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

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

about, and whatever tends to increase the usefulness and deepen the spirituality of our ministry, should be jealously guarded and fully made use of.

I have "said my say." To many of my readers it may seem that space and time might better have been occupied with the weightier matters of the law or of the Gospel. It may be so; yet if, as the result of these lines of friendly criticism, some few dead flies, or even some microscopic animalculæ, be taken out of that ointment of spikenard, very precious, which from year to year the Church, from her broken box of alabaster, should pour at her Master's feet, they will not have been written in vain. Nor let us forget the lesson of one of our children's hymns:

> Little drops of water,
> Little grains of sand,
> Make the mighty ocean,
> Make the boundless land.

W. Hay Aitken.

Art. IV.—RELIGION UNDER THE STUARTS.

History of England, from the Accession of James I. to the Outbreak of the Civil War. By Samuel R. Gardiner, LL.D., etc., etc. In Ten Volumes. London: Longmans, 1884.

THE publication by Mr. Gardiner, "in a connected form, of the works which have been the labour of twenty years," puts the public within easy reach of a very valuable history of the times of the early Stuart Kings. Mr. Gardiner's patient researches have probably almost exhausted the materials available for the period, though he tells us that material is constantly accumulating, and that he has been obliged almost to rewrite the first portion of the book. General readers will, we think, be fully satisfied with the evidence of a complete examination of the sources of history which the book exhibits. Their complaints, if they have any to make, will probably be of another character. They will perhaps find themselves sometimes bewildered among the multiplicity of details, and the difficulty of detecting the principle of arrangement, and following the thread of the history. We do not propose in this article to attempt any survey of the general history contained in Mr. Gardiner's volumes. Our object simply is to extract from them such facts and statements as may serve to give some sort of picture of the religious life which had to be lived under the earlier Stuarts.

That during the latter years of the reign of Queen Elizabeth there was a strong reaction in favour of the Church is freely admitted by Mr. Gardiner (vol. i. p. 38). Strange to say, however, at the same time that he admits this, he is very severe on the conduct and character of the man to whom, more than any other, it was certainly due, viz., Archbishop Whitgift. He makes the assertion that to aid Whitgift in what he considers his persecuting course, the Court of High Commission was called into existence (vol. i. p. 34), and that this court, as administered by him, was something altogether different from the Courts of High Commission which had been at work previously. We are unable to discover any essential difference. The three articles put by Whitgift to the clergy were all grounded on statute law; and that strict discipline was required at the moment no one really conversant with the state of the Elizabethan Church can deny. We have not been able to find anything either in Mr. Gardiner or elsewhere to make us doubt Fuller's assertion that Archbishop Whitgift was "one of the worthiest men that ever the English hierarchy did enjoy." Burghley found fault with his discipline, it is true; but were Burghley's hands clear from the spoliation of the Church? and was it not Whitgift's gallant defence of Church property, even to the Queen herself, which made Burghley and Walsingham fume? Whitgift was content with bare subscription to his articles, as articles of peace. Bancroft went beyond this, and forced the clergy to declare that they heartily approved of that which they were accepting. This was, perhaps, an unjustifiable invasion of the domain of conscience, and many of those who had previously subscribed could not bring themselves to do so again, under the circumstances. But can any sane man contend that some test of conformity was not necessary at that time? It is easy to talk about "concessions" and "comprehensions," or the policy of "loving your enemies and hating your friends;" but history is written in vain if it does not teach us the absolute futility of sacrificing principle to expediency. We are more at one with Mr. Gardiner when he speaks of the only rational solution of the difficulties raised by conflicting opinions—a solution little understood, unhappily, in those days:

> A system in which an established Church is surrounded by independent tolerated Churches may not be ideally perfect, and even in England it is not likely to hold its own for ever. But it was the only solution of the problem fitted for the seventeenth century when once Bacon's solution had been rejected. It gave to the national religion, in a new way, that combination of organization with individual liberty which Bacon had seen to be indispensable. In the development of their religious liberty the Catholics, little as they knew it, were even more deeply interested than the Puritans. Only when the two parties which divided Protestant

England, were pacified, either by peaceful union or peaceful separation, would they feel themselves strong enough to tolerate an enemy so formidable as the Church of Rome. (Vol. i. p.253.)

Of these happy days there was not then much apparent prospect. The Romanists (Mr. Gardiner persistently calls them *Catholics*) were subjected to intolerable hardships and persecutions. There can be no doubt that James had led them to believe that their condition would be greatly benefited if they acquiesced peaceably in his accession. He bribed their quiescence, and then made their condition worse than before. In the year 1605, "in different parts of England, 5,560 were convicted of recusancy." This by law involved the forfeiture of two-thirds of their lands. Many escaped this by bribing the King's Scottish followers; but a considerable number had to pay the forfeiture. Arrears in fines, which had been allowed to accumulate in the late reign, were now demanded. The rich were obliged to pay £20 a month. The goods and chattels of those who were in arrear were seized. Even the menials of the Court were allowed to prey upon these unfortunate "victims." "The profits of the lands of two recusants were granted to a footman, and this was by no means an isolated case" (vol. i. p. 230).

A very graphic and interesting account of the Gunpowder Plot is given by Mr. Gardiner. He points out well how great a share in bringing it on and supporting it the horrible doctrine of Equivocation, as taught by the Jesuits of those days, had. It is well known that Garnet's life might probably have been spared but for this:

Garnet was again examined several times after his conviction, and there may possibly have been some inclination on the part of the King to save his life. But the Jesuitical doctrine on the subject of truth and falsehood, which he openly professed, was enough to ruin any man. He not only justified the use of falsehood by a prisoner when defending himself, on the ground that the magistrate had no right to require him to accuse himself, but he held the far more immoral doctrine of equivocation. According to this doctrine the immorality of a lie did not consist in the deception practised on the person who was deceived, but in the difference between the words uttered and the intended meaning of the speaker. If, therefore, the speaker could put any sense, however extravagant, upon the words of which he made use, he might lawfully deceive the hearer, without taking any account of the fact that he would be certain to attach some other and more probable meaning to the words. (Vol. i. p. 281.)

Those who held and advocated such monstrous sentiments as this did, as it were, court persecution. Garnet added (though this is not quoted by Mr. Gardiner), "In cases of lawful equivocation, the speech by equivocation being saved from a lie, the same speech may without perjury be confirmed by an oath, or by any other usual way, though it were by receiving the sacra-

ment." The condition of the Romanists in the earlier years of the reign of James was indeed miserable, and for this they had chiefly themselves to thank. Then in this era of inconsistencies the whole condition of things is changed, and during the latter part of the reign Parliament is complaining open-mouthed of the favour shown to Romanists by king and judges.

We have called this the "era of inconsistencies," and we believe that no general term would better describe the character of the reign of James I. It is a period very difficult for the historian, as there are scarce any guiding threads running through it, except, perhaps, the increasing unpopularity of the King, and the growing importance of the middle class. What Mr. Gardiner seems to us to have done for the period is to have provided a large and valuable mass of materials, and to have thrown light on many difficult and obscure points. It would be too much to expect that he should make everything plain and simple—that, with the very best desire to represent him favourably, he should be able to exhibit James as a consistent and able ruler; or to clear away the cloud which will for ever rest on the fame of the great Bacon (vol. iv. chap. xxxiv.). What thorough knowledge and lucid and sympathetic statement may do for history is well exhibited in Mr. Gardiner's thirty-sixth chapter, giving the account of the voyage of the *Mayflower*, and the settlement at New Plymouth. Bancroft's enforcement of conformity was not accompanied, as it should have been, by the toleration of the worship of the dissidents. It is true that in the days of James separatists were not followed up with the unrelenting rigour which they afterwards experienced under Laud. But they were always at least in danger of fine and imprisonment, and could not meet together safely for common worship. The Brownists, the earliest of the separatists, had made their way to Holland. Here, however, peace did not go with them. "The self-assertion and independence of character which had made them separatists not unfrequently degenerated into an opinionativeness which augured ill for the peace of the community" (vol. iv. p. 145). Johnson, one of their leading ministers, incurred great odium from the fact that his wife had her clothes fashionably cut, and would insist upon wearing cork heels to her shoes. To these elements, already disturbed, there came in 1606 a new factor of disorder. John Smith, a separatist minister, who had got together a congregation at Gainsborough, emigrated with them to Holland, and immediately began to quarrel with Johnson. "He had adopted Baptist opinions, so far, at least, as to assert the necessity of the rebaptism of adults. Not being able, however, to satisfy himself as to the proper quarter to apply for the administration of the

rite, he finally solved the difficulty by baptizing himself. He was not one in whose neighbourhood peace was likely to be found" (vol. iv. p. 146). This good man was generally known, as Heylin tells us, as a "Se-Baptist." A congregation of a more sedate and devout character had been formed at Scrooby under two ejected ministers, Clifton and Robinson. These men, finding the difficulties and dangers of their position too much for them, decided to follow the others into Holland. After great obstacles surmounted they found themselves in Amsterdam. "But even at Amsterdam there was no rest for them. The little Church there was still distracted by disputes, and it was not for a love of theological polemics that they had left their homes. Smith and Johnson might quarrel as much as they pleased; but as for themselves, they had come to Holland in search of peace; and if peace was not to be found at Amsterdam, it must be sought elsewhere" (vol. iv. p. 151). Accordingly they soon moved to Leyden. Yet here they were not at ease. "They had come to Holland to keep themselves separate from the world. Were they sure they had succeeded?" On the contrary, the rigid elders found their congregations drifting fast into "worldliness." To escape this, they formed the design of emigrating bodily to the New World, that they might escape dangerous surroundings. Very much in the same spirit the monk or the nun seeks the cloister. But—

Naturam expellas furcâ, tamen usque recurret.

From this project, after wonderful obstacles and difficulties, grew the voyage of the *Mayflower* and the settlement of the "Pilgrim Fathers." The story is admirably told by Mr. Gardiner, and with the fullest sympathy for the religious feelings of the emigrants. A little knowledge of the after-life of these good people may perhaps serve a good deal to qualify this sympathy. In their persecutions of one another, their whippings and brandings, and even murders, they rivalled, if they did not exceed, their English persecutors.

That not alone for Romanists and Puritans, but also for Churchmen, the reign of James must have been a very wretched and trying time, is abundantly evident. It was, as we have said above, the "era of inconsistencies." At one time the King was Calvinist, at another he was Arminian. At one time he favoured the Protestant interest, at another the Romanist. The clergy were never sure how their utterances in his presence, or of which he might be informed, would be received. In 1616 the King sent strict orders to Oxford for the repression of Calvinism. In 1617 Mr. Sympson, preaching before him and advocating Arminian views, was censured, and forced to recant. Nearly at the same time Dr. Mocket, warden

of All Souls, having written a book in which Calvinism was supported, was punished by the burning of his book, while poor Mr. Peacham, Rector of Hinton St. George, was tortured and condemned to death for sentiments found in a sermon in his study, which had never been preached.[1]

Interference with opinion of the most vexatious kind prevailed. The famous Selden was forced to recant his argument about "Tithes" in a most abject manner; while Mr. Knight, a young Oxford divine who had advocated the doctrine taught by Paræus, that subjects might in certain cases take arms against their sovereign, was summoned before the Council and committed to the Gatehouse, where he remained two years (vol. iv. p. 297).

When James was approximating to the Spanish alliance, absolute and Romanist views were in favour. Throughout the country there was uneasiness and fear. The most lively dread existed of the hated religion of the Spaniard, and the strongest measures were used to coerce public opinion. "A servant to Mr. Byng, a lawyer, was stretched on the rack for saying that there would be a rebellion, and 'a simple fellow' was condemned to a traitor's death for declaring that, though he was ready to spill his blood for the King if he maintained religion, he would be the first to cut his throat if he failed therein" (vol. iv. p. 296). Dr. Everard was committed to the Gatehouse for speaking against the Spaniards in a sermon. Mr. Clayton was sent to prison for "reproducing Coke's scurrilous allusion to the introduction of the scab by sheep imported from Spain." Dr. Sheldon "was thought lucky to have escaped with a reprimand for some harsh reflections upon the people who worshipped the beast and his image" (vol. iv. p. 347).

The Archbishop was ordered to issue directions to preachers not to handle controversial topics. This was intended as a support to the High Church and Arminian School then coming into vogue. But, as Mr. Gardiner well points out, the greatest injury that could be done to them was to enable them to silence their opponents by force:

> The great battle of the sixteenth century had been waged between Catholicism and Protestantism. The great battle of the seventeenth century, as yet felt rather than understood, was to be waged on behalf of mental and personal liberty. Unfortunately it lay in the King's power to decide whether the Arminians should range themselves, on the whole, on the side of the advancing or the retrograde party amongst their country-

[1] In this sermon the writer questioned the right of the King to exact from the clergy a "Benevolence" or extra-legal contribution; the Convocation having been dissolved before voting the usual Clerical Supply, and the King endeavouring to use this plan of "benevolence" in lieu thereof.

men. Laud disputing with a Jesuit or a Calvinist, was a true Protestant, a genuine successor, according to the altered conditions of the age, of Luther and Knox. Laud entrusted with power to silence his opponents, to forbid the study of books which he considered objectionable, and to restrain the preaching of sermons which he held to be mischievous, would be upon the side of the Jesuits and the Pope. It was thus that James's efforts at repression resulted, against his will, in giving new life to Puritanism. It gained the alliance of many a man who had no sympathy with the narrowness of its tenets, but who found in the lofty and noble spirit with which it was pervaded, the strength which could enable him to shake off the weight which pressed so heavily upon the energies of the nation. (Vol. iv. p. 348.)

We cannot follow Mr. Gardiner through the minute account which he gives of the Spanish match negotiations and the Prince's visit to Spain. The story is well told, but it is one that is insufferably tedious. Of the character of James I., the historical estimate is much more favourable than that usually accorded to him. It is but just to ascribe to James I., he writes, a desire to see justice done to all, to direct his subjects in the ways of peace and concord, and to prevent religion from being used as a cloak for polemical bitterness and hatred:

But he had too little tact, and too unbounded confidence in his own not inconsiderable powers, to make a successful ruler, whilst his constitutional incapacity for taking trouble in thought or action, gave him up as an easy prey to the passing feelings of the hour, or to the persuasion of others who were less enlightened or less disinterested than himself. His own ideas were usually shrewd, and it is something to say of him that if they had been realized, England and Europe would have been in a far better condition than they were. Keenness of insight into the fluctuating conditions of success, and firmness of will to contend against difficulties in his path, were not amongst the qualities of James. (Vol. v. p. 315.)

We think this estimate considerably too favourable; but, at any rate, it may be said of James that he was a better King than the far worthier man who succeeded him. Mr. Gardiner's remarks on Charles's character show considerable insight. "Conscious of the purity of his own motives, he never ceased to divide mankind into two simple classes—into those who agreed with him, and those who did not—into sheep to be cherished, and goats to be rejected. Such narrowness of view was no guarantee for fixedness of purpose. When the moment came at last for the realities of life to break through the artificial atmosphere in which he had been living, when forms unknown and unimagined before crowded on his bewildered vision, it was too late to gain knowledge the acquisition of which had been so long deferred, or to exercise that strength of will which is only to be found where there is intelligent perception of the danger to be faced." The historian also offers some able explanations of that crying defect in the character of Charles—his want of sincerity. "When he entered into an engagement he either formed no clear conception

of the circumstances under which he would be called upon to fulfil it, or he remembered too clearly this or that consideration which would render his promise illusory, or would at least, if it had been spoken out, have prevented those with whom he was dealing from accepting his word. When the time came for him to fulfil an engagement, he could think of nothing but the limitations with which he had surrounded it, or with which he fancied he had surrounded it, when his word had been given. Sometimes he went still further, apparently thinking that it was lawful to use deception against those who had no right to know the truth (vol. v. p. 318).

As regards the prospects of religion, they were decidedly better under the new King than under James. There would be no more inconsistencies. Charles was fixed and earnest in his religious opinions. He was also devout, and little inclined to listen to loose stories and jocular remarks during sermon-time, as his father had been. Immediately on the accession of Charles, the dispute between Calvinism and Arminianism broke out more fiercely than ever. The occasion of this was the publication of Mr. Montagu's books. Parliament, inclined to Puritanism and Calvinism, and full of hatred to Rome, connected the Arminian opinions with Rome, and assailed them with extraordinary virulence. We think Mr. Gardiner sees more of reality in this notion than really exists. At all events the King would not yield. Montagu was protected, and ultimately became a Bishop. But this cost Charles an immense amount of popularity, and the religious policy which he from henceforth adopted, of entertaining as much bigotry to the Arminian side as the Parliament entertained towards the Calvinistical, was a fruitful and growing source of trouble to him. The Arminian divines, gratified by the favour of the King, and seeing nothing but bitter hostility in the Parliament, speedily became the advocates of the absolute rule of the monarch as against the claims of the legislature. The most extravagant doctrines were preached by obsequious clergy. Dr. Sibthorp maintained that it was the King's right to make the laws and impose taxes as he pleased. Dr. Wren argued that the proper way to show the fear of God was by fearing the King. "Unless you will be slaves and rebels, you will fear God and the King alike." Dr. Mainwaring claimed that "Kings were above all; inferior to none, to no man, to no multitude of men, to no angel, to no order of angels. Their power is not merely human, but superhuman. To the King is communicated all power; of dominion over the states and persons, and of jurisdiction over the deeds and actions of mortal men." This became the actual religion of these men. It was eagerly accepted by Charles, and promoted in every way by Laud, who

saw in the exaggerated prerogative of the King, both civil and ecclesiastical, a way, as he thought, of working salutary reforms in the Church. Hence the policy of Laud becomes almost wholly Erastian. There is no action whatever of the Church as such. It is the King's prerogative, wielded by ecclesiastical hands, which is made to enforce everything, whether it be a declaration as to how the Articles are to be interpreted, or a body of canons for the Church in Scotland.

We have no intention of entering upon the oft-repeated story of Laud's attempts to enforce conformity, and the hardships of the Puritanical clergy. We do not perceive that Mr. Gardiner has added anything of importance to the facts already well known; but with the candid spirit which distinguishes him, he has given the Archbishop fair play, and treated him very differently from some other historical writers who have gained credit for impartiality. We observe that Mr. Gardiner advances in candour and gentleness as his work goes on. The treatment of Laud in vol. vii. is very different from that which is accorded to Whitgift and Bancroft in vol. i. The more, indeed, that these times are studied, the more do we perceive that allowance is to be made for all parties. There was much of good as well as a considerable amount of wrong-headedness both in the Laudian and the Puritan. There was much to teach us that "The Church would never remain united unless its rulers knew how to conciliate moderate opponents. They would have to conciliate others also whose minds were cast in a different mould. They would have to find room by the side of Gouge and Sibbes for Nicholas Ferrar and George Herbert" (vol. vii. p. 262).

And if this period is fruitful in lessons of toleration, so is it also conspicuously important in the history of our theology. To it the rise of the three great schools of thought, which continue to this day to group under them almost all the clergy of the English Church, may be distinctly traced. Our readers will perhaps pardon us for sketching this somewhat more at length. The peculiar position of the English Church, after the breach between her and the Church of Rome established at the Reformation, forced the cultivation and practice of controversial writing upon her chief divines. Being assailed, they were forced to defend their position, and it must be acknowledged that they did it with great vigour and success. But when the position of the Anglican Church towards the Roman had been cleared and established by such works as Jewel's "Apology" and others, there arose a new class of assailants on the other side, against whose attacks Anglican divines had to contend. And these assailants were more difficult to meet than the Romanist writers; for not only did they carry with them

popular sympathy, but the subjects on which controversies with them turned seemed in their nature trivial, and such as might well be neglected or conceded in the face of dangers threatening from the other side. Happily our great divines did not take this plausible view, which if adopted would have speedily resulted in the loss of the continuity of the English Church, but defended against the Puritans the principles of Church government, the value of the Sacraments, and the externals of worship, with the same vigour and force which they displayed against the Romanists on the other side. It is sufficient to mention the able and pungent treatises of Bancroft, Whitgift, Cooper, and Bilson, and especially the monumental work of Richard Hooker, to show the strong position held by the Church as against the Puritans at the end of the sixteenth century.

But controversy, as these divines well knew, is not the highest work of a Christian theologian; it is rather his misfortune than his deliberate choice. And thus, when the first fervour of the attacks on both sides had abated, and the position of the Anglican Church had been strengthened, English theologians began to turn their attention to constructive and expository work, rather than to heated skirmishing with opponents. This is the main character of Hooker's great work, which is only controversial accidentally, but in substance constructive.[1] From about this date (1609) may be dated the rise of what is called the Anglo-Catholic school, the principles of which involved a revolt from the authority of the divines of the Foreign Reformed Communions, and an appeal to the judgment of the early Fathers, and the practice of the primitive Church; and of these views and of this spirit, the most prominent and able exponent in the reigns of James and Charles I. was Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester. He was the first to take a direct stand against the teaching of Calvin. He went further than Hooker, who had maintained that Episcopacy was permissible and salutary, and claimed it to be of divine right. He gave great prominence to the sacrificial view of the Eucharist as distinct from the receptive view; but he differed altogether from Archbishop Laud in his view as to the relations of cere-

[1] This is also the character of a work, nearly as great as Hooker's, but much less known, namely, Field "Of the Church." In his dedication, Dean Field, says, "That all men may know that we have not separated from the ancient Faith, nor forsaken the fellowship of the Catholic Church, but that we have forsaken a part to hold communion with the whole, I resolved to communicate to others what I had privately long since for my own satisfaction observed, touching the nature of the Church, the notes whereby it may be known, and the privileges appertaining to it."

monials to orthodoxy or good living, and he was not prepared to enforce them at the heavy cost of alienation and bitterness. "This I can affirm," says Fuller, "that wheresoever he was a parson, dean, or bishop, he never troubled parish, college, or diocese with pressing other ceremonies upon them than those he found before his coming thither." Andrewes was a controversialist against Rome, as most of the divines of his day were; but his chief strength lay in his sermons, published after his death by Laud and Buckeridge, and which, in spite of the extraordinary quaintnesses which disfigure them, are a perfect mine of theological learning. "The world wanted learning," says one of his contemporaries, "to know how learned this man was." As one of the most influential of the translators of the Bible, and as the constant friend of the learned foreigners who came to England, such as Isaac Casaubon and Hugo Grotius, his reputation for learning was, however, extensive. His great fault was an excessive subserviency to the King, which led him to take an unworthy part in the matter of the divorce of Lady Essex; but he behaved admirably when Archbishop Abbot got into trouble about the accidental killing of a gamekeeper, and by his great authority and learning succeeded in destroying the pretence set up by some of the Bishops that the Archbishop had contracted *irregularity* by the accident, and could not thenceforth perform aright his Episcopal functions.

Andrewes may be regarded as the founder of the Anglo-Catholic school; but there were other divines of that period nearly, if not quite, equal to Andrewes in learning, who wrote from somewhat of a different standpoint. Of these, the most conspicuous were Joseph Mede, Bishop Hall, and Bishop Usher. Of these, Mede is most distinguished for his work on the Revelations, and his interpretations of prophecy; Hall, for his practical and devotional writings, sermons, reflections, and contemplations; Usher, for his profound knowledge of obscure antiquities. These divines, while they quoted the Fathers, and showed deference to the decisions of Councils, yet allowed also authority to the moderns, and did not disregard the voice of the foreign Reformers. They dwelt much upon the doctrine of an Invisible Church existing within the bosom of the Visible Church, which they regarded as the subject of the promises made to the Church; and they held that the verifying faculty in the interpretation of Scripture, and the settlement of disputed points, was to be found in the spiritual guidance of the understanding of the faithful. They may be classed as the *Scriptural* school of writers, as distinguished from the school of Andrewes, Laud, and Cosin, which we may describe as the *Patristic* school.

But this period was to witness the rise of another school of

divines, which has perhaps had as much influence on the theology of the Church of England as either of the two former. This may be described as the *Rationalistic* or Latitudinarian school, of which the founders were John Hales and William Chillingworth. Hales was a man of great talent and learning. He was a Fellow of Eton, and lived a very secluded life. His writings, which have been preserved, only amount to a small collection of sermons and a short tract on schism, which is principally remarkable for the earnest attempt made by Archbishop Laud to prevent its publication. In spite, however, of the Archbishop, it got into print, and we can easily understand why Laud was so anxious to repress it. The author begins by saying that heresy and schism are two theological scare-crows, used for frighting away persons from making inquiry into opinions. Schism is a maintaining and using a rival communion and worship, or the insisting on such terms of communion as involve separation. In this case, it is the *imposing authority* which is guilty of schism, not those who separate; "for," says the writer, "when either false or uncertain conclusions are obtruded for truth, and acts either unlawful or ministering just scruple are required of us to be performed, in these cases consent were conspiracy, and open contestation is not faction or schism, but due Christian animosity." He refers the decision of what is necessary to man's own judgment rightly instructed. He repudiates altogether the appeal to antiquity. But schism is in most cases unnecessary, for in Hales's view a Christian may worship indifferently with any religious body. "For all public meetings pretending holiness, so there be nothing done but what true devotion and piety brook, why may I not be present in them, and use communion with them? Nay, what if those to whom the public service is committed do something either unseemly or suspicious, yet for all this may we not separate, except we be constrained personally to bear a part in them ourselves." He thinks that a Trinitarian may attend an Arian service, but in order to avoid schism, he would have public services cleared of everything save those things in which all Christians agree. What those are he does not tell us. Hales's argument, therefore, while it justifies separation on principle, is yet mainly directed to removing the causes of it on Latitudinarian principles.

It is unnecessary to state at length Chillingworth's argument in his great work "The Religion of Protestants." As proving the contradictory against Romanism, and as destructive of the notion of an infallible Church, it is simply perfect and unanswerable; but as a constructive treatise, it will be judged differently. It is directly opposed to those two great schools of English theology which we have already sketched; to the

Patristic school, which adopts ancient writings, traditions, and decrees, as interpreters of Scripture; to the *Scriptural* school, which believes in a direct teaching as to the meaning of Scripture to be conveyed to the mind of the devout reader by the operations of the Holy Spirit. He advocates the Rationalistic view, or truth discoverable from Scripture by each man for himself by fair inquiry, and, like his friend John Hales, he held opinions and doctrines to be matters indifferent, and not grounds of separation. Of a somewhat kindred view with these divines was a layman whose writings attracted great attention at this period, Sir Thomas Browne, the Norwich physician. In beautiful English, rivalling that of Chillingworth or Bacon, Browne advocated toleration on Latitudinarian principles. We thus have in the midst of the strictest discipline and most rigid book-examination of Laud, the birth and development of the extremest Latitudinarian principles. Many were attracted to these opinions by their liberality and seeming reasonableness. It was reserved for a famous divine of the Church of England to show the true relation between a creed firmly held and zealously guarded, and the just treatment of the opinions of others. In a well-known passage in "His Liberty of Prophesying," Jeremy Taylor says, "Although variety of opinions be impossible to be cured, and they who attempted it did like him who claps his shoulder to the ground to prevent an earthquake, yet the inconveniences arising from it might possibly be cured, not *by uniting their beliefs*—that was to be despaired of—but by curing that which caused these mischiefs and accidental inconveniences of their disagreeings." Towards reaching this good end, we think Mr. Gardiner's History may contribute not a little. The fair and candid spirit which pervades it, together with the exhaustive research which will recommend it to all historical students, are both of the highest value.

GEORGE G. PERRY.

ART. V.—A JOURNEY UP THE RIVER CONGO.

The River Congo, from its Mouth to Bólóbó; with a General Description of the Natural History and Anthropology of its Western Basin. By H. H. JOHNSTON, F.Z.S., F.R.G.S. With maps and illustrations. Sampson Low and Co. 1884.

ATTENTION has of late in many ways been directed to the Congo, or Livingstone river, particularly in regard to the enterprise of Mr. Stanley; and a well-written narrative of a journey up that great river is just now welcome. Mr. Johnston's