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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN

OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

VOL. XI.

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1885

important qualities—enterprise, energy, business tact, and public spirit—sufficiently account. To these, however, must be added another of no small importance—discernment and knowledge of character. He collected around him some of the ablest writers of the age. But Walter himself was the soul of the *Times*. He gave the tone to its articles, and superintended its entire conduct with unremitting vigilance.

In illustration, several anecdotes are recorded. Here is one. In the year 1810 there was an unfair and threatening combination on the part of the *Times*' men, and a strike:

> Mr. Walter had only a few hours' notice of it, but he had already resolved upon his course. He collected apprentices from half-a-dozen different quarters, and a few inferior workmen, who were glad to obtain employment on any terms. He himself stript to his shirt-sleeves, and went to work with the rest; and for the next six-and-thirty hours he was incessantly employed at case and the press. On the Monday morning, the conspirators, who had assembled to triumph over his ruin, to their inexpressible amazement saw the *Times* issue from the publishing office at the usual hour, affording a memorable example of what one man's resolute energy may accomplish in a moment of difficulty.

Twenty-three years later Mr. Walter was quite as ready to lend a hand, if the need were pressing. "Thus it is related of him that in the spring of 1833, shortly after his return to Parliament as member for Berkshire, he was at the *Times* office one day, when an express arrived from Paris, bringing the speech of the King of the French on the opening of the Chambers. The express arrived at ten a.m., after the day's impression of the paper had been published, and the editors and compositors had left the office. It was important that the speech should be published at once; and Mr. Walter immediately set to work upon it. He first translated the document; then, assisted by one compositor, he took his place at the type-case, and set it up. To the amazement of one of the staff, who dropped in about noon, he 'found Mr. Walter, M.P. for Berks, working in his shirt-sleeves!' The speech was set and printed, and the second edition was in the City by one o'clock." Mr. Walter died in 1847.

Reviews.

Letters of the Rev. J. B. Mozley, D.D. Edited by his Sister. Rivingtons. Pp. 360. 1885.

RECENTLY, in recommending a new edition of Dr. Mozley's great work, "A Review of the Baptismal Controversy," we took occasion to pay a tribute of respect to the learned author. Professor Mozley, who with

some justice has been called the Bishop Butler of the nineteenth century, was a philosophical thinker of singular strength ; and he had the gift of placing his thoughts upon clear bold lines, with simple and striking surroundings. The sort of coldness that seemed to characterize him increased one's confidence in his judicial temper ; and as to his research, keen insight, controversial candour, massiveness, and reverence, there could hardly be two opinions.

The letters of such a divine, of course, have a real interest ; and this volume will be read by many who, like ourselves, admired Dr. Mozley, without in some points agreeing with him. A moderate "High" Churchman, in certain respects "Broad," he held with firm and unshrinking grasp, in rationalizing days, fundamental verities, while in a spirit of conservative—wise and charitable—comprehensiveness, he defended a main principle of Evangelicalism in the Church.

The earlier pages of the volume before us contain much that is interesting in regard to Mr. Mozley's university career and the Tractarian movement ; but upon these pages we cannot even touch.[1]

In March, 1850, Mr. Mozley writes to his sister, that the Gorham decision is "making a sensation, or, rather, it is not so much a sensation as a graver feeling that a long and anxious struggle is commencing, of which people do not see the issue." He adds : "I have read enough to see that the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration has a history appended to it, and is not to be decided upon wholly from the verbal statements in the Church Office, but that we are bound to go into the history of it. And I certainly see various changes and modifications as to the doctrine, coming out in that history, as allowable within the Church. I see statements made sometimes which, if put into easy English and placed before some of our orthodox friends, would be set down at once as heresy, but which occur in undoubtedly orthodox authorities." Further reading, however, he cautiously added, might change his opinion.

But further reading did not at all change his opinion : on the contrary, his views were confirmed. At that time, as he wrote, he knew "enough to see that people make very strong assertions on points on which they do not know much in reference to this question" (Archdeacon Wilberforce, for example), and instead of retracing his steps he went forward.

In the same year, 1850, referring to those who "think so fearfully of our Reformation Erastianism," "our ultra friends who are eager for a convulsion," he writes, that he cannot agree with their views. "nor do I see anything in their temper which attracts me" (p. 203). He refers to "D——, who is a *considerable Romaniser*" (the italics are our own), "meeting Cardinal Wiseman at dinner," and he comments on certain clerical converts (perverts) who set themselves up as laymen : one goes to the theatre, and another has a stall at the opera-house. Instead of clerical black, it appears, some "were garbed in showy waistcoats," and even decked themselves in blue neckties and ginger-coloured trousers. The brighter the hue, perhaps, and the "louder" the pattern, the deeper rejoicing at being free from Anglican Orders.

In 1853 Mr. Mozley wrote : "Gladstone introduced me to Lockhart :" and he began an article for the *Quarterly*. At this time many interesting remarks appear in his correspondence on literary, political, and ecclesiastical affairs. He thought that Mr. Gladstone would do much for the Church. Things were more and more tending to Liberalism at Oxford ; and "a High Church Liberalism" seemed likely to be the order of the

[1] In the year 1846, *The Guardian* was planned by a few High Churchmen, among whom James Mozley was prominent as writer and organiser. For a time its failure seemed inevitable.

day. In Feb., 1856, he met "Elwyn, the editor of the *Quarterly*, an agreeable, very well informed man, and a fluent talker."

In 1855 (Jan. 1) appears a remarkable letter. Miss Mozley says:

> The following letter, written after having been for ten years thrown upon his own thoughts, and upon the natural bent of his own mind and character, wears a serious air—a full consciousness of taking a step. Of course, to those near him, the step was no surprise.

The step was this: he would have nothing more to do with the editing of the *Christian Remembrancer*. "I find that after four years of reading," he writes, "interrupted indeed, but still carried on with some degree of "system and considerable thought, I have arrived at a change of opinion, "more or less modified, on some points of High Church theology; but to "a very decided one with respect to a particular doctrine which has been "the theme of great dispute, and on which the party in the Church "which the *C. R.* professes to reflect, has taken very strongly one side—I "mean the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. I now entertain no "doubt of the substantial justice of the Gorham decision on this point.

"I have, too, been engaged, as you may know, on a book which is now "arriving at something like completion, and part of which will express "my views on this question, and enter into the whole argument connected "with it." It was not, he explained, that he wished to separate himself from those with whom he had hitherto acted. The Tractarian body, he said, was still the "one with which, on the whole," he most sympathized. Nevertheless, it is clear that he was, bit by bit, drawing away from the Tractarians, although the influence of family ties and personal connections was still powerful.

He loyally accepted the Gorham decision. "I find, after reading and reflection, that I accept the Gorham decision." When Charles Marriott said to him, "For my part, I object more strongly to the tribunal than to the decision," Mozley wrote: If people "cannot use stronger language than this, it seems to me that the ground for any strong separation of parties in the Church is rather gone."

In 1856 Mr. Mozley accepted the Vicarage of Old Shoreham, and married a daughter of Professor Ogle. The Vicar and Mrs. Mozley were much esteemed by their parishioners. The services were of the old-fashioned type, we believe, and the Vicar preached in the black gown to the last.

Mr. Mozley, in 1859, praises Cobden's refusal of office. "I dare say," he writes, Cobden "is not sorry to show a set of exclusives, who look down upon his class as purchaseable with certainty—if only they can lower their fastidious taste to swallow them—that he can do without it." Mr. Mozley remarks, that Cobden "had had an uncle of his own name, once a Dean of St. Paul's;" and adds, "He is not the sort of man whom one would suppose had connections in the Church." Another letter in 1859 has the following paragraph:

> That review of Jowett in the *Times*—except on the audacious principle, which often tells—seems rather a mistake in judgment: the puff overdone, and the ground not judiciously taken. If the letter of Scripture is a veil, and Christianity is Jowett behind the veil, one does not feel very secure. It is curious to see two totally opposite schools talking of the difficulty of interpreting Scripture. But really, this aboriginal Christianity, which Jowett and his reviewers dig up beneath no end of strata, is as perfect an *arcanum disciplinæ* as ever was invented by tradition (*p.* 245).

The Rationalist movement in Oxford, for which the Tractarian had paved the way, was now gaining strength and spreading. In 1860, Mr. Mozley had "a conversation with B., who was rather strong as to the

Jowett element in Oxford, and the narrow line between it and positive infidelity." In 1861 Mr. Mozley writes that the writers of "Essays and Reviews" had gone great lengths; "but I think that even they would shrink from what their theology would practically become if taken up by the mass. That is simple infidelity, and indeed atheism; for Baden Powell's essay, popularly interpreted, could be nothing else. A few subtle intellects may maintain really to *themselves* a neo-Christian ground, retaining something of the Scriptural system; but a congregation of such spirits is an impossibility" (p. 250). In 1865, Mr. Mozley writes of the "great lengths" to which Stanley was going; "he forgets that Renan is not an unsettled heathen, but an apostate from Christianity."

Here and there in this volume one desiderates an editorial note. For example, on page 255 appears a letter about the Articles, the last paragraph of which, though it is wonderfully shrewd and has an interest of its own, will to some readers be unintelligible. The paragraph runs thus: "Gladstone's speech was very clever in having something in it to please everybody, and excite hopes in all directions, and yet with the orthodox bent pre-eminent." Again, on page 261 appears an editorial statement as to the correspondence between Mr. Kingsley and Dr. Newman, exciting "much amusement;" but no mention is made of the *Wasn't Kingsley right after all?* Here and there, we may add, an expression of opinion—not James Mozley's—obtrudes itself. For example, on page 115, Mozley criticizes Newman's letter to the Vice-Chancellor, about Tract XC., remarking that "a general confession of humility was irrelevant to ther present occasion." "Whether they would be provoked to think it humbug or concealed triumph, or be softened by it," said Mozley, "I hardly knew." In a footnote we have a letter from another member of the family (the Mozleys—it will be remembered—were by marriage connected with Newman), praising Newman's letter as breathing a "Catholic spirit of humility." It was a very common practice among Dr. Newman's admirers, at that time, to praise his humility.

In the autumn of 1862, Mr. Mozley published his "Review of the Baptismal Controversy." Being part proprietor of the *Christian Remembrancer*, which took a strong line against his book, he was desirous to dissociate the family name from the title-page of that periodical; and in December he sent to his sister an extremely interesting statement as to his own views. "I should describe our family politics," he wrote, "as "moderate High Church. I should describe myself under that term. I "have said nothing but what recognised moderate High Church divines "have said, such as the late Bishop Kaye, who was always regarded as "*the* learned Bishop of the Bench in his day; and what the Bishop of "Oxford openly says in his charges—namely, that our formularies were "meant to include both parties. But though moderate High Church, we "don't go along with the spirit that breathes in the controversial reviews "of the High Church party, still less should we be disposed to turn a "clergyman out of his living for holding what is admitted on all sides to "have been openly held in the English Reformed Church, from the first "moment of its existence to the present moment. The Gorham judg-"ment simply sanctioned a *de facto* state of things which had existed from "the first, there being, too, nowhere, any dogmatic statement the other "way in our formularies."

Of "Father Faber" Mr. Mozley writes in 1865, that he "could not help discerning something of the *baby*" in his photographs. He had previously remarked (p. 209), "his talk always seemed to me artificial and with effort." In 1866, referring to a "remarkable assertion" made by Father Faber about the Archangel Michael, Mr. Mozley wrote to his sister:

> Faber is certainly very amusing. . . . I may use that term because his spiritual

world is so completely a region of his own invention, that one ceases to connect it with serious subjects. The decision of a controversy by a fact about St. Michael, hitherto unknown, but assumed as an undoubted celestial fact because his pen knocked it off with perfect ease, is quite a specimen of Faber's reasoning.

In 1866, Mr. Mozley, after reading the life of Scott—"Bible Scott"—writes of "the extraordinary energy and strong sense of the man, joined to his enthusiasm and disinterestedness." He admires Scott's "balance of mind," as well as his acuteness and intellectual power. How far it is correct to say that Scott's Commentary was undertaken to keep "doctrinal ultraism down in his own party," as Mr. Mozley wrote, is an interesting subject, to which we shall be pleased to return.

In 1869, the new Premier offered to Mr. Mozley a Canonry of Worcester. Of Mr. Gladstone's letter, one paragraph has, just now (after Mr. Bligh's Cathedral Reform letter in the *Times*), a special interest:

> Among the Canons of our Cathedrals even, and perhaps especially since 1840 there are few who have contributed, or are likely to contribute, much to the theological store of the Church of England in this day of her pressing need. I rejoice that my first act in this province of my duty has been to promote the addition to their number of one who, as to both promise and performance, is sufficient sensibly to raise the average.

In the same year Canon Mozley, in a private letter, gave his views upon this point. Cathedral Reformers were busy; Deans were to be abolished, and Canons utilized. Canon Mozley's remarks, in reply, are well worth reading: and, for ourselves, we thoroughly agree with his conclusion as to Canonries—"*a proportion ought to be insisted upon;*" let busy "practical" Canons be diocesan workers, but other Canons may devote themselves to theological writings; let the claims of learning and thought be duly considered. Of four Canons, one, at least, as we think, ought to take some share in diocesan labours as Mission Preacher.[1]

There was a tendency in 1869, no doubt, to give everything to "*busy* men," as Canon Mozley said. And in the cry against Deans and Chapters there was, as many of our readers will remember, something not particularly just. Nevertheless, the need for Cathedral Reform was real; and it has grown more urgent.

In 1871, Canon Mozley was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford. In January, 1878, he entered into rest. The closing pages of this volume contain some touching passages in regard to the death of Mrs. Mozley six years before.

Thomas Carlyle. A History of his Life in London, 1834-1881. By J. A. FROUDE, M.A. Two vols. Longmans, Green, and Co.

We do not think that the present volumes will materially affect the opinions which a large section of those who read them have been led to form, within the last three or four years, touching the life and character of Carlyle. The last portion of the work, however, is better than the first.

"Carlyle exerted for many years," says his biographer, "an almost unbounded influence on the mind of educated England. His writings are now spread over the whole English-speaking world. They are studied with eagerness and confidence by millions who have looked to him, and looked to him not for amusement, but for moral guidance, and those millions have a right to know what manner of man he really was. It may be, and I for one think it will be, that when time has levelled accidental distinctions, when the perspective has altered, and the foremost

[1] See "Diocesan Missions," July CHURCHMAN, 1883.

figures of this century are seen in their true proportions, Carlyle will tower far above all his contemporaries, and will then be the one person of them about whom the coming generations will care most to be informed." This may be partly true. Yet it is of Carlyle as a "genius," a literary man, and not as a teacher, we think, that the coming generation will inquire. But let us again listen to Mr. Froude. Carlyle, he says, came "forward as a teacher of mankind. He has claimed 'to speak with authority, and not as the Scribes.' He has denounced as empty illusion the most favourite convictions of the age. No concealment is permissible about a man who could thus take on himself the character of a prophet and speak to it in so imperious a tone." In short, Carlyle played a part which, in some sort, entitles his readers to demand, and justifies his biographer in affording, a complete account of his character.

Now, Mr. Froude speaks of his friend's "creed." "Carlyle taught a creed," he says; but if we inquire "What are the articles" of this belief? we ask in vain. Nor did the "prophet" lay down any principles by which his followers might shape their course. We read that the duties of man is a better watchword than the rights of man, which is undoubtedly correct; but if anyone asks what his duties are, or how he is to do them, no answer is given. There are protests, and doleful doubtings, and aspirations and ejaculations; and some of these have a sort of poetic reverence and sublimity. But of practical common-sense directions in life's labours; of help and comfort in life's sorrows, temptations, and perplexities, there is nothing at all.

We may quote a few of the passages in which the "prophet" of Chelsea describes his contemporaries.

In 1834-5 he was at work on the "French Revolution." He stuck to his book "like a burr," his diary says. But now and then he went into society. Here is a bit from his journal:

Met Radicals, etc., at Mrs. Buller's a week ago. Roebuck Robespierre was there—an acrid, sandy, barren character; dissonant-speaking, dogmatic, trivial, with a singular exasperation; restlessness as of diseased vanity written over his face when you come near it. . . . Sir William Molesworth, with the air of a good roystering schoolboy, pleases me considerably more.

Shortly afterwards he met Southey:

February 26, 1835.—Went last night, in wet, bad weather, to Taylor's to meet Southey, who received me kindly. A lean, grey, white-headed man of dusky complexion, unexpectedly tall when he rises, and still leaner then—the shallowest chin, prominent snubbed Roman nose, small care-lined brow, huge bush of white-grey hair on high crown and projecting on all sides, the most vehement pair of faint hazel eyes I have ever seen—a well-read, honest, limited (strait-laced even), kindly-hearted, most irritable man. We parted kindly, with no great purpose on either side, I imagine, to meet again. Southey believes in the Church of England. This is notable—notable and honourable that he has made such belief serve him so well.

In the year 1838 he made the acquaintance of Grote; and thus he describes him:

In the evening a Bullerian rout. "Dear Mrs. Rigmarole, the distinguished female; great Mr. Rigmarole, the distinguished male." Radical Grote was the only novelty, for I have never noticed him before—a man with straight upper lip, large chin, and open mouth (spout mouth); for the rest, a tall man, with dull thoughtful brows and lank dishevelled hair, greatly the look of a prosperous Dissenting minister.

In the following year he met Hallam:

A month ago (Carlyle writes to his brother) Milnes invited me to breakfast to meet Bunsen. Pusey [not Dr. Pusey, but his elder brother] was there—a solid, judicious Englishman, very kind to me. Hallam was there—a broad, old, positive

man, with laughing eyes. X. was there—a most jerking, distorted, violent, vapid, brown-gipsy piece of self-conceit and green-roomism. Others there were; and the great hero Bunsen, with red face large as the shield of Fingal—not a bad fellow, nor without talent; full of speech, Protestantism — Prussian Toryism — who zealously inquired my address.

In 1847 Carlyle spent a day at Rochdale, and made acquaintance with Mr. Jacob Bright and his distinguished brother:

I will tell you (he writes to his wife) about Bright, and Brightdom, and the Rochdale Bright mill some other day. Jacob Bright, the younger man, and actual manager at Rochdale, rather pleased me—a kind of delicacy in his features when you saw them by daylight—at all events, a decided element of "hero-worship," which, of course, went for much. But John Bright, the Anti-Corn-law member, who had come across to meet me, with his cock nose and pugnacious eyes and Barclay-Fox-Quaker collar—John and I discorded in our views not a little. And, in fact, the result was that I got to talking occasionally in the Annandale accent, and communicated large masses of my views to the Brights and Brightesses, and shook peaceable Brightdom as with a passing earthquake; and, I doubt, left a very questionable impression of myself there! The poor young ladies (Quaker or ex-Quaker), with their "abolition of capital punishment"—*Ach Gott!* I had great *remorse* of it all that evening; but now begin almost to think I served them right. Any way, *we cannot help it:* so there it and Lancashire in general may lie for the present.

Sir Robert Peel, we are told, was one of the few men in England whom Carlyle had any curiosity to see. A personal acquaintance, through the Barings, began at a dinner at Bath House, in the year 1848:

March 27.—Went to the Peel enterprise; sate next Sir Robert—an evening not unpleasant to remember. Peel is a finely-made man, of strong, not heavy, rather of elegant, stature; stands straight, head slightly thrown back, and eyelids modestly drooping; every way mild and gentle, yet with less of that fixed smile than the portraits give him. He is towards sixty, and, though not broken at all, carries, especially in his complexion, when you are *near* him, marks of that age; clear, strong blue eyes, which kindle on occasion, voice extremely good, low-toned, something of *cooing* in it, rustic, affectionate, honest, mildly persuasive. Spoke about French Revolutions, new and old; well read in all that; had seen General Dumouriez; reserved seemingly by nature, obtrudes nothing of *diplomatic* reserve. On the contrary, a vein of mild fun in him, real sensibility to the ludicrous, which feature I liked best of all.

Here are two bits from the second volume. Carlyle went one evening to the Dean of Westminster's:

Lion entertainment to Princess Helena and her Prince Christian. Innocent little Princess, has a kind of beauty, etc. One little dash of pretty pride, only one, when she rose to go out from dinner, shook her bit of train right, raised her pretty head (fillet of diamonds sole ornament round her hair), and sailed out. "A princess born, you know!" looked really well, the exotic little soul. Dinner, evening generally, was miserable, futile, and cost me silent insomnia the whole night through. Deserved it, did I? It was not of my choosing—not quite.

Here is a note on a then current question of political and ecclesiastical interest;

Irish Church Resolution passed by a great majority. *Non flocci facio.* In my life I have seen few more anarchic, factious, unpatriotic achievements than this of Gladstone and his Parliament in regard to such an Ireland as now is. Poor Gladstone! Poor old decayed Church and ditto State! But once more, *non flocci facio*, him or it. If they could abolish Parliamentary eloquence it would be worth a hundred abolitions of the Irish Church, poor old creature!

We had marked other passages in the second volume; but enough. The work before us—really interesting as it is—can hardly be termed profitable. Of Mr. Froude's own expressions some, to say the least, seem quite uncalled for. If Carlyle had kept more of the faith of his child-

hood, how much happier he would have been, and how much more useful! His biographer concludes in the following words: "So closed a long life of "eighty-five years—a life in which extraordinary talents had been de- "voted, with an equally extraordinary purity of purpose, to his Maker's "service, so far as he could see and understand that Maker's will—a life "of single-minded effort to do right, and only that, of constant truthful- "ness in word and deed. Of Carlyle, if of anyone, it might be said that "'he was a man indeed in whom was no guile.' No insincerity ever "passed his lips; no dishonest or impure thought ever stole into his "heart. In all those long years the most malicious scrutiny will search "in vain for a single serious blemish. If he had frailties and impatiences, "if he made mistakes and suffered for them, happy those whose conscience "has nothing worse to charge them with. Happy those who, if their "infirmities have caused pain to others who were dear to them, have, "like Carlyle, made the fault into a virtue by the simplicity and com- "pleteness of their repentance."

The Unique Grandeur of the Bible. Being a new Plea for an old Book, in six chapters. By the Rev. WILLIAM ANDERSON, M.A., late Rector of Upper Cumber, and Prebendary of Derry, Minister of the Octagon Chapel, Bath. London: Hatchards, Piccadilly. 1884.

This is a very recommendable volume by an earnest, able clergyman, who knows that the Bible is God's Book, because it has spoken with power to his own conscience and heart, and who has also tested it in a variety of ways to see whether it can claim equal authority over the mind. The result, as herein exhibited, is a most assured affirmative as to the reasonableness of regarding the Bible as Divine. The argument is developed in six chapters, which bear the following titles:

I. The Place of the Bible among the Sacred Books of the World.
II. The Bible and the History of the World.
III. The Bible and Modern Thought.
IV. The Bible and Human Systems of Morality.
V. The Bible and the Soul of Man.
VI. The Bible and Christ.

Taking each of these in turn, the author seeks to demonstrate that the Bible occupies a position by itself; and while we are of opinion that, in his loving zeal for the Book, he is often led to assert a detailed uniqueness which it would perhaps be wiser not to insist upon so strongly, we are assured that, taking the argument as a whole, it must strike very strongly any unprejudiced reader. We also feel bound to state that several of the principal arguments are positively delightful to read, so novel is the treatment, and so powerfully convincing the reasoning.

The first chapter opens thus: "What has been the result of comparing the Bible with the other sacred books of the world?" Anyone who knows at all the prevailing currents of thought amongst thinkers and scholars, will perceive that Prebendary Anderson has boldly faced that aspect of anti-Christian belief which is just now the most dangerous—dangerous, *i.e.* to those who are easily moved by passing phases of opinion—for we need hardly say that no true Christian can ever doubt the ultimate issue of these controversies. Thus the author has, at the very outset, plunged *in medias res*, and taken the bull by the horns. But how has he fared in the encounter? We are not afraid to say that his triumph is complete—indeed, startlingly so. For when—basing his statement on a comparison of the Bible with the sacred books of the East, published under the editorship of Professor Max Müller—he states (page 4) that no effort which could have been made with the avowed

object of showing the superhuman excellence and unapproachable superiority of the Bible could have yielded a happier result than the recent publications by which we have been enabled to compare it with the contemporary record of other faiths, he is well within the mark. Whether we accept his own judgment as that of a cultured believer, who has read the "sacred" books, so far as they have been translated, or prefer that of one not likely to be over-prejudiced in favour of the uniqueness of the Holy Scriptures, Max Müller himself, the result is one that must rejoice the heart of every Christian. The latter has felt bound to apologize for the disappointment which his great life-work—the editing and translation of the sacred books of the East—must cause many expectant readers. He says: "Readers who have been led to believe that the Vedas of the ancient Brahmans, the Avesta of the Zoroastrians, and the Tripitaka of the Buddhists, the Kings of Confucius, or the Koran of Mahommed, are books full of primeval wisdom and religious enthusiasm, or, at least, sound and simple moral teaching, will be disappointed on consulting those volumes" (pages 8, 9). Further, the Professor thus states his own evidently pained wonderment: "We confess it has been for many years a problem to us—aye, and to a great extent is so still—how the sacred books of the East should, by the side of so much that is fresh, natural, simple, beautiful, and true, contain so much that is not only unmeaning, artificial, and silly, but even hideous and repellent" (page 9). Mr. Anderson, of course, holds not only that the Bible far excels these books in all those points which are common to it and them, but that it contains special and unique excellences—that is, the Bible not only comes triumphantly out of the ordeal of comparison, but does not really admit of comparison. "By these" ["the revelation of spiritual truths, and the record of the promises of God"] "it is raised as far above the best of human systems and books of human thought as the sun is higher than the Alps" (page 38).

We have given so much of the brief space at our disposal to the first chapter of the volume before us, that we can only say in general that those parts which specially deal with the philosophical and scientific aspects of the discussion are, on the whole, worthy of so admirable a commencement; and that the last chapter is wisely devoted to a commentary on a fine phrase in the short but charming preface, "Christ is the centre of the Bible."

Having said so much in just praise of a really readable and useful work, we must, in conclusion, speak candidly as to one grave fault in the book. It is sadly wanting in a severely logical order of thought—indeed, we are bold to suggest that the author, when preparing a second edition for the press, should submit it to the candid revision of a not too friendly critic. "The Unique Grandeur of the Bible" is so good that it deserves to be made a great deal better. M. A.

Short Notices.

John Wycliffe and his English Precursors. By Professor LECHLER, D.D., of the University of Leipzig. Translated by Professor LORIMER, D.D. A new edition, revised; with a chapter on the events after Wycliffe's death. Pp. 500. Religious Tract Society.

THIS volume has reached us too late for a worthy notice in our present impression; but inasmuch as the January CHURCHMAN will be issued before the five hundredth anniversary of Wycliffe's death, we are minded