It was there he died in 1861, surrounded by a band of loving friends and disciples—the last words on his lips being: "My God, open to me!"

In the lives of Lacordaire and his fellow-workers and disciples we cannot fail to recognise the beautiful fruits of genuine piety and Christian love and devotedness; but a painful sense of something lacking is left on the mind of the Protestant reader. We miss the free, joyous walk with God which the New Testament sets before us. We hear much of the Cross of Christ; but these good men seem to look on Him as if still and ever hanging on the cross: the crucifix represents their faith; and though they would assuredly never have thought of throwing a doubt on the doctrine of the Resurrection, it is kept habitually a good deal out of sight. They do not see that the real symbol of the Christian's faith should be, not the crucifix with the dying Saviour, but the unoccupied cross and empty sepulchre, declaring that "He is not here, but is risen."

And more is involved in this than meets the eye at first. The Resurrection was the pledge to man that the work of atonement was finished. Wherever, then, it is kept in the background, that work will be virtually, if not directly in words, looked on as incomplete. And the effect of this is to lead earnest men to try and do something to complete that work, by suffering as well as action.

¹ See Dora Greenwell's "Life of Lacordaire," in which interesting sketches of several of these friends are given.

It is evident that Lacordaire and his friends had no clear view of the difference between the *atoning* sufferings of Christ, in which no man can partake, and the sufferings incident to holy living in an evil world, in which true disciples must be ready to share.¹ The idea of helping in the work of expiation seems to have been firmly rooted in their minds. It is painful to see this good and devoted man trying to atone for sins of carelessness or light-mindedness in his pupils by extra penances; taking a kind of morbid delight in voluntary tortures inflicted on himself, and even insisting on the novices in his convent treating him as a slave or a criminal, ordering him to do menial work, striking and insulting him!

In one letter to an afflicted friend, indeed, his natural good sense for a moment gained the ascendant, when he observed that our most painful mortifications (such as those caused by ill-health) are "those which are not taken up at will, and neither begin nor finish at pleasure;" but he failed to perceive that there could be no real humiliation in submitting to a kind of mimicry of harsh treatment from adoring disciples, who knew well, and knew that *he* knew, they were only playing a part to please him!

Such are the mistakes into which even wise and good men will fall when once they go off the line traced by Christ and His Apostles, and seek to do for themselves what He has done so fully and entirely for them.

Still, we can give the tribute of respect to the humility and love which evidently actuated Lacordaire and his friends, and if we catch in their words too much of the cry "Make me as one of Thy hired servants," we must hope that the trembling prayer has been long since quenched in the grateful song of praise for the pardon whose fulness and freedom they had failed to comprehend while on earth.

The history of La Mennais is a sadder one than that of any of his early associates. The tide which had carried him in the opposite direction from that of most of them continued to bear him on. The feeling of antagonism to the Church at last broke through all restraint. In the spring of 1833 he had celebrated his last Easter Mass in the midst of his disciples and friends; he was never to do so again. The force he had laid on himself in his earlier days in taking orders against his own inclinations was probably exercising a reactionary power in later years; for Nature, as has been truly remarked, though a patient, is an unsparing and unforgetting creditor; and the treatment he had received at Rome had sunk deeply into his soul. "I looked not for perfection," he wrote afterwards,

¹ This last must be what the Apostle meant by "filling up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ."—Col. i. 24.

“which it would be simplicity, not to say madness, to expect in the existing world; but for a certain analogy between the outward fact and the ideal type, founded upon maxims admitted speculatively.”

This analogy he could not find in the Romish Church. He does not seem ever to have entertained the idea of taking up a position like that of the “Old Catholics,” or of Pere Hyacinthe Loyson; much less of uniting himself in any way with Protestants or those sympathizing with them. The great watchword of Rome as to her dogmas is “All or nothing;” and the peculiar doctrines and practices of that Church, and those common to Christians in general, seem to have been so closely intertwined and welded together in his mind, like the branches of a tree trained over a trellis, that a part could not be broken off without the whole fabric giving way. He never actually renounced Christianity; but it seems that his hold on its central doctrines was considerably slackened. How far he really let go that hold is very difficult to ascertain, because those who have given any record of his latter days have generally been either thoroughgoing votaries of the Romish Church, or else more or less imbued with freethinking and sceptical views. The former regarded him as an outcast and a complete enemy to the faith; the latter were eager to hail any approach to their own unbelief. A firm and decided Bible Christian opposed to the Church of Rome was a phenomenon inconceivable to either of these two classes.

Of the later part of his life but little comparatively has transpired. Some light is thrown on it by his correspondence with the Baron de Vitrolles, a lifelong and most intimate friend, though entirely differing from him in politics and religion, being an old Legitimist and thorough Romanist. But this difference was no hindrance to a close and affectionate correspondence, which only ceased with La Mennais' life, and of which some part has recently been published. It opens in the prison of St. Pelagie, where he was confined during the year 1841, and closes in the winter of 1853. The tone which pervades it is one full of almost feminine tenderness and affection for his friend; all the topics of the day, familiar, literary, and political, are touched on; but religion is altogether avoided, and the impression left on the mind is that of one who is trying to veil the inner life, and pass on as a mere spectator of outward things. An undercurrent of sadness is perceptible through outward cheerfulness.

A dark cloud seems to rest on the concluding years of this remarkable man. Whether he was able finally to turn to Him to whom so many, excommunicated by their own Church, have “looked and been lightened,” and who has enabled them

to say with Savonarola, "Separated from the Church Militant, but *not* from the Church Triumphant," we know not. We can only hope earnestly that such was the case, and that the troubled, weary heart found rest at the feet of the great High Priest, whose heart of love can be "touched by the infirmities" of His erring children.

In taking leave of this group of talented and earnest men, we must feel that their history affords no plea for the Church to which they belonged, whose pitiless rule drove one to the verge of unbelief and blighted his life hopes, and led the other to bury rare powers under a monk's cowl. But while we thank God for our clearer light, let us not forget the deeper responsibility it lays on us, of showing that we have been truly "made free" through Christ by "glorifying Him in our bodies and spirits, that are His."

E. J. WHATELY.



ART. IV.—THE KINGDOM OF ALL-ISRAEL.

The Kingdom of All-Israel: its History, Literature, and Worship. By JAMES SIME, M.A., F.R.S.E. Pp. 620. Nisbet and Co., 1883.

THIS is a very opportune and a really valuable book. It is the story of the kingdom of all-Israel as it existed and was known in its most prosperous days. This history the writer has examined and scrutinised on the same principles that have been applied in verifying the history of Greece and Rome; namely, the comparison of the history with the literature and the due attention to the technicalities of words and phrases. In studying the Biblical records the observance of these principles is of paramount and indispensable importance; for if the date of the historical records is uncertain or questionable, that of various portions of the literature is undisputed, as, for instance, Hosea, Micah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the like; and the evidence which may be drawn from these is conclusive with regard to the facts that they imply. For example: no man in his senses can doubt that Hosea must have had our actual Book of Genesis before him when he alluded as he did to certain incidents in the personal history of Jacob. No critic would be warranted in surmising that the history was suggested by the hints found in the prophecy. There must have been a depository in which the record of the incidents was preserved, and that record must have been familiar alike to the prophet and his readers.

This is a conclusion of no less certainty than one that is mathematically demonstrable; and therefore we may be sure

that whatever else is true, this cannot be other than true. No theory can avail to establish conclusions which are inconsistent with this fact. It is impossible that Genesis can be later than Hosea; and, so far as its integrity is involved in the existence of these parts, its existence as a whole is carried with the proof of the existence of the parts. No theory of disintegration can stand which is inconsistent with this evidence of acquaintance with particular parts of it.

It is this kind of argument which is urged with so much effect by Mr. Sime in his extremely well-written and highly interesting and readable book. He shows that the record of the history of all-Israel, which is unquestionably authoritative, and is, at all events, our only source of information, is continually bearing spontaneous and unpremeditated testimony in a hundred ways to the recognised existence of documents which must have been no less authoritative when that history was recorded, and, so far as the record is trustworthy, when it took place. This kind of evidence is absolutely beyond the reach of any fabricator, for the simple reason that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred it could never be discovered, and therefore the labour of so fabricating would be utterly lost.

"The history in Samuel," says Mr. Sime, "is unintelligible if the Book of Deuteronomy was not from the first a household book in Hebrew homes." This may be said to be, in a great measure, his thesis; and a most important one it is, for if that Book is not the work of Moses, which it professes to be, then the idea of a *special* divinely communicated written revelation must come to an end. Everything else in the Old Testament must be confessedly subjective if the revelation ostensibly given in Deuteronomy is not real. If Deuteronomy is authentic, then it is certainly genuine; and if it is genuine, then is Moses as truly the mediator of the first covenant as Christ was of the second. But if Deuteronomy is not genuine, then it is hard to see how, except in a very shadowy way, he was a mediator at all. Attacks are frequently made upon the genuineness of the books of Scripture because that is the point on which, from lack of evidence, it is most easy to make assertions and to build theories, and because, in nine cases out of ten, it is not perceived that in attacking the genuineness of these books their authenticity is undermined.

The authenticity of the books of Scripture—that is to say, their truth as narratives of fact—is so very deep-rooted in the belief or the prejudices of mankind, that it requires considerable boldness to attack it directly; therefore the attack is made on the side of genuineness, because it is not commonly perceived that to attack the one is to undermine the other. It is easier to say that Deuteronomy is not genuine than it is

to say that Moses was an impostor. Many will patiently listen to the one assertion who would indignantly reject the other. But if Deuteronomy be not genuine, what guarantee can we have for the authenticity of its facts? Nay, seeing that we cannot tell *when* it was written by many centuries, are there not a hundred chances to one against its being authentic? Whereas, if the book is the genuine record of the man who professes to write it, then we must decide furthermore upon his personal truth or falsehood, and most certainly it becomes proportionately difficult to decide that he is not speaking the truth, if indeed it is he who speaks. It is thus, in like manner, that not seldom the authenticity of the facts of Scripture—say, for example, the Gospels—is really bound up with and involved in the truth with which the books are ascribed to their traditional authors. If St. John wrote the fourth Gospel, we have small reason to doubt his facts; if he did not write it, we have as little reason to accept with confidence what has been fictitiously recorded with the lustre and authority of his name. It is therefore an easy method of dealing a back-handed but effectual blow at the reality of the facts of Scripture, to scatter broadcast and without scruple insinuations against the genuineness of its various parts.

Now if it can be shown—and it seems to us that Mr. Sime has gone far in showing—that the history of Samuel as recorded is a witness of the existence and the knowledge of Deuteronomy at the time it was written, then in proportion as that history is trustworthy, we have the strongest possible confirmation of the genuineness and truth of Deuteronomy; for in the interval between Moses and Samuel there is no one whom it would be worth anyone's while to suggest as the author: and therefore to neutralise the combined force derived from the mutual interdependence of Deuteronomy and Samuel, it would be needful to assume that Samuel was written with a view to support Deuteronomy, or that both were framed and fabricated with a view to support and confirm each other; neither of which suppositions can be entertained for a moment.

As an instance of the critical discernment of the writer may be quoted the following (p. 27). After saying that it was customary to anoint kings in Egypt, he continues:

A more effectual plan was adopted to secure a king's respect for Law (in Deuteronomy): "He shall make him a copy of this law; and it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life." Although, then, Deuteronomy was not the source from which the idea of anointing came, the propriety or necessity of the custom found a lodgment in Hebrew thought at an early period. Jotham, the son of Gideon, about two centuries after the conquest, and Hannah, the mother of Samuel, a century later still, are witnesses to the existence of the phrase

in their day. It may have been a traditional saying, handed down among the Hebrews in anticipation of the time when the law of the king, embodied in the popular law-book, should be realized in the nation's history. That it is not found in the Book of Deuteronomy is a clear indication of the great age of that book compared with the parable of Jotham or the anointing of Saul.

This is surely a point which has been too much overlooked, and which is of intrinsic and undeniable importance. All through the Pentateuch there is abundant mention of anointing, but it is invariably in connection with the priesthood, or the temple and its furniture. There is no hint of the anointing of kings. But no sooner do we come to the king as a fact and reality, than the idea of anointing is paramount and inseparable from his office and person, and the only two hints at the notion are these in the history of Jotham and the prayer of Hannah. Critics may indulge their passion for theory as they please, and may insist upon the late date of the Pentateuch and upon its composite nature; but here, as a matter of fact which it is impossible to ignore, and assuredly very difficult to explain, while it nevertheless asks loudly for explanation, is a characteristic feature which declares as clearly as it is possible to do that the books of the law and the historical books are as widely separate in time as they were totally distinct in origin. No fabricator would have been justified in leaving on the surface of his narrative so glaring an inconsistency between books upon any supposition intended to be so interdependent as the Pentateuch and the historical books.

The early history of the election of Saul is then worked out with great fulness of detail, and all the minutest touches and indications of the narrative are elaborated and set in their true relation and light, so that the story reads with all the freshness and vividness of novelty; and it is remarkable, in the course of doing this, how the presence of Deuteronomy is detected presiding like a conscience over the actions of Samuel, and that to a degree which was not suspected, so that "out of 100 verses in the story as told in Samuel, nearly one half borrow the words and thoughts of Deuteronomy."

Nor can it be said that in the eighth century B.C. the rights of property in books was not recognised, for as Mr. Sime well says: "Sargon, the great king of Assyria, 707 B.C., has left a testimony which might make the advocates of this theory blush. The last words of the long annals of his reign are: 'Whoever shall alter my writings and my name, may Assur, the great God, throw down his sword; may he exterminate in this land his name and his offspring, and may he never pardon him this sin!' Dishonesty and forgery in writings were

esteemed as discreditable in Sargon's days as in ours—perhaps more so."

To mention another instance, Samuel's well-known words: "To obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." The burning of the fat by the priests is not the only reference to the law in these six Hebrew words, important though it is in its bearing on the existence of Leviticus at that time; "fat of rams" is found elsewhere only in the song (Deut. xxxii. 14), "with fat of lambs and of rams." "It is impossible to get rid of these and other coincidences of phrase as accidental. They are nerves of life running through the history and giving feeling to every part. If they be taken away the history is left of its life. It becomes a machine wound up to go through certain movements, but destitute of the living action which marks this narrative" (p. 91).

Mr. Sime's remarks on p. 112 may be taken as rightly characterising much of the criticism which has found so much favour of late. Speaking of Bleek's "Introduction," with regard to his reasoning on Leviticus—"a conglomerate of a most elastic nature"—he says:

"Perhaps" occurs thrice in them; "probably," twice; "probable," twice; "very probable," twice; "likely," twice; "it may be maintained with certainty," once; "this may be certainly assumed," once; "we cannot analyse this book in detail with any certainty, but I think it tolerably certain," once. And no fewer than nine lines contain a hearty condemnation of De Wette's view that "the various parts of Leviticus were added gradually by different compilers." "This supposition," he says, "is quite inadmissible, and has been tacitly retracted, even by De Wette himself." Here then are thirteen "probables" in about seventy lines. For any practical purpose the reasoning is absolutely worthless; a "probable" every five or six lines may prove a writer's inability to make up his mind; it can never lead to definite and sure results.

With reference to the gap in the history which is conspicuous in the Book of Numbers, which is put forth as a mere indication of late origin, Mr. Sime remarks, p. 115: "If the writer of the Book of Numbers considered it necessary to bury in oblivion the events of the thirty-eight years, he only did what every other writer would have done. The Hebrews had had their chance, and had thrown it away. Politically, they were dead men in the eye of the historian. Even their children did not receive the rite of circumcision, the seal of the covenant; civil death had passed over the camp of Israel (Josh. v. 5). A generation would elapse before they would sleep in their graves; but to renew their lives, their doings, their hopes, would have been a barren waste—a record of a race that had been effaced from the world. Lightning had struck the stock of the tree. A young shoot was

growing up: thirty-eight years would be required before the blasted trunk would decay, and the young shoot attain to its usual vigorous growth. Moses refused to write the history of that lightning-struck stock. The thread of the narrative could only be resumed when the chance which the parent stock had thrown away should be again given to its brother offspring. Most justly, therefore, does the chasm exist, for the men whose deeds would have been recorded were dead men in the eye of the law, condemned to lifelong imprisonment in that wilderness peninsula. The long gap, instead of being a proof of unreality in the history, proves, on the contrary, a deliberate design in the author." By putting ourselves in the author's place, says Mr. Sime, and viewing things as he may be thought to have viewed them, we are more likely to get at the real truth of this story, than by heaping "perhaps," or "probable," and "very probable," on "most likely," till we raise a scaffolding high as the heaven, but with foundations on a quicksand.

In a chapter on "The Literature and Worship of the People," the writer shows with great clearness (for the appreciation of which, however, the reader is referred to the work itself) that the ritual at Shiloh was the same as the ritual in the wilderness; that the sacrifices were the same in both cases, and regulated by the same laws; that it was the same with the offering of incense and the law of the feasts: and if from the narrative in Samuel it is right to infer that Elkanah went to Shiloh "only once a year," so also we may infer of Joseph and Mary that they "went to Jerusalem every year at the Feast of the Passover" only; that the furniture of the temple in Shiloh was the same as the furniture of the Mosaic tabernacle; that the garments of the high priest were the same at Shiloh and Nob as in the wilderness; that the names used for them, *me'il* and *ephod*, were specific as well as ordinary; and that the law of Moses was the same at Shiloh as in the Pentateuch. While, therefore, on the first blush of the thing it seems as though there were a great blank between the history of Samuel and the Pentateuch, on closer examination it is found that the indications of acquaintance with, and observance of, the Mosaic law, are minute and numerous, and since from their very nature they are unobtrusive and not immediately detected, their value as evidence of the existence of the law book is greatly increased thereby. Indeed, it becomes impossible to resist the inference which can alone be drawn from it.

The work of Mr. Sime is the most complete and satisfactory work of the kind that has appeared since Dr. W. Smith's first volume (when are the others to follow?) on the Pentateuch;

and it must be borne in mind that a few clear cases of proof, such as those here given, cause a whole mass of theory and conjecture to kick the beam.

Space does not allow us to do more than commend the remainder of the book to the attention of the reader, with the exception of the thirteenth chapter on the antiquity of Deuteronomy, which calls for more detailed notice. With regard to the fifth book of Moses, scholarship and criticism must be poor faculties if they cannot combine to make it something less than doubtful whether it is a work of the fifteenth century before Christ or of the eighth. But there are certain features which are plain to ordinary people, if not to critics and scholars, and about which the public at large are as competent to judge as the most learned. For instance, it is a significant fact to start with, that Deuteronomy is full of Egypt, but knows nothing of Assyria, though the latter in the age of Hezekiah must have been of all-absorbing interest. Again, there is no mention of Jerusalem in the book, as there might have been if it was written when Hezekiah was attempting to put down the high places, and to make his capital the only seat of ritual worship. For the writer makes mention of Ebal and Gerizim in such a way as to make them eclipse every other region in the land, as the Samaritans in the Lord's time naturally believed they did. The town of Shechem, according to this designation, was the central point of Palestine, and the national capital of the country. According to this writer, therefore, an importance is assigned to the whole neighbourhood which went far to defeat the purpose he had in view, if, as the theory supposes, that purpose was to write of Zion in the age of Hezekiah as the only place of acceptable sacrifice. Moreover, Ebal and Gerizim were then in a kingdom far from friendly to Judah. The command to build an altar on Ebal is intelligible if given before the people crossed the Jordan; it is unintelligible if not promulgated till many centuries after the conquest. While, however, to people who had spent their youth in Egypt the words of Deuteronomy—full of remembrances of Egypt—were as fresh as the spring grass, to people who knew the land only by report, and had never been in it, they were as withered as the grass of the desert under an autumn sun. The language would have been as much out of place in Hezekiah's reign as appeals to Englishmen would be in our own Queen's, reminding them of the pleasant fields and clear skies left by their Norman forefathers seven or eight centuries ago. And yet, at the same time, had the lessons of kindness to the stranger based on the recollection of Egyptian bondage been parables or frauds enforced for the first time eight centuries after the Exodus, the book could

not have been received with the reverence shown by the chiefs of the land. The king rent his clothes, we are told. "Great is the wrath of the Lord that is kindled against us," he said, and Huldah the prophetess assured him that his eyes should not see all the evil that was coming on Jerusalem and Judah. Unless the story of the book, as told in its own pages, is true, we are plunged in a further sea of hypocrisy and deceit, of which not only the unknown romancer was guilty, but the king, and the prophet, and the priest must have been themselves accessories or dupes. Then comes the absence of the horse, as an animal known to the writer of Deuteronomy. The dislike of it or the fear of it (Deut. xx. 1; xiv. 4, 7) is easily explained, if the book was written when it professes to have been; but in the days when Isaiah said, "their land is full of horses, neither is there any end of their chariots," it is incredible. No part of the Mosaic narrative gives the slightest hint of horses being in use for any purpose among the Hebrews; but in the days of Solomon the price of a horse was from £17 to £18 of our money. Only on the supposition that the writer of the book was living among a people who had no horses in their camp is this silence intelligible; and before the time of David the horse was unknown as a domestic animal among the Hebrews.

The law of the central altar (Deut. xii. 1-32) and the law of the king (Deut. xvii. 14-20) are the two great stumbling-blocks to modern critics. A central altar is held to be in flat contradiction to the history as it unfolded itself in the seven centuries from Moses to Hezekiah. But those who refuse to recognise in the central altar of Solomon the revival of a thing which once existed in Israel, but had ceased for a season, explain a lesser difficulty by shutting their eyes on others much greater. All through the Books of Samuel there are traces of acquaintance with this law; and if it is borne in mind that not every time mention is made of a popular feast or sacrifice is a priestly or atoning sacrifice necessarily meant, much difficulty is obviated. When Absalom slew cattle and sheep for his guests and partisans at Hebron, or Adonijah his brother at a later period at Zohelath, it does not follow that they were the peace-offerings or atoning sacrifices of the temple service. Absalom was not acting the part of a prince; he was aping the king in entertaining at a coronation feast the crowds who were flocking to his support. But there is no proof that Hebron, any more than Zohelath, was a local sanctuary or a centre of priestly worship.

We must conclude our notice of Mr. Sime's very able work, which we cordially recommend, and for which we heartily thank him, with the following quotation on the law of the king (p. 459):

The law of the king, given in Deuteronomy, was not forgotten in after-time. It comes to the front in Gideon's judgeship as a living thing, thought over, talked about among the people, and ready to be acted on. But Gideon refuses the honour. He does not condemn the people for making an unlawful request. He merely puts the kingship aside as an honour he would not take, but not as an honour which his countrymen had no right to offer. The law continued to be talked of among the people. They felt they were entitled to do as they had done in offering him the throne. They felt also that they were entitled to offer it to his family. At least, as soon as Gideon died, his court and eldest son expected to see supreme power bestowed on his brothers, while he himself, as unworthily born, would be shut out. By murdering all of them except Jotham, he seized, or thought to seize, the prize which his father put aside when it was offered as a free gift. Undoubtedly the minds of men were then familiar with the idea of a king for Israel. Although it came to the surface only in the days of Gideon and Samuel, it lay deep in the nation's heart, and may have burst forth in other cases. Of this we have ground for suspicion in the song of Hannah, more than fifty years before the choice of Saul: "The adversaries of the Lord shall be broken to pieces; out of heaven shall He thunder upon them. The Lord shall judge the ends of the earth; the Lord shall give strength unto His king, and exalt the horn of His anointed" (1 Sam. ii. 10). Instead of regarding these words as an utterance of the nation's deepest feelings, modern thinkers take the superficial view that they could not have been spoken by a poet unless a king had been then ruling in Israel. On the supposition that Hannah, like the elders in her son's old age, was only expressing the people's deep yearnings for a champion to deliver them from priestly vileness within and foreign thralldom without, there would be room for poetry such as breathes in her song, while it is difficult to see what she or they had to do with a king sitting on his throne. Hope gilded the future in her eyes with a coming glory, in contrast to the baseness which she saw around her in Eli's sons, and in the incapacity of the national chiefs. A king on his throne in actual life is seldom known to have inspired the people with these hopes. Since, then, Hannah's song was about half-way, in point of time, between Gideon's judgeship and the choice of Saul, a bridge is thus found existing across the gulf of centuries, from Gideon's death to the beginning of Saul's reign. The idea of a king ruling over the land never was dead among the Hebrews. Specially in times of trouble and discontent would it come to the surface; possibly it came up in their history many more times than are recorded in their books. We have, therefore, safe ground to go on in declining to regard the idea as new in Samuel's judgeship; at least, he was well aware that the people had the will of Jehovah on their side, for, in his view of the case, they were only rejecting himself as judge. Until it was pointed out to him, he never imagined that they were rejecting Jehovah as their king.

STANLEY LEATHES, D.D.



ART. V.—DIOCESAN MISSION SERVICES.

IN the biography of Richard Waldo Sibthorp appears an anecdote about crowded churches some sixty years ago. Mr. Sibthorp's popularity in the neighbourhood of Lincoln¹ as a preacher, we read, made rapid strides among devout Churchmen and also among the religious Dissenters. The common people heard him gladly. Wherever he preached, in fact, crowds followed; and one Vicar objected on this very account. "Such a throng of people," he said, "made the church dirty." In Mr. Knight's admirable "Memoir of Henry Venn," is recalled a similar anecdote. A Fellow of Queen's, Incumbent of a church in Cambridge, was taking a holiday. Being told that his church was being filled to crowding by a popular young substitute, the Vicar remarked, "It doesn't matter; I can soon empty it again."

Such a state of things can hardly now be realized. An Incumbent who complains of a "throng of people," or regards his empty church with satisfaction, is almost an impossibility. A few fossils, no doubt, may be known; but a Rector or Vicar whose dwindling congregation causes him no concern is at all events a rarity. Public opinion nowadays is strong; and a clerical conscience which may be callous to episcopal criticism is apt to be sensitive with regard to local critics, whether clerical or lay. Certainly, as a rule, throughout the Church, the clergy zealously bestir themselves: the services are conducted with regularity and reverence, sermons are—to say the least—sincere, and the duties of the pastorate are conscientiously fulfilled. Further, in the majority of parishes, perhaps, there are occasionally special services of an evangelistic character; efforts are made for the conversion of careless Churchgoers, and of outsiders, and for the deepening of the spiritual life in real Christians. A very high standard of ministerial duty and

¹ At an earlier date, according to Gunning's "Reminiscences," some churches in Lincolnshire were badly served. At a certain very small parish, service was performed only once a month. A clergyman who was visiting for a few days in the immediate neighbourhood, and who was a friend of the officiating minister (residing at a distance), offered to perform service on the following Sunday. Consent was readily granted. When notice was given to the clerk, he appeared confused, and then submissively remarked, the service ought not to have come off until a week later; for, not at all expecting there would be any change from what they had been so long accustomed to, he had set a turkey in the pulpit as soon as their parson had left, and he had reckoned that by the time he came again the pulpit would have been at liberty!

responsibility, in fact, is admitted almost universally and without dispute.

Nevertheless, though this is so, the condition of things, viewing the Church at large, is far from satisfactory. Whether the inquiry be made with reference to the spread of sound, spiritual religion, or with a special view to the question how far the Church is gaining the affections of the great body of the people, and what support as an Establishment she may rely upon to meet the brunt of a Disestablishment and Disendowment agitation in these democratic days, the statistics which have been published in the last two or three years, due deductions being made, supply matter for very serious reflection. It can hardly be denied that in our large towns a considerable proportion of the working-classes do not attend a place of worship; and if a careful census-taker makes allowance for chapel-goers among some sections of the great middle class, the number of habitual attendants in the churches of the National Church, we fear, is sadly small. It has been stated by the Dean of Lichfield, on the authority, if we remember right, of Convocation returns, that 5,000,000 of the English people have never had the tidings of salvation brought directly home to them.¹

The condition of the country parishes, in some respects, is infinitely superior, of course, to that of the great towns and cities and the densely peopled modern districts. The country, as opposed to the town, is richly supplied with Pastors and churches. The means of grace, as a rule, are ample. Yet those of the rural clergy who are eminent for spirituality of tone, for diligence in pastoral labour and affectionate zeal in preaching, seldom depict the religious state of country parishes in glowing colours. Oftentimes one hears of dulness and formality; and in many an out-of-the-way parish it must be easy to sink to a humdrum level. Three points are sometimes taken as tests. First, of the total population of the parish, making due allowance for age and health, what proportion habitually, Sunday after Sunday, make their way to the sanctuary? Second, what proportion never, or scarcely ever, enter church? Third, what is the *communicant* proportion?

¹ There are twice as many people in England now as there were about sixty years ago. In the last ten years 3,000,000 of souls were added to the nation.

In his admirable address, at the Rochester Diocesan Conference, the Right Rev. President said: "If out of our debate together we can get only a little light on how to fill our empty Churches, as well as to build new ones which shall not be empty; how to imitate the enthusiasm of the Salvation Army, without copying their eccentricities . . . we shall not have met in vain."

In eloquent words the Bishop of Peterborough, at the Leicester Congress, put the facts of the case as regards the duty of the National Church, at the present moment, towards the largely increasing population of the land. "The one great Church question of our time," said the Bishop, "before which all others fade into insignificance, is this: Round about church and chapel, impartially indifferent or impartially hostile to both, lie the masses of our great town populations, the scattered units in our country parishes, for whom life has no higher, no better meaning than that of a daily struggle for the means of a joyless existence, uncheered by the hope of a happier hereafter, undignified by the consciousness of Divine descent and heirship of immortality. What can the Church of England do for these—these masses on whom, in their fast-growing might, some are looking with timid fear and others with sinister expectations, but on whom the Church should look only with yearning and affectionate desire, as her truest wealth and her most precious Catholic heritage? This tangled, trodden, earth-soiled harvest into which her Lord has sent her to toil and reap—can she gather this? Can she so enlarge her barns as that they shall hold this? Here, believe me, lies the one supremely urgent question for which we have to find an answer, and that speedily."

Suggestions for gathering the people from the highways and byways may be grouped under four heads: first, the Sermons; second, the Services; third, Sympathy, exhibited and evoked in Pastoral visits from house to house; and fourth, Spiritual power, as the result of promise-pleading prayer. As to the sermons and ministerial sympathy, the Bishop of Liverpool's *ad clerum* at the Derby Congress has doubtless borne good fruit. With regard to the services, a plea for greater elasticity has often been urged in *THE CHURCHMAN*. In the Sunday morning service especially, as we think, for agricultural labourers no less than for artisans, simplicity¹ and variety are clearly called for. In those parishes where the Incumbent has no curate, and where more than two services on the Sunday can hardly from the nature of the case be expected, the provisions of the Act of Uniformity Amendment Act are, unhappily, of little or no service.² Of the highest importance,

¹ In the "Life of the Prince Consort" appears an anecdote worth quoting in regard to repetitions. "Lord W. asked if a prayer for the Queen's peculiar circumstances should be added.—Prince: 'No, no; you have one already in the Litany—"all women labouring of child." You pray already five times for the Queen. It is too much.'—Lord W.: 'Can we pray, Sir, too often for Her Majesty?' Prince: 'Not too *heartily*, but too often.'"

² In the *Standard*, lately, appeared a letter from a vicar of what may be called a working class town parish. He found that the men and

however, may be regarded those suggestions which come under the head of Spiritual power. In a day of self-indulgence and materialism on the one hand, and of sacerdotal ecclesiasticism on the other, there is obviously a need of special prayer. One cheering sign of the times, indeed, is the growing acceptance of the maxim, "To pray is to work;" and when clergy and their congregations gather together in hopeful prayer for an outpouring of the life-giving Spirit, an increase of devotion and usefulness will surely result. The week-night prayer-meeting in the schoolroom is a feeder for the services in the sanctuary, both on the weekday and the Sabbath.

These thoughts arose and found expression as we pondered over the lately published letter of Archbishop Benson concerning Mission Services. That weighty and interesting letter, which, in connection with the Tait Memorial Fund, has attracted much attention, will strengthen the hands of those in any diocese who have pleaded for systematic "Mission" services, and evangelistic work, under the Bishop's direction. The subject—to take a single instance—was brought before the Chichester Diocesan Conference six years ago by Mr. Purton, Rector of Kingston-by-Sea, and he recommended that a series of special services in every parish or district should be carried on—if not otherwise—under some members of the Cathedral body.¹

women of the working class, and of the lower middle class, would not attend the Sunday morning service. The service was not, to use a common phrase, "*suivable*." He ventured, therefore, to make a few omissions, and he found that the attendance increased. A certain parishioner, however, complained to the Bishop, and his lordship directed the vicar to read the full service, according to law, without alteration. Similar experiences have been published concerning rural parishes. It is easy to say, "Take the Litany as a separate service, with two or three hymns;" but, to make only one reply, "What is to be done in the thousands of parishes where, during the winter months, the second service is held in the afternoon?"

¹ Again, in the year 1880, in concluding a paper on Missions, Mr. Purton said: "In my pleading for variety I would touch upon another point. Three years ago, in the first happy assembly of a Conference in this diocese, I pleaded for special services under diocesan guidance. During those years the movement in favour of such services has in some dioceses gained strength; there is a 'Canon Missioner' in Truro and in Winchester, while in Lincoln the Canons assist in evangelistic services. At the recent Church Congress—I was glad to observe—this point was prominent. It is, in my opinion, of great importance; for by it (1) you may have Mission services in parishes where otherwise they would not be held, and (2) you may carry on yearly, once, twice, or thrice a year, special services under able experienced Preachers, in every parish of the diocese. A *Mission* can only be held after an interval of some years; but I plead for—to use a cumbersome term—ordinary 'extraordinary' services of an evangelistic character; week-night sermons (they must be

The Primate's letter was read at a meeting of the Tait Memorial Mission Fund. "I should highly desire," wrote his Grace, "that the Fund should provide living agents, and not fresh buildings." Lord Shaftesbury has often protested against a mere "bricks and mortar" plea; and everybody knows that of the churches built for the working-classes, not a few are as empty "as barns in July." Living agents are needed; and it must be added, agents of the right stamp. The Primate proceeded as follows:

I have no hesitation in saying that something more systematic and better organized than the present valuable but temporary mode of Mission work is demanded by our circumstances. I should be glad to see attached to every diocesan centre of work, in its Cathedral, a body of Mission Canons, or at least one Canon Missioner with such small staff under him as could be provided. This is what Cranmer established in the Six Preachers of Canterbury, and though the funds are now inadequate for the purpose there, the idea remains in connection with that Cathedral. But in the meantime it would be quite possible to lay the plan and to work it afresh in connection with the Archbishop.

The work which such Mission Preachers should carry out is described by his Grace in seven clauses, the first clause running thus:

(1) The preliminary and universal condition of their work would be wholly subsidiary to the parochial system; the Missioners would work in no place without the invitation of the parish clergyman and the consent of his Bishop.

"Without the Incumbent's permission;" these words will not, we presume, exclude an episcopal suggestion. The "parish clergyman" may not always be ready to invite Diocesan Preachers. In a parish where Mission labour is very greatly required, whether the Incumbent be indolent or incapable, it is possible that without a direct appeal from the Ordinary, the door may remain closed. One defect of our parochial system is this: the Incumbent is, practically speaking, an autocrat; and a worldly, vain, and sluggish Incumbent can lay down the law that no clerical voice "in *my* church," or "among *my* people," shall be listened to, except that of which his congregation or parishioners have long been weary. The Church of England, indeed, as a National body, is too parochial; the diocesan tie is very thin, and the forces of central organization are feeble.

When "thus invited," continues the Archbishop, the Missioners would work in the following modes:

preached in the evenings, when working-men in towns and the agricultural labourers can attend) preached by picked men. Two seasons in the Church's year, Advent and Lent, are of course especially suitable for such services."

(2) They would penetrate almost godless districts and groups of population by preaching, visiting, and arousing knots of people with whom, if they were once drawn together, the parochial clergy and their lay-helpers would deal. (3) They would take groups of parishes in this way, where the Incumbents had so arranged their plans as to awaken the attention of larger areas and bring more force to bear. (4) They would associate with themselves for special Missions clergy from the neighbourhood or farther afield, whom their wide experience would show to be sufficient for their purposes, though not ready to devote themselves entirely to such work. (5) One of their most important functions is the entering of well-worked and organized, but hitherto somewhat irresponsible parishes, where the clergy so often need a fresh voice, fresh witnesses, varied appeals to strengthen and "back up" their own long-continued unrewarded efforts. I have witnessed the most remarkable and rich results of long good work thus suddenly realized in communicants, schools, classes, etc., in parishes where there had hitherto been only languid life, and many could not be attracted at all.¹ (6) They would take with them devoted laymen as time would allow, and train them to boldness and readiness in working in the open air and otherwise in support of their own ministers. (7) All their teaching would have a substantial basis and staple (instead of excitement and strangeness which end where they began), namely, the thorough understanding of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and what springs immediately from those when they once are realized.

"Two such Missioners, at £300 a year each," adds the Archbishop, "would make in the course of a short time many clergymen glad, many parishes alive, many gainsayers Christians. They would draw to themselves other men able to support themselves, and would promote much self-devotion, and attract much ability to religious work which now is aimless.² I believe that this would be a true commemoration and pursuance of the aims of my revered predecessor."

¹ Mr. Hay Aitken—whose experience, probably, in our day is unrivalled—stated, not long ago, that he has never detected any feeling of jealousy on the part of Incumbents, when they have seen persons to whom they had preached for years with apparently little effect, coming to the Mission Preacher, and yielding themselves to the power of God.

² In a characteristic speech, full of point, the Archbishop, at Lord Granville's, alluded to the results of Mission labours in certain parishes of the diocese of Truro. A clergyman and his wife, said his Grace, asked for advice. He recommended them to try a Mission. They did so, and a more changed place than that parish became after the Mission he could not imagine. He had lately to confirm between forty and fifty persons, old and young, where formerly they could not get more than two or three. The local preacher, who had been all hardness and opposition at one time, when on his death-bed, sent for the clergyman's wife and said to her, "I have been a different man since the Mission, and now God is calling me, and I have sent for you to pray with me." The churches were now filled. Many people went who were Dissenters, and would never cease to be Methodists, and nobody was seeking to make them otherwise. They went to church in the morning and to the meeting-house in the evening, and they encouraged their children to go to the Sunday School.

This letter of the Archbishop—rich in promise—many Church Reformers will deem most timely, and will gladly welcome its suggestions. For ourselves, provided only the Mission Preachers be sound and suitable men, we consider that the hopes expressed in the letter are thoroughly well-grounded, and we make no doubt that they will, with the Divine blessing, be all fulfilled. But the Canons must be evangelistic rather than ecclesiastical. If they are evangelists, “full of faith and of power,” minded to preach Christ’s Gospel in simplicity, able to stand up with a Bible in their hands and attract attention in out-of-the-way corners in towns, at a dinner-hour audience in a factory, or a railway workshop, or a barn, gathering to themselves coadjutors, clerical and lay, breathing the same spirit, they are sure to succeed; and they will get a permanently increasing series of earnest workers. It is in Lay Preachers that the Church of England has always been weak. Nor is there any way of getting at the masses, and at the same time of deepening Christian zeal among our devout laity so effectual, probably, as the one which enlists laymen’s sympathies and employs their powers as personal workers in evangelistic efforts.

One result of the Mission Services, as recommended by Archbishop Benson, will be, we think, the strengthening of the Cathedral system. At present, Cathedrals are the weakest part of the National Church. “What Cathedral has contributed largely to evangelization?” asked the late Lord Harrowby, some twenty years ago, at a Church Congress; and the answer of that sound, staunch Churchman was, “Not one!” Matters, no doubt, have somewhat improved of late. Nevertheless, among thoughtful Churchmen not minded to live in a fool’s paradise, it will generally be admitted, perhaps, that in the working of dioceses the Cathedral establishments, speaking broadly, are of little or no use. In these democratic days, when every institution in England is said to be on its trial, and when the utilitarian principle of “payment by results” seems to be gradually gaining acceptance, it is surely prudent to divert some portion of Cathedral revenues into an evangelistic channel.



ART. VI.—EPISCOPACY IN SCOTLAND:

A REJOINDER.

IT will probably surprise no reader of Dr. Skene’s article in the June number of *THE CHURCHMAN* to learn that the Church of England congregations in Glasgow do not accept its statements as representing their opinion of the present con-

dition of the Scotch Episcopal Church, or of their own attitude towards it.

Dr. Skene's views may be collected and summarized somewhat as follows. There are certain congregations in Scotland which, for reasons that at the time seemed good and sufficient, withdrew from their previous connection with the Scotch Episcopal Church. These reasons were: The "primary authority" assigned to the Scotch Communion Office; and the enforcing of a Canon which made prayer-meetings illegal in that Church. That latterly, however, in consequence of two pamphlets put forth by Dr. Skene and Mr. Dawson, the Scotch Bishops have made certain concessions to the views of these congregations on the points referred to, which concessions have induced Dr. Skene to return to the Scotch Episcopal Church; and finally, that all the congregations in question must take the same step, or accept the stigma and the punishment of schism.

He supports these views by contrasting the former tone and spirit of his Church with those which it manifests at the present time; by representing the existing position of the Scotch Communion Office as one of bare and excusable toleration; by asserting that the Scotch Episcopal Church is recognised by the Church of England as her "true representative" on this side the border; by urging the absolute identity of the standards of the two Churches; and by giving an imperfect statement of the grounds on which the Glasgow congregations object to follow his advice and example.

These views must be examined; but it should first be noted that the representatives of these latter congregations have from the first declined to accept them as a sufficient presentation of facts, or as an authorized expression of their sentiments. If we are once more to fight a pitched battle on behalf of the Evangelical and Protestant character of genuine English Churchmanship, it must not be on ground selected by Dr. Skene. We hold a strong position, and are not to be decoyed out of it, and on to the comparatively defenceless platform on which we have seen him out-manceuvred and captured.

The ministers of these Glasgow churches owe no more allegiance to the Scotch Episcopal Church than to the Church of Scotland, being clergymen of the Church of England, ministering here under the authority of a special Act of Parliament (10 Anne, cap. 7). The seat-roll of St. Silas's Church shows that 75 or 80 per cent. of the congregation were members of the United Church of England and Ireland before coming here; the same is probably true of St. Jude's Church, as it is of St. Silas's Mission Church. Our position is not one of secession from the Scotch Episcopal Church, but of refusal

as English Churchmen to unite with it, or to put ourselves under the authority of its Bishops and its constitution generally. We do not put forward or endorse the "grounds of separation" attributed to us; viz., "The refusal to the Evangelical congregations in Scotland of those Christian privileges enjoyed by their brethren in England;" and "The recognition of the Scotch Communion Office as a standard of doctrine which they could not accept." We are individually members of the Church of England or of the Church of Ireland; and the question which presents itself to our minds is this: "Shall we become members of the Scotch Episcopal Church, or of the Church of Scotland, or shall we unite, as English Churchmen do all over the world, as Church of England congregations, under ministers of our own Church? We have decided to maintain this last position, balancing its clear advantages against its recognised inconveniences.

St. Silas's Church has, therefore, for nearly twenty years been held in trust as "a place of worship in proper connection with the Church of England;" such worship to be carried on "according to the presently existing standards of the Church of England, under the ministration of ordained clergymen of that Church, and no other." This admirably conceived Constitution may well be compared with an extract from the Grahamstown Judgment of last year: "The obvious course for a church which desires to be in connection with the Church of England to all intents and purposes, would be at least to say at starting that its faith, doctrine, and discipline should be those which then prevailed in the Church of England. Such a church would, until some fresh departure occurred, be in connection with the Church of England."

The charge of schism does not touch us. We are no more schismatics than our brethren on the Continent or in the Colonies, who retain their immediate connection with the Church of England, in preference to joining any of the Christian communities established there. We are not so fortunate as they are now in having formal Episcopal superintendence, though that is not due to our own rejection of it, or lax disregard of its advantages, but to restrictions imposed by a Presbyterian nation, which had good reason to put some check on the pretensions of Episcopacy within its borders. This is an inconvenience which we share with the incumbents of donatives and peculiars in England, with the chaplains of the army and navy, with many Continental chaplains, and other clergy and their congregations. One noteworthy instance is the Chapel Royal, Savoy, whose chaplain has been indebted to the Bishop of Antigua for the exercise of Episcopal functions, because the Bishop of London is debarred from

exercising his diocesan authority within its precincts, by the same secular power which has forbidden its exercise by the Church of England among ourselves.

Those few among us (and they are very few) who were once members of the Scotch Episcopal Church, are in the position of those who have been led to renounce the Church of Rome, in the first instance, because of some one flagrant abuse, such as the traffic in indulgences, or the assertion of Papal infallibility, and who have found afterwards many another ground for remaining separate. It is not by the removal of the abuse which first aroused opposition and awakened inquiry that those can be recalled in whom further inquiry has developed firmer opposition.

Dr. Skene urges upon us, however, the improved spirit of the Scotch Episcopal Church, and enters into an historical retrospect, apparently for the purpose of showing the contrast between the *Punica fides* of that Church in former, and indeed in uncomfortably recent days, and the "better spirit" which began to prevail, as he thinks, about 1863. He notes how the "usagers" (we should now call them "Ritualists") as soon as they "obtained a majority in the Episcopal Synod," introduced in 1755 the non-juring Communion Office, in violation of the "Articles of Agreement" of 1731; how the Articles of the Church of England were subscribed in 1804 for the satisfaction of the English Government, "under a reservation not communicated to the Government, or by which their subscription was qualified;" how the opposition of his own grandfather was disarmed at the same time by an agreement which his new allies, nullified seven years afterwards; how the Evangelical movement of 1822 in the Scotch Episcopal Church was met in 1838 by a Tractarian revision of the Canons, which eliminated from them the term "Protestant," as applied to the Scotch Episcopal Church, raised the Scotch Communion Office to a position of "primary authority" as a standard of doctrine, and gave to the Bishops the power of suppressing the prayer-meetings of the Evangelicals; how these latter, having been decoyed into the Scotch Episcopal Church in 1804, were driven out in 1842; how the Gorham Judgment was repudiated by the Episcopal Synod in 1850, and the clergy forbidden to teach what the Church of England had sanctioned; and how the same Episcopal Synod in 1858 thus addressed the clergy on the subject of the Lord's Supper: "You will continue to teach that this Sacrifice of the Altar is to be regarded no otherwise than as the means whereby we represent, commemorate, and plead, with praise and thanksgiving before God, the unspeakable merits of the precious death of Christ, and whereby He communicates and applies to

our souls all the benefits of that one full and all-sufficient sacrifice once made upon the cross."

An ominous introduction is all this to an appeal to our confidence in the "better spirit" now prevailing. Of the growth and existence of this "better spirit" but scanty evidence is supplied. Its first token, coming from the same Episcopal Synod which rejected the Gorham Judgment, is a repudiation of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, qualified by the utterance just quoted respecting the "Sacrifice of the Altar." Then again, "there was more spiritual life and less narrow formalism in her teaching and services," or, as we should say, modern "High Church" and "Ritualistic" services and doctrines were substituted for the old "high and dry" style. And finally, a mission in Edinburgh in 1875, conducted by Bishop Maclagan and Dr. Pigou, led High Churchmen to adopt the prayer-meetings which had been suppressed in 1842. Dr. Skene also points to the alleged feelings of the southern clergy and of half the Scotch Bishops towards their special Communion Office, and the close approximation of their services to those of the Church of England; but he does not seem to be aware that this approximation is towards services of the "high" type; that the Scotch Office is used in 74 churches, and the "Eastward Position" in 93 out of a total of 265; and that "Hymns Ancient and Modern" are in practically universal use. With respect to the spirit shown by the Scotch Bishops, clergy, and laity towards those English Churchmen who decline to join their communion, abundant, and definite, and recent evidence might be given of the active existence of a very different tone to that believed in by Dr. Skene. If a member of the Church of England "joins one of these ('English Episcopal') congregations, he will soon learn that he can only enjoy in Scotland the same privileges to which he has been accustomed in England, at the expense of being termed a schismatic, and his position in the Church being misunderstood and misrepresented." Which very mild account of Scotch Episcopalian toleration is quoted from Dr. Skene's pamphlet of last year.

But we are little concerned with these things, except when this interference has material results; we are more interested in the principles which guide the policy of the Scotch Episcopal Church. We see in it a practical working illustration of what High Churchmen would like the Church of England to be. It is essentially an organization on Tractarian lines. It perpetuates a dual Communion Service, such as the English Church Union proposes, and Canon Hoare has taken the lead in denouncing. Its legislation and the interpretation of its laws are virtually in the hands of the Bishops. They claim also, under Cyprian's authority, an absolute veto on the election of a new bishop.

The Church Court may advise the Bishop, who presides over it in person, but the Bishop decides and passes sentence on his own authority, subject to no appeal, except to his brother Bishops. The doctrine of the "Divine Institution" of Episcopacy is in the first Canon struck as the key-note of the whole system, and careful search throughout the code will show how strictly it is made to harmonize with this preliminary tone. The doctrine is not held as a matter of "pious opinion," but rigidly enforced. Most Evangelicals will think that Bishop Lightfoot's essay on "The Threefold Ministry" goes to the outside limit of Church of England teaching on the subject; but this falls far short of what Bishop Wordsworth's reply demands on behalf of himself and his brother prelates, and of those views to which they have given expression in the laws of their Church.

What fitting place can Evangelical clergy and congregations, to say nothing of Church of England ones, have in such a communion? In 1826, the Scotch Bishops unanimously resolved that "the time was past when they could with safety refuse to tolerate anything that was tolerated in the English Church;" but this happy disposition did not last long, for after seven years of "peace and harmony," the time that was past came round again, and intolerance revived in the vigorous shape which ultimately drove Mr. Drummond out. Now the clergy under Bishop Cotterill, including, according to Dr. Skene, two Evangelicals, declare their belief that Evangelical men have, as a matter of fact, enjoyed the same liberty of worship as in England, and hope that the Bishop, "without relinquishing such safeguards as are really necessary," may succeed in persuading new-comers to count with confidence on a like toleration. But toleration, mitigated by "safeguards," is not the position to which an Evangelical has been accustomed in the Church of England.

The article under review further proceeds to represent the present position of the Scotch Communion Office as one of bare and excusable toleration, the plea put forth in the Declaration recently addressed to us by the Bishops. But, so recently as 1876, the present Primus, when consecrating the cathedral in Cumbrae, said: "No words of my own can so forcibly express my own deep conviction of what is the *special duty and office* of our Church in Scotland at this time, as the words addressed to the congregation gathered together at the consecration of my own cathedral by the deeply-lamented Bishop Douglas, of Bombay." These words were: "Hold fast your own distinctive usages, and especially your Communion Office, so majestic, so primitive in its distinguishing characters, and so clear in its assertion of the truth." Yet this same

Bishop has just invited us to join his Church, and, I presume, to assist in promoting its objects, on the understanding that in so doing we "do not thereby commit (ourselves), either to an approval of the distinctive features of the said Communion Office, or to any acceptance of doctrine which can be supposed to be inconsistent with the Book of Common Prayer."

The "distinguishing characters" and "distinctive features" of this lauded Communion Office are a formal oblation of the bread and wine before consecration as well as after, and especially the consecration prayer quoted in Dr. Skene's article: "Bless and sanctify with Thy Word and Holy Spirit these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may become the Body and Blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son"; the omission of the word "militant" in the rubric which follows the offertory sentences; and other significant deviations from the English form. On this Dr. Skene observes that "in the Eastern Church, from which this form was derived, the Invocation is understood to express the doctrine of a material change in the elements, but the supporters of this office have always maintained that the expression can only mean 'become by way of efficacious representation.'" It seems characteristic, however, of the Scotch Episcopal Church to borrow liturgical forms and other necessities of ecclesiastical life, without borrowing the owners' interpretation of them, as in the case of the Articles and Baptismal service of the Church of England. And Dr. Skene's qualifications to act as a judge in such a controversy may be estimated from the fact that he pronounces the Communion Service of 1637 to contain "no features which are really objectionable," though it contains an offering up of the bread and wine, and a "memorial" oblation of the consecrated elements and other changes, of which Short speaks as bringing the Prayer Book back to a greater conformity to the first Liturgy of Edward VI. and the Roman rituals; and that he further declares the before-quoted Synodical utterance on "this Sacrifice of the Altar" to be "a moderate view of Eucharistic doctrine, in accordance with that generally held in the Church of England." Can he be aware that the Church of England bases her Communion Service on the rendering, "This do in remembrance of Me;" and that the words he quotes are an amplification of the Romish version, "Sacrifice this for My memorial"?

But we have to consider the apologies offered for the retention of the existing Communion Office. It is persistently represented as of limited and decaying use, "confined to congregations in the north," "obviously permitted to certain congregations as an article of peace," and so restricted in use "that there is obviously no possibility of its being imposed on

any congregation contrary to their wishes." It was, however, in use in but thirty churches in 1845; these had increased to forty-four churches in 1867; and to seventy-four churches in 1882. It is clear that in the great majority of these churches the service must be of recent importation; its use is imperative on any clergyman who may be appointed to one of these churches; its introduction into a new church, at the will of a majority, *must* be sanctioned by the Bishop, unless he can prove undue influence; and it may, therefore, be imposed upon the Evangelical members of a congregation in spite of their resistance. Evangelical Churchmen are thus shut out from these seventy-four congregations, whether as clergymen or laymen; and an Evangelical Bishop, solemnly pledged to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's Word, would find himself as solemnly pledged to sanction this heretical service.

Dr. Skene's next point is the recognition of the Scotch Episcopal Church, as the true representative of the Church of England in Scotland, by Convocation and by individual Bishops. But he would do well to inquire at what time Convocation or individual members of it were entrusted with authority to exercise jurisdiction in Scotland, or to repeal statute law. And if this authority is not entrusted to Convocation, still less is it entrusted to Pan-Anglican Synods. The Upper House of Convocation, having no legislative power, cannot obtain it by taking into council groups of colonial and foreign bishops. If the English Church withholds such authority from its own Bishops, it is not likely to listen patiently to the mandates of strangers.

The individual opinions of English Bishops could be matched by contradictory opinions from men as eminent and as Evangelical as any named. One name alone seems to claim a passing note, the honoured name of Bishop Baring. His advice has reached us only in fragmentary extracts or mere recollections of unproduced correspondence, and counter-balanced by the fact that those to whom it was addressed, and who knew all the circumstances, were unable to act upon it. Yet, without slighting his memory, it would not be impossible to quote on the other side one name, at least, which counts for even more in Evangelical Councils.

Another argument which has great weight with Dr. Skene, is the supposed fact that the introduction to the Canons contains words which commit the Scotch Episcopal Church to an unreserved acceptance of the standards of the Church of England. But the Grahamstown judgment of last year assured the South African Episcopal Church that though there are in the first article of its constitution, "and in other

parts of the Synodical proceedings, general expressions affirming in the strongest way the connection of the Church of South Africa with the Church of England, and its adherence to the faith and doctrine of the Church of England, all these general expressions are unavailing for the present purpose, if, on coming to particulars, we find that the constitution substantially excludes portions of the faith and doctrine of the Church of England." The practical test applied by the Privy Council showed that "in England the standard is the formularies of the Church as judicially interpreted. In South Africa it is the formularies as they may be construed without the interpretation." In consequence, "in the Church of South Africa a clergyman preaching (Mr. Gorham's) doctrines may find himself presented for, and found guilty of, heresy."

The Scotch Episcopal Church utters an abundance of these "general expressions;" but, like the South African Church, it is careful to nullify them by repudiating the judgments of the English Church Courts, and therefore the English Church's interpretation of its standards. In the introduction to the Canons of 1863 we read: "In this character, being in full communion with the United Church of England and Ireland, and adopting as a standard of her faith the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion, as received in that Church, she (the Episcopal Church in Scotland) claims the authority which, according to the thirty-fourth of those Articles, belongs to 'every particular or national Church, to ordain, change, or abolish Ceremonies or Rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying.'" Dr. Skene quotes the first half of this, laying special emphasis on the words "*as received in that Church,*" and adding: "The Church thus explicitly receives them as they are interpreted by the Church of England, and accepts them without qualification." But the words which follow that clause, and which are omitted in Dr. Skene's quotation, constitute a "qualification," and a serious one. The late Bishop Mackarness, when representing the Scottish Episcopal Church at the Newcastle Church Congress, advanced this as an argument justifying the retention of the Scotch Communion Office, which is used at an "altar," orders an "offering up" of the bread and wine, changes "one oblation" into "own oblation," a "memory of His death" into a "memorial of His death and sacrifice," directs the offering of the consecrated elements as a "memorial," prays that the bread and wine may "*become* the body and blood" of Christ, brings back the offering of ourselves to the Consecration Prayer, omits the word "militant," and the last part of the words with which the bread and wine are delivered to the communicants, and reserves the consecrated elements. It may

be noted that the same prelate, on being transformed from a Staffordshire Vicar to a Scottish Bishop, adopted a mode of confirming taken from the First Prayer Book of Edward VI., in preference to that in the Book of Common Prayer.

It is true, then, that the Scotch Bishops say: "The standards of the Episcopal Church in Scotland and of the Church of England are the same"; but we are unable to reconcile this statement with the retention and defence of a Communion Service whose doctrines the Church of England emphatically rejects, with the most unqualified assertion of the doctrine of "Baptismal regeneration," and with the repudiation of the Church of England's interpretation of its own standards.

In this connection, two utterances of the Episcopal Synod require explanation :

On the Lord's Supper.—" You will continue to teach that this Sacrifice of the Altar is to be regarded no otherwise than as the means whereby we represent, commemorate, and plead, with praise and thanksgiving before God, the unspeakable merits of the precious death of Christ, and whereby He communicates and applies to our souls all the benefits of that one full and all-sufficient Sacrifice once made upon the Cross."

And on Baptism.—" We (the Bishops of the Church) declare that we do not consider the sentence in the case referred to (the Gorham case) as having any authority to bind us, or to modify in any way the doctrines which we and the Episcopal Church in Scotland hold, and have always taught, respecting the nature of Baptismal Grace. . . . We declare, then, that we teach, and always have taught, and we entreat, and to the extent of our Episcopal authority do enjoin you, brethren, severally to teach . . . that every child baptized according to that Office is then and there 'regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's Church.' . . . 'In my Baptism I was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.' . . . All the preceding statements, reverend brethren, we teach, and, by the authority committed to us, we enjoin you to teach to the flocks under your charge, in their plain, and natural, and grammatical sense, without the intervention of any hypothesis—charitable or otherwise."

Dr. Skene classes this latter utterance with the "numerous protests drawn forth from the High Church party in England," ignoring the fact that it emanates from the College of Bishops, with whom rest the interpretation and enforcing of the doctrines of their Church, and who have power, under their Canons, to admonish, suspend, deprive, and degrade from orders. Capetown, Colombo, Grahamstown, will suffice to show that modern Anglican Bishops are not slack to assert

and to use these powers, if once conceded to them, or supposed to be so. There is no reasonable ground of comparison between such authoritative utterance and formal sanction of false doctrine, and the impunity enjoyed by the Ritualists, not only without lawful authority, but also in open defiance of it.

Finally, Dr. Skene undertakes to state the "grounds of objection" in virtue of which "the two Glasgow congregations have peremptorily refused to join their brethren in either uniting themselves to the Church, or entering into a Concordat" similar to that made between St. Thomas's, Edinburgh, and Bishop Cotterill. He specifies the two originally put forward by himself, and pronounces them untenable; adding, "It is probably due to this being apparent to themselves that two other grounds have since been urged: viz., That the Scotch Episcopal Church protested against the Gorham judgment in 1850, and that the 'Declaration' is merely the opinion of individual Bishops, and has no authoritative or permanent character." Objections which he pronounces to be equally untenable. But he will find the first of these strongly urged in the well-known pamphlet issued by us in 1876, and the second in our Chairman's acknowledgment of the Bishop's Declaration. Naturally, the Bishops offered concessions only on those points on which Dr. Skene's pamphlet, without any mandate from us, asked for concessions; and, as naturally, our Chairman examined these concessions critically; but Dr. Skene overlooks the following sentence: "These are not the only fundamental principles of the Scotch Episcopal Church which are repugnant, I am sure, to English Episcopalians."

The present writer's reply, dated two days earlier than the Chairman's, and addressed to him, was a protest against Dr. Skene's attempt to minimize the differences between the two Churches, and an epitome of those matters which would require to be adjusted before Evangelical Churchmen could recognise the Scotch Episcopal Church as adequately representing their own. It was as follows:

GLASGOW, *December 19, 1882.*

DEAR MR. BURNS,

I have received a declaration emanating from the Bishops of the Scottish Episcopal Church, and intended to satisfy the scruples of those members of the Church of England who may be desirous of connecting themselves with the Church in question, but object to sign certain of its Canons.

The document to which I refer is a very imperfect and unsatisfactory representation of the differences, in doctrine, discipline, and government, which exist between that Church and the Church of England; and I should on this ground alone feel that a discussion of the subject had been raised on a false issue.

But, beyond this, I have no intention of leaving the Church of England; and no amount of assurances and explanations from other bodies would induce me to take any such step, so long as that Church maintains its distinctively Evangelical and Protestant character.

For your information, however, and for the benefit of any who may wish for a fuller explanation of my views on the subject, I address to you, as Chairman of the Association which unites the Church of England congregations in Scotland, this brief memorandum of certain considerations which I would venture to commend to members of that body who may contemplate seceding from it.

It appears to me that the declaration to which I have referred invites Evangelical clergymen of the Church of England to occupy in the Scottish Episcopal Church a position analogous to that of Ritualistic clergymen in the Church of England.

The Ritualist in the Church of England (in it, but not of it) teaches doctrines which are repudiated and denounced by the Court of Final Appeal; himself repudiates and denounces the fundamental doctrines of his Church; and may be deprived of his charge if the law be enforced against him. He enjoys at best a precarious toleration.

The Evangelical in the Scottish Episcopal Church is in a like ignominious position. He teaches regarding Baptism (for instance) doctrines which his highest Court of Appeal has formally condemned and forbidden; he condemns doctrines and practices concerning the Lord's Supper which his Church sanctions and fosters; and consequently he holds a position from which his Bishops can oust him at will. It is he, in this case, who enjoys a precarious toleration.

I might enumerate and dilate upon many other grounds of objection to the fundamental principles and established practice of the Scottish Episcopal Church—its assertion of the Divine Institution of Episcopacy, its repudiation of non-episcopal ordination, its adoption of Cyprian's ultra-episcopal maxim, its method of electing Bishops, its mode of enacting Canons, its interpretation of the Prayer Book, its autocratic Church Courts, its sacerdotal Communion Service, its altars, its sacrificing priesthood, its assumption of illegal titles, its self-conferred territorial jurisdiction, its present repudiation of bygone reassuring declarations—but I content myself with one comprehensive ground for refusing to enter the Scottish Episcopal Communion.

I regard the Declaration which has been forwarded to me as an attempt to commit me, and others who share my position and views, to what has been called "Anglicanism;" that is, an attempt to force upon members of our Church, when outside of England, a specious imitation of our own Church, in which, however, immunity and encouragement are secured for doctrines and practices which are illegal at home, and loyal Churchmen are deprived of the safeguards against sacerdotalism and ultra-episcopalianism which at home they still possess.

My answer to the Declaration is, therefore, as follows: I am a member and a clergyman of the Church of England; I have the right to retain that position wherever I may find myself; that right has recently been reaffirmed and practically enforced by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the Grahamstown Judgment; that right has been expressly reserved to me by law when resident in Scotland; that right is carefully recognised and safeguarded in the "Constitution" of the Church (St. Silas's, Glasgow) of which I am Incumbent; and the right thus secured to me by the laws of the Church and realm to which I belong, I intend, with God's help, to maintain so long as the Divine Providence which, in my judgment, guided me to this difficult but honourable post, shall enable me to retain it.

Trusting to have your sympathy and support in this determination,
I remain, dear Mr. BURNS,

Yours faithfully,

FREDERIC PEAKE, M.A., LL.D.,
Incumbent of St. Silas's (Church of England),
Glasgow.

The Vestries of the Glasgow Churches, first separately and then unitedly, discussed the whole question, and came to the conclusion that neither Declaration nor Concordat afforded a suitable basis for a business-like arrangement. The Declaration offers an opinion, differing from our own, as to the effect of signing the Scotch Canons, and leaves untouched many grave questions in dispute. The Concordat scheme proposed isolated agreements between individual congregations and individual Bishops; dependent for acceptance and continuance on the goodwill and the tenure of office of each separate Bishop; not binding on the Scotch Episcopal Church in its corporate capacity; and making no provision for new congregations of members of the Church of England who might object to corporate union with the Scotch Episcopal Church.

We, therefore, embodied our views in two resolutions which represent the attitude of the Glasgow congregations:

I. That a corporate union of the Church of England congregations in Scotland with the Scotch Episcopal Church on the basis of the Bishops' Declaration is not desirable.

II. That, as members of the Church of England, we shall be prepared to recommend to the congregations which we represent, any proposal for union involving the acceptance by the Scotch Episcopal Church of the standards of our Church with regard to faith, doctrine, and worship, as they have been or may hereafter be interpreted by our own Church Courts.

We feel that the second of these resolutions offers to the Scotch Episcopal Church an opportunity for stating what it means when it professes to adopt the standards of the Church of England. We want to know whether it desires to be a *bonâ fide* representative of the Church of England so far as the Presbyterian constitution of Scotland and the good faith of England will permit; or whether it is to be another Cape-town Church, *plus* a Communion Service, which we will no more tolerate in the Church to which we belong, than we will tolerate the perhaps less objectionable service proposed by the English Church Union. We offer to the Scotch Episcopal Church an opportunity for clearing up doubts and objections which remain in spite, or even because, of the ambiguities in the Declaration. We have, therefore, placed these resolutions in the hands of the Scotch Bishops—and we are waiting for an answer.

FREDERIC PEAKE.



Review.

An Old Testament Commentary for English Readers. By various writers. Edited by CHARLES JOHN ELLICOTT, D.D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Vol. II. Cassell and Co. 1883.

The first volume of the "Commentary for English Readers," edited by Bishop Ellicott, was reviewed in *THE CHURCHMAN* as soon as it was published, and we were pleased to recommend it as not only able, scholarly and interesting, with critical replies thoroughly "up to date," but as answering, in some degree, to the particular promises of the honoured editor's Introduction. The second portion of this important work, the volume now before us, also calls for cordial commendation. In not a few respects, indeed, the second volume is better than the first. It contains no commentary of equal weight with that on Genesis by the Dean of Canterbury, but the average is unquestionably high. For many theological students, and for "English readers" of commentaries generally, devout and thoughtful men and women who have no knowledge of Greek or Hebrew, but who study such works with zest and profit, the contributions of Caouons Spence and Farrar will probably prove exceedingly attractive. The commentaries on Deuteronomy and Joshua were written by the Rev. C. H. Waller, who is well-known in connection with the London College of Divinity, and as one of the Examining Chaplains of Bishop Ryle; and these two contributions, we need hardly remark, are thoroughly sound. The Rev. R. Sinker, the learned librarian of Trinity College, to whose contributions to the "Dictionary of Christian Antiquities" reference has been made in these pages, wrote the commentary on Ruth, while that on 2 Samuel was contributed by Dr. Gardiner, Professor of Divinity, Middletown, Connecticut. Viewing the volume as a present-day work, intended to meet contemporary criticisms and supply the needs of students and truth-seekers living in an atmosphere of "modern thought," this commentary has a real value, and a large portion of it is in every way excellent.

The Book of Deuteronomy, it has been remarked, was allotted to Mr. Waller, a tutor of considerable experience, and well qualified, in all respects, for such a work. His notes are sensible, terse, and profitable, though the directly spiritual exposition is occasionally poor. With his Introduction, we confess, we are somewhat disappointed. Considering the importance of the subject just now, when such writings as Mr. Robertson Smith's are so widely read, the Introduction might have been a little fuller; but editorial barriers, of course, are not to be lightly overleaped, and these are secrets into which we may not pry. Mr. Waller's Introduction, no doubt, is as long as Archdeacon Farrar's, but at the present moment certain criticisms on Deuteronomy, too often spoken of with bated breath, seem to call for treatment which is full and emphatically firm. In his expository notes, however, Mr. Waller does good service; and with many readers, perhaps, his comments on particular passages, comparing verse with verse, will have more weight than an examination of rationalistic criticisms in an elaborate Introduction. There is no doubt, indeed, that the mode of reply to modern critical theories which Mr. Waller selected has its own advantages; and, in particular, he did well to lay stress on Rashi, and quote him freely. The quotations from Jewish Commentaries, it may be noticed here, form a feature of this volume which is pleasingly prominent, and likely to be of real service. Canon Spence recognises the value of the great Hebrew

commentators ; and of his very interesting notes a few derive their point from Rashi and other such authorities. To return to Mr. Waller's Introduction to Deuteronomy. The analysis of the Book is clear, and there are marks of originality. On certain points, however, as was said, we desiderate a little fuller treatment. For instance, he touches upon the occurrence of Deuteronomic phrases in the Book of Jeremiah ; but the connection between these two inspired writings is—in view of recent positive assertions—not only interesting but of high importance. He should therefore, we think, have examined this question at some length. He should also have laid more stress, it seems to us, on the testimony of our Lord and His Apostles.

In his note on iii. 23-28 ("Thou hast begun to show thy servant thy greatness . . .) Mr. Waller says : "Moses evidently did not realize that he might see the works of Jehovah and His glory still more clearly in the other world." Is this remark quite clear? We should rather have compared such passages as Exodus xxxiii. 12.

Mr. Waller's comment on v. 7 runs as follows :

Thou shalt have none other gods before Me. Literally, upon My face, in addition to My presence, or, as Rashi says, "in any place where I am, that is, in the whole world." "Whither shall I go from Thy Spirit, or whither shall I flee from Thy face?" Idols are, at the very best, only masks which man puts upon the face of God, insulting to His dignity, and tending to conceal Him from our view.

The note on the parallel passage, Exod. xx. 3, in the "Speaker's Commentary" (alluding to verse 23 in that chapter) is very good.

On xii. 5 ("unto the place which the LORD your God shall choose") Mr. Waller remarks that the very form of this order proves its antiquity. "No one who was acquainted with the removal of the 'place' from Shiloh to Nob, from Nob to Gideon, from Gideon to Jerusalem, could have written with such utter unconsciousness of later history as these words imply." This remark is perfectly true ; but it leaves unnoticed the insinuation or assertion that the book was cleverly dressed-up with a "pious" intention, and is either a forgery or a quasi-historical parable. On verses 13 and 14, again, Mr. Waller comments thus :

Take heed to thyself that thou offer not thy burnt-offerings in every place. . . . An attempt is made by some modern writers to establish a contradiction between this precept and the one in Exodus xx. 24 : "In all places where I record My name I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee." But they are not really contradictory. The choice of Jehovah makes the place of acceptance. He need not always choose the same spot. Either this law in Deuteronomy was written by Moses, or it was not. If it was, it must be taken in the same sense as Exodus xx. 24. If it was the work of later times, the writer must have known perfectly that Jehovah had varied His choice from time to time, and therefore the injunction must still bear the same sense.

These remarks are undeniably sound.¹ And it may be remarked, further, that inasmuch as the Book of Deuteronomy contains no mention of Jerusalem, while it gives to Ebal and Gerizim a supreme importance, the absurdity of the notion that Deuteronomy was written when Hezekiah was striving to limit to Jerusalem all ritual worship, becomes tolerably clear. The mention of Ebal in chapter xxvii.² has always seemed to us a strong link in the chain of internal evidence for the Mosaic authorship of this book.

¹ Jeremiah vii. 12, "My place which was in Shiloh" is important. We agree with Mr. Cheyne that the rendering of Judges xviii. 31, "All the time that the house of God in Shiloh existed" is better.

² Hengstenberg remarks that among the Egyptians it was a common practice to depict records on walls with a coating of "plaster" (verse 4).

In commenting on xxiv. 17-22, "the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow," Mr. Waller dwells mainly upon the first of these three. "In a very special way," he says, "and for some special reason, all through the Old Testament 'the Lord careth for the stranger.' What the reason is, if we had the Old Testament only, we might find it hard to discover. But when we open the New Testament, we may see that this is one aspect of the love of God the Father to His Son Jesus Christ, Who was one day to come among us as a 'stranger.'" Mr. Waller also refers, with other passages, to "I was a *stranger*, and ye took Me not in." This lengthy note appears to us rather fanciful. The stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, surely, are linked together in the Divine command. Verses 17 and 18, indeed, on which Mr. Waller comments, form one of the links of the internal evidence of the Mosaic authorship of the Book of Deuteronomy. "Thou shalt not pervert the judgment of the *stranger*," says the inspired writer; "*thou shalt remember that thou wast a bondsman in Egypt.*"¹ Of reminiscences of Egypt this book is full; and a lesson of kindness to strangers is naturally frequent in addresses to those whose remembrance of Egyptian "bonds" was fresh.

On xx. 1 Mr. Waller might have given an explanatory note, touching the "horses and chariots," in reference to the Mosaic authorship. In the period of the Exodus "horses and chariots" were common enough, we know, in the land of Egypt; but when, with the later books of Moses in our hands, we study what is written of the land of Israel, the silence is significant. On xvii. 16, ". . . he shall not multiply horses," with reference to Solomon, Mr. Waller has given a good note; but again he misses the point of connection with Egypt ("*nor cause the people to return to Egypt*").

In the "Commentary on Judges" by Canon Farrar, to which we must now turn, we had marked many passages for brief comment and quotation. We must content ourselves, however, with two or three remarks. On Dr. Farrar's theological bias, on his stores of learning and remarkable powers, we have lately, in reviewing his "Early Days of Christianity," made some observations. Of his work now before us, in which there is no doctrinal debate, we are gratified to be able to write in hearty praise; it is singularly interesting and instructive. Few scholars of the day could handle certain passages in the Book of Judges with such felicitous illustrations and pointed phrases as are herein found. For the swing of his usual brilliant style, of course, brief expository notes gave little scope; but the literary grace of a master of thought and language is by no means lacking. A single note may be quoted:

A swarm of bees and honey in the carcase of a lion.—This incident has been questioned, because it is truly said that bees hate all putrescence and decomposition, and that the notion of bees being generated in the rotting bodies of oxen (which we find in Virgil, *Georgic* iv., etc.) is a vulgar error. But it is overlooked that the word "carcase" here means (as the Syriac renders it) "skeleton." The fierce sun of the East dries up all the animal moisture of a dead body, and reduces it to a skeleton with extreme rapidity, and bees have no dislike to dried bones as a place in which to swarm. Thus Herodotus tells us (v. 114) that when the Amathusians cut off the head of Onesilus, because he besieged them, and hung it over their gates, a swarm of bees filled the skull with combs of honey.

The Archdeacon also gives another illustration from Rosenmüller. He adds that unless Samson had considered that a skeleton could not be re-

¹ In Lev. xix. 33, 34, appears a command concerning considerate, even affectionate treatment of "strangers," having this basis: "*for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt.*" Compare Exod. xxii. 21. In his Introduction Mr. Waller justly remarks that the particulars of the laws in Deut. xii. to xxvi. "evidently breathe the very air of the Exodus."

garded as a dead body, he could not have "taken thereof with his hands," verse 9, without breaking the express conditions of his Nazarite vow (Num. v. 6).

In his Introduction the Archdeacon touches on the moral characteristics of the book, and he says: "It must now be clear to every Christian that the exterminating wars of Joshua, the fearful and indiscriminate vengeance inflicted by Israel on the offending tribe of Benjamin, the treachery of Ehud and of Jael, the wild revenge of Samson, the blood-vengeance of Gideon, and other events herein narrated, are *not to be quoted as examples for modern times.*" The concluding words of this remark, which we have emphasized, are surely not necessary, unless in his opening word "NOW" the Archdeacon desires his readers to look back to periods when the fierceness of strife between Christians, or between Christians and heathen, resulted in sanguinary surprises. Balfour of Burleigh, in Scott's "Old Mortality," might have cried, no doubt, "The sword of the Lord and of Gideon;" and at the massacre of St. Bartholomew, or in the Crusades of Palestine and Mexico, blind bigotry gilded with an imaginary Divine sanction deeds of anti-Christian cruelty. The question is, in these days, of real importance. Mozley is, of course, well worth quoting; but for ourselves, nothing so good, so clear and full, in a small compass, has been published as Dr. Boulton's Islington paper.

The "Commentary on 1 Samuel," by Canon Spence, takes up 150 pages of a volume of 510 pages. It is not probable, however, that any of his readers will be of opinion that the learned Canon has taken too much space. His notes are eminently readable—a point of importance as regards the family circle. By all reverent and thoughtful readers, indeed, this portion of the volume is sure to be termed enjoyable as well as informing; and we should gladly, did limits of space permit, give some specimen quotations. A few expressions which we had marked for criticism we must, at present, let pass. One remark we may add. Canon Spence has done well to give some choice quotations from Wordsworth, Payne Smith, Lange, and Keil. Such works as these, and the "Speaker's Commentary" are not to be found, as a rule, on the shelves of "English Readers."

Short Notices.

Universalism; or, the Witness of Reason and Scripture concerning Future Punishment. With an Appendix on Conditional Immortality. By T. M. MACDONALD, M.A., Prebendary of Lincoln, and Rector of Kersal, Manchester. Pp. 47. Hatchards.

This pamphlet has only one fault (if fault be here the proper word): it is short. It is so very good, so prudent, so firm, one wishes it had been longer: on certain points, especially as regards "Conditional Immortality," the treatment—one says with regret—might have been more full. After all, however, the *brochure* is best as it is, if only it may attain, from its *multum-in-parvo* brevity, a worthily large circulation. Many thoughtful people, in these bustling days, will make time for a little book on controversial matters, if—important proviso!—it be really good, whereas a larger publication is apt to be looked at as hopeless. Canon MacDonald's pamphlet, as we have said, is exceedingly good, and it deserves

to be read and recommended largely. So far as we know, it is—take it all in all—decidedly the best thing of the kind. Its chief characteristic is its reverent appeal to Scripture; but the witness of Reason is suggestively set forth. A single quotation will show how the author meets the advocates of Annihilationism. We quote pages 43, 44 :

2. Reason disowns the doctrine, for there is absolutely no such thing as Annihilation known in nature: "Nature does not annihilate;"¹ and besides, "We have no reason to think the destruction of a living being to be possible. We have no more reason to think that a being endowed with living powers ever loses them, than to believe that a stone ever acquires them."²

3. It is a perversion of language to speak of existence and annihilation as the *literal* meaning of life and death. Life (whether in the sphere of the vegetable creation, or the animal, or the spiritual) is existence under such conditions as to realize the purposes for which life is given. It is not being, it is *well-being*. The life of a plant is found in union with the soil, the life of a branch in union with the living tree, of a limb in union with the living body, of a body in union with the soul, and the life of the soul is found in union with the Living God.

4. That this life of God in the soul of man, created in God's image, is the life ever spoken of in Scripture as originally bestowed, as forfeited by sin, and as restored in Christ to those that accept Him, we should have thought to be unmistakably plain.

(i.) "Come unto Me;" "Abide in Me;" "Come, ye blessed of My Father." *This is Life.*

"Depart from Me, ye cursed;" "Where I am ye can never come." *This is Death.*

"Ye will not come unto Me that ye might have life" (John v. 40).

"He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, but he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but" (the opposite of life) "the wrath of God abideth on him" (John iii. 36).

"Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man," etc., "ye have no life in you." "He that eateth My flesh," etc., "hath eternal life."

Separated from Christ, there is no life.

United to Christ, there is life eternal.

(ii.) Can anyone read life as merely continued existence in such passages as the following?

"I am the resurrection and the life. He that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die" (John xi. 24-26).

"He that heareth My words, and believeth," etc., "hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, *but is passed from death unto life*" (John v. 24; comp. 1 John iii. 14). "This is life eternal, to know Thee," etc. (John xvii. 3). "Reckon ye yourselves to be alive unto God" (Rom. vi. 11). "To be spiritually minded is life and peace" (Rom. viii. 6). "I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. ii. 20). "Lay hold on the life, which is life indeed" (1 Tim. vi. 19, R.V.).

(iii.) Is it possible to read death as annihilation in such passages as these?

"Let the *dead* bury their dead" (Matt. viii. 22). "This my son was dead," etc. (Luke xv. 24). "You hath He quickened who were dead" (Eph. ii. 1). "Though he were dead, yet shall he live" (John xi. 25). "You that were dead in your sins" (Col. ii. 13). "To be carnally minded is death" (Rom. viii. 6). "She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth" (1 Tim. v. 6). "He that loveth not his brother abideth in death" (1 John iii. 14). "Thou hast a name that thou livest, and art dead" (Rev. ii. 1).

Mr. White,³ following Professor Hudson, of Cambridge, U.S.A., says, "Unregenerate men are described as 'dead,' because they" (their souls) "are certain to die" (*i.e.*, to be annihilated), and so he understands these passages as predictions of what will be; *e.g.*, "Let the dead," *i.e.*, those who are doomed to be annihilated, "bury their dead." "He that hateth his brother abideth in death," *i.e.*, will be annihilated at some future time! Can it be believed that our Saviour and His Apostles agreed thus to veil their meaning from all common understanding?

¹ "The Unseen Universe," sec. 120.

² Butler's "Analogy," chap. i., note.

³ "Life in Christ," p. 306.

Thirty-eighth Report of the Thames Church Mission Society, instituted A.D. 1844. 31, New Bridge Street, Ludgate Circus, E.C.

We have very great pleasure in inviting the attention of our readers to the Report, just published, of one of the most useful, sound, and best-managed Societies of the time. On the work of the Thames Church Mission, as our readers may remember, an article appeared in *THE CHURCHMAN* about a year ago, bearing the honoured name of that veteran Christian worker, among the foremost in evangelistic efforts, Captain Maude. The work carried on by this Society is a Mission work which is of undeniable importance; it has been largely blessed; and if only the excellent Committee were strengthened by larger gifts and subscriptions, they would be able to enlarge and develop the work. The Report—which is really interesting, and will bear reading all through—contains an account of the proceedings at the Annual Meeting at Exeter Hall, April 25th, with a statement as to income, the work done, the pressing needs, etc., and, also, extracts from the Journals of the staff. An Appendix gives information about the Mission to Deep-sea Fishermen, the motto, as it were, of which is the testimony of Mr. John Burns, Chairman of the Cunard Line. Mr. Burns says (of the agents of this Society), “Their work on board ship in the North Sea is not only most remarkable, but most gallant in those who are conducting it.” A letter from the Marquis of Cholmondeley, one of the Vice-Presidents of this Society, is enclosed, we have observed, in the pages of this Report; and as this appeal to “Christian friends” has a very peculiar character, we cannot refrain from quoting it:

As the one survivor of that little band which met forty years ago for consultation and prayer relative to the deplorable godlessness of the seamen then frequenting the port of London, it gives me special joy to-day to add a few words to those of the Report which will reach you herewith.

It has pleased the Lord to answer abundantly the prayers of His people, and while the retrospect is such as to fill our hearts with thankfulness, the future is bright with hopes of still greater blessing.

The object thus far has been the glory of Christ in the spiritual good of those ministered to by the Society’s agents, and surely herein has lain the secret of success. May God keep His servants humbly following on the same lines.

The Report tells its own unvarnished tale, and I most heartily commend it to your prayerful perusal, and especially ask you to read the closing words of Lord Shaftesbury’s powerful address quoted on page 86.

Do not forget that the Society’s income is altogether out of proportion to the extent and importance of its operations.

The Quarterly Review. No. 311. John Murray.

This is a very interesting number. “Dean Swift in Ireland,” “Farrar’s St. Paul and Early Christianity,” “The Future of Parties and Politics,” are specially able and attractive. But “The Indian Crisis” and “The Progress of Medicine” are very good; and the review of Mr. Jeaffreson’s book, “The Real Lord Byron,” is, in a literary sense, a real treat. “Modern Farming—Hay and Ensilage” will attract many readers: it is clear and encouraging. From the article on Dr. Farrar’s “St. Paul” we may quote some observations on a point which was made prominent in our review of that book. *The Quarterly* says:

The portrait of St. Paul seems to us to be daubed with too crude a colour, when his tacit admission of the taunt, that “his bodily presence was weak and his speech contemptible,” is pressed into support of the assertion that he was mean and ugly of aspect even to repulsiveness. The view, too, taken by Dr. Farrar of the “thorn in the flesh,” or *stake* as he prefers to call it, strikes us as greatly exaggerated. That the affliction was of the nature of epilepsy, incapacitating him at times for

active labour, and rendering his nervous system morbidly sensitive, is far from unlikely; but the addition of chronic ophthalmia, so virulent in its acute stages as to produce delirium, and inflicting on his countenance such a "terrible disfigurement" as to crush him beneath "an agony of humiliation," needs more to justify it than a couple of obscure hints in the Epistle to the Galatians, which may be easily explained otherwise. Indeed, the harrowing picture of the Apostle's infirmities, drawn in these volumes for the sake of contrast with the vastness of his labours, must be pronounced radically inconsistent with his amazing activity and power of endurance. How, we are constrained to ask, could he have made such journeys, survived such tortures, preached with such energy and success, indited such Epistles, borne up under the strain of governing the Churches with so vigilant an assiduity, had he been the broken-down man of Dr. Farrar's portraiture—the tottering, half-blind, and wholly unstrung invalid, who needed to be "passively conducted from place to place by companions whose office it was to guide and protect and lead him by the hand," and who was so shattered in nerves "that he could not write a severe letter without floods of tears," nor "endure to be left for even a few days alone"?

In the article on the "Future of Parties and Politics" the *Quarterly* makes some quotations from the speeches of one of Mr. Gladstone's colleagues. "Three things," says the *Quarterly*, "are sought for by Mr. Chamberlain at this moment: they are manhood suffrage, equal electoral districts, and the payment of members of Parliament. The Church, also, must be disestablished. Not long ago, it would have been thought a somewhat odd proceeding in a Cabinet Minister to go about the country with a sort of huckster's cart filled with wares which his colleagues regard as contraband; but we get used to every thing now. Mr. Chamberlain's function is, as he says, 'to put the dots on the i's; or, as he expressed it on a former occasion, in phraseology which might perhaps have been improved by some of his literary friends, 'to make things go quicker and more satisfying.' That the Church was doomed we knew long ago from Mr. Chamberlain. The hatred which he bears to it is sufficiently explained by his sneer at Christianity in his Cobden Club speech. 'Nearly nineteen centuries have passed,' said he, in partial explanation of the failure of Free-trade predictions, 'and still the doctrines of the Christian religion have not received universal acceptance; and I suppose we should think it a little presumptuous to describe the Apostles as very worthy fishermen who were neither philosophers nor statesmen, but who were chiefly to be remembered as the authors of a variety of predictions which have been falsified by events.' It is not often that an English public man has addressed an audience in this strain, but it must be remembered that the Radical of to-day denies vehemently that we are a Christian nation, and Mr. Chamberlain may see no harm in modelling his speeches upon that theory. Down with the Church—that, from him, is a reasonable cry. He has told us once before that 'it had been a hindrance to all political and intellectual progress; that it was a political manufactured, State-made machine'; and that the Liberal Party would be 'blind to the teachings of the present and deaf to the evidence of the past, if they did not take the first opportunity to remove that perpetual stumbling-block in the way of progress.¹ And his raid upon the landowners of the country ought not to have excited the surprise it did, for he has told them that the 'condition of things with regard to land involved a great injury and wrong to the labourers employed on the soil.'² It is the declaration of opinions such as these that has made Mr. Chamberlain a Cabinet Minister, and if he goes beyond most of his colleagues, he gains the more hearty applause at

¹ Speech at Bradford, Nov. 14, 1877.

² Speech at Rochdale, November, 1877.

"public meetings—a fact which we commend to the serious notice of all who think that, because he is loud, pretentious, and blatant, he can be safely disregarded. It is said that there can be no harm in his doctrines while he has colleagues in the Ministry who are largely interested in land—'Lord Hartington,' for instance, 'with his future rent-roll of £200,000 a year,' or 'Sir William Harcourt, with the archiepiscopal traditions of his family.'" Lord Hartington may or may not perceive the inevitable end of the course which his Radical associates are pursuing; he may be deluded with the not uncommon idea that the 'middle-classes' will one day rise up as one man in support of the landlords, and that the 'instincts' of the people will prevent any interference with the rights of property. Or he may feel that if something goes, much will still remain; a good deal may be taken from £200,000 a year, and yet a man may be left in comfortable circumstances. Or, lastly, he may believe that nothing would be gained by his retiring from the field, and leaving every position in the hands of the enemy. If he is unable to control Radical opinion from within the Cabinet, how much less could he do so from without? This consideration may weigh much with the Whigs generally, and in some measure may account for the anomalous ground they occupy. To depart from the Liberal ranks altogether would be to leave everything to the mercy of the Democrats and Socialists. The latter may still win everything in the end, but if an evil cannot be averted, it is sometimes a gain to postpone it. But whatever may be Lord Hartington's view of the matter, or however potent with Sir William Harcourt may be the archiepiscopal traditions of his family, it is not likely that either will have much weight in influencing the final direction of legislation on the land question, or any other question concerning which Radicalism is united. . . .

"The land and the Church are to be the first objects of assault, and Mr. Chamberlain may say, as he said once before, 'I care little which of these great questions we first attack.'"

In the *National Review* (W. H. Allen and Co.) appear, as usual, several ably written articles. This magazine deserves well of the Conservative party, and ought to be strongly supported. We had marked some passages for quotation, but space is lacking. From an article on "The Lords and the Deceased Wife's Sister's Bill" by the Right Hon. A. J. Beresford-Hope, M.P., we may quote one passage, as follows:

In any continental country and in all of the United States, where the brother and sister-in-law are free to marry, the uncle and niece, the nephew and aunt, can do the same, and the Papal dispensation which is allowed in one case is allowed in the other. A writer in the *Saturday Review* ten years since analyzed the royal and very noble entries in the "Almanach de Gotha," and found that the volume contains "four patent instances, within our own time, of marriage between a widower and his wife's sister, one between a widower and his brother's widow, and six between an uncle and a niece; and this irrespective of the coincidence of one sister-in-law being also a niece. So the last-named and most repulsive alliance stands in a majority over both the others." The list has since been swelled by the present occupants of the throne of Holland, who are uncle and niece.

With *July Little Folks* begins a new series, most attractively. This charming magazine we are always glad to recommend.

* * * We are again obliged to postpone several Notices of Books, and omit references to current topics.

¹ The *Spectator*, December 30, 1882.